



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: Matt Adams- Executive Director

ADDRESS: 670 Indigo

APPLICATION: CA2-23-060

MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1963

Property Location: First house in the Cul de Sac on Indigo

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Paint removal and windows 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: Complaint for painted brick was issued on 7/22.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant has not indicated this as a part of the proposal; however, the original windows have been removed from the house and Staff recommends the original windows be reinstalled or be replaced in-kind. A 2012 photo show the original window featured side lite on each window. The proposed windows are three single windows.

Painting

The Applicant has painted the masonry. Unpainted masonry is not permitted in the District. Staff recommends, the painted be removed from the masonry in a manner that is not abrasive to the brick. Pressure washing is permitted. The Applicant can consult the Secretary of Interior Standard for treatment of Historic properties to gather further information for removal.

Front Door

The door that is shown is a Craftsman door, which is not appropriate for this style house and time. Staff recommends the proposed door be a door that is reflective of a door suitable for this time.

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 return the windows to original windows to match the original windows in light design, function, materials and shape and size. A 2012 photo provides the specific windows in questions, per Sec.16-20Q.006(3)(c)(d);
2. The painted shall be removed from the masonry in a fashion that is not abrasives to the brick per Sec. 16-20Q.005(1)(b)(i)
3. The Applicant shall install a door that abide by the District regulations regarding doors. And be a door reflective of the time and style of the house, per Sec.16-20Q.006 (3) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



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: 181 Pearl Street NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-072
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District, Subarea 3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Pearl Street SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Georgian Cottage

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA3-22-422

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

Application CA3-22-422 was approved with conditions at the September 28, 2022 hearing of the Urban Design Commission. Staff issued final approval of the plans on October 25, 2022. Since that time, the Applicant has been working with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs Historic Preservation Office to utilize historic tax credits as funding for the project. The regulations require that the new features on the approved addition differentiate from the original features on the house to establish a visual differentiation between old and new.

This application addresses three elements which would be altered to differentiate the new work on the addition. The Applicant proposes changing the size of the windows and trim on the addition to differentiate the new workmanship. The windows installed on the addition portion, would be smaller than the existing windows on the original portion of the house. The windows would comply with the code in terms of style and materials.

The application proposes that the siding installed on the addition be 6” in reveal versus the original body of the house which has a 4” reveal. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal as it meets the requirements laid out in Sec. 16-20A.006 (13)(b)(1).

The cap molding on the trim would be also reduced in scale by 50% and the decorative portion of flat trim would be eliminated. Sec. 16-20A.006 (c) states, “Alterations shall not introduce materials or building elements that do not reinforce the architectural character of the building and shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. Sec. 16-20A.006 (e) states, “Any alterations or additions shall be compatible with the massing, scale and architectural features of the property.” Staff finds that the proposed alterations to the approved plans meet the requirements of the code for alterations and addition, as they are compatible with and reinforce the overall design of a Georgian Cottage. As such, Staff does not have any concerns with the revised window size or trim design.

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: 310 Ormond St.
APPLICATION: CA2-23-074
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: North block face of Ormond St. between the Hill St. and Grant St. Intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vernacular Victorian Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Installation of public art.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work that does not affect the front façade or front roof plane.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: the HP Studio Staff has previously reviewed applications CA2S-18-474 for site work, CA2S-19-395 for minor alterations to non-street facing façades, and CA2S-22-335 for additions to non-street facing façades.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions.

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

The Applicant is proposing a series of changes to the front façade including the replacement of non-historic siding and windows. In general, Staff has no concerns with these changes as the materials proposed (unclad wood 1/1 windows and smooth faced cement siding) meet the District regulations. The Applicant is also proposing replacement of the front porch railing. Staff would recommend that the Applicant submit documentation showing that the railing is not original to the structure, or that the railing is deteriorated to the point where repair is not possible. Staff further recommends that replacement of the railing only be permitted after Staff has confirmed that the railing is not original to the structure, or that the railing is deteriorated to the point where repair is not possible. Lastly, Staff recommends that any replacement railing meet the District regulations and be constructed using a two-part top rail, butt-jointed balusters, a bottom rail, and kick stops.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit documentation showing that the railing is not original to the structure, or that the railing is deteriorated to the point where repair is not possible, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
2. Replacement of the railing shall only be permitted after Staff has confirmed that the railing is not original to the structure, or that the railing is deteriorated to the point where repair is not possible, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
3. Any replacement railing shall meet the District regulations and be constructed using a two-part top rail, butt-jointed balusters, a bottom rail, and kick stops, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D); and,
4. 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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 821 Piedmont Ave. (Nicholson Wilson Perrin House LBS)
APPLICATION: CA2-23-077
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: SPI-17 (Subarea 4)

Other Zoning: Landmark Building/Site

Date of Construction: 1892

Property Location: Southeast corner of Piedmont Ave. and 6th St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style\: 19th Century Eclectic. Exhibits a mixture of Classical and Renaissance architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch floor replacement

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions.

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

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of all wood porch floors with a PVC porch flooring product. The Applicant notes previous alterations where PVC flooring was installed on the property, however, Staff is not able to locate approvals from the Commission for this work.

From the photographs provided, Staff finds that the porch flooring is in various states of disrepair, with the majority of the flooring appearing to be in relatively good condition. However, given that much of the flooring is painted these photographs would not convey the structural integrity of the porch materials. Photographs of the drip edge of the flooring have been provided which appear to show damage consistent with moisture contact.

Based on this information, Staff finds that some of the porch flooring requires replacement. To determine the extent of replacement required, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide a rough floorplan of the porch areas along with labels showing which of the photographs corresponds to the specified porch area. Staff further recommends that any area of porch flooring which Staff has determined to be repairable in condition be retained. Staff further recommends that the replacement flooring match the orientation of the original, be installed so that rain will properly shed from the porch, and that any joints be made at a 45-degree angle replicating the original flooring joints.

Regarding the use of a PVC flooring material, Staff finds that this would not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20.009(5). As such, Staff recommends any replacement porch flooring material be a wood tongue and groove material matching the width of the original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide a rough floorplan of the porch areas along with labels showing which of the photographs corresponds to the specified porch area, per Sec. 16-20.009(2);
2. Any area of porch flooring which Staff has determined to be repairable in condition shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20.009(2);
3. The replacement flooring shall match the orientation of the original, shall be installed so that rain will properly shed from the porch, and any joints shall be made at a 45-degree angle replicating the original flooring joints, per Sec. 16-20.009(5);
4. Any replacement porch flooring material shall be a wood tongue and groove material matching the width of the original, per Sec. 16-20.009(5); and,
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
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: Matt Adams- Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2733 Baker Ridge
APPLICATION: CA2-23-080
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: East of Forrest Ridge and West of Collier Ridge

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations: Windows, Siding
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: None Known

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to change windows on the house to match the existing grid patterned windows except for the three windows on the front. The Applicant indicates the existing windows are vinyl and the replacement windows will be vinyl. While the original windows were probably wood, at the time of designation, those windows had been removed with the existing vinyl. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The existing siding on the house is wood. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing siding with textured cementitious siding. The District regulation doesn't speak of replacement of wood siding. The regulation does mention that lap siding is governed by the compatibility standard. Since the existing siding is wood on the house, Staff expects the new siding to be compatible with that existing wood siding, which probably was the original siding. Staff recommends the wood siding to be replaced with wood siding in-kind including the reveal or repair in-kind to the existing wood siding.

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 replacement siding shall be in-kind including the reveal with the existing siding or be repaired in-kind with the existing wood siding per Sec. 16-20Q.006(1)(h) and
2. 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: Matt Adams- Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2965 Baker Ridge
APPLICATION: CA2-23-085
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1957

Property Location: Corner of Larchmont and Baker Ridge

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations
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: No, know issues

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

ALTERATIONS

The house sits on a corner lot, so the proposed rear deck, and window replacements will be seen by the public.

Deck

The Applicant is proposing to replace in-kind the existing deck at the same location. Photo show the deck is in disrepair. Staff is not concern with this proposal

Windows

The Applicant also proposes to replace two windows that are on the back of the house that are partially blocked by a garage, retaining wall and stairs. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval



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: 451 Collier Ridge Drive NW
APPLICATION: CA2-23-089
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1948

Property Location: East side of Collier Ridge Drive NW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: American Small House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, CA2-22-566

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

At the January 11, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission, the Applicant (under CA2-22-566) proposed replacement of the existing siding, windows, and doors on the house. Though it was not included in the scope of proposed work, Staff observed that the rear addition, would be converted into a bedroom, with two windows added, and the existing door eliminated. There would be a new door added to the rear elevation, to the side of this addition.

The Application was approved with the following conditions, with no objections or request for discussion from the Applicant. The conditions in red are addressed in this revised application, the conditions in green are conditions which are not addressed in this new application (but Staff would note that due to the number of outstanding conditions, no final approval has been issued for CA2-22-566.

- 1.) The Applicant will update the existing elevations to accurately depict all features present on the house.
- 2.) The Applicant will remove the non-historic siding to determine the condition of the original wooden siding, submitting photo-documentation so that Staff may determine the appropriateness of replacement.
- 3.) The Applicant may replace the siding on the additions which were constructed without the original wooden siding, with wood siding which matches the original present on the house in reveal.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit compatibility data for doors present on the block face.
- 5.) The Applicant will retain and restore the existing historic windows present on the structure.
- 6.) The Applicant may replace the damaged glass in the windows, which have had original glass removed.
- 7.) The Applicant will repair and replace the damaged exterior framing on the historic windows with framing which matches the existing in material, scale, and reveal.
- 8.) The Applicant will not enclose the existing window on the right elevation.
- 9.) The Applicant will restore the window which has been infilled with plywood in that location on the right elevation.
- 10.) The Applicant will install two new windows on the rear addition which are wood-framed, double-hung windows with a six-over-six lite pattern which matches the style of the one remaining 1948 window that on the house.
- 11.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

While in the process of fulfilling the conditions of CA2-22-566, the Applicant submitted photos illustrating the condition of the original wooden siding. Staff determined that the siding, with the exception of small patches was not sufficiently deteriorated to warrant full replacement with cementitious siding. Staff acknowledges that portions of the house, which are non-original additions are clad in other materials and their replacement with wood siding which matches the original in scale and reveal was approved with the previous application. The Applicant states that *“The original siding was put up with no osb and is simply an underlayment. The house was wrapped with roofing felt paper right over the framing studs and the siding was applied on top of the felt paper which serves no purpose for the interior insulation or keeping*

the electrical components separated from the outside weather. It's purpose is served as a underlayment. Without an actual exterior siding, this home will not be energy efficient.” The Applicant requests with this application that the previous Commission ruling be reversed, and the installation of cementitious siding be approved. Staff has significant concerns with this proposal. No evidence has been given of proposed interior work, which would leave the historic cladding material in place, and work to provide further insulation of the house from the interior. Staff would further note that Sec. 16-20Q.006 (21) states, “Alterations and additions to contributing structures requiring a certificate of appropriateness shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure, shall comply with the applicable regulations for in subsection 16-20Q.006; and shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property...To protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, any new work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and environment.” Staff finds that the proposed used of wood-patterned, cementitious siding would not comply with the requirements of the code, and the historic siding must be retained, and the new siding which is installed on non-original portions, must match the historic siding in size, scale, and material per the previous Commission ruling on CA2-22-566.

The Applicant also proposes the installation of steel, 9-lite doors on the house. The doors on the house are not original and Staff has requested the Applicant submitted compatibility data for the contributing structures on the block face as a condition of CA2-22-566. The Applicant has submitted photos, but no associated addresses, and far less than are present on the block face. Staff is concerned because the doors submitted are clearly non-historic replacements which do not meet the code. The compatibility data was not sufficient to provide evidence for the proposed door design. These non-compliant doors may pre-date the listing of the district and cannot be used for compatibility purposes. Section 6-20Q.006 (2)(c) states, “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.” Based on the houses present on the block face it appears that a six-panel, solid wood door will meet the requirements of the code. The proposed steel door with nine-lights that does not match the historic doors present on the block face in design or materials and cannot be installed on the front or rear elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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: 320 North Highland Ave
APPLICATION: CA3-22-070
MEETING DATE: February 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** MRC-3-C/Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: Northeast corner of North Highland Ave. and Copenhill Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial/Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New construction of a multi-family structure (Building C)

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Approvals of previous portions of the project.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously approved CA4PH-23-454, CA3-22-590, CA3-22-457, CA3-22-462, and CA3-22-589 at this site and the neighboring site at 346 Copenhill Ave.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions.

CA3-22-070 – 320 North Highland Ave.

April 12, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant has provided plans and documentation for the proposed multi-family structure (Building C). In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposal and finds that it meets the District regulations. Staff would, however, note that the plans show on pg. A2.3a (Building C – South Elevation) the grade line for the front façade as being measured from Bernina Ave, and Copenhill Ave. Regardless of where the functional front of the building faces, Staff finds that the lot fronts North Highland Ave., and therefore the height measurement must be taken from the façade of the building facing North Highland Ave. As such, Staff recommends the height of the building taken from grade at the south/front façade of the building be provided. Staff further recommends that the height of the building meet the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The height of the building shall be taken from grade at the south/front façade of the building be provided, per Sec. 16-20L.005(f);
2. The height of the building shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20L.005(1)(b)(ix); and,
3. 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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 638 Eloise St.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-087
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4B/Beltline.

Date of Construction: 2014

Property Location: East Block Face of Eloise St., between the intersections of Berne St. and Mercer St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Contemporary Infill

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial.

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

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 7 feet (required) to 5 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 sewer easement in the rear of the property. Based on the information provided, Staff finds that the easements specified take up almost the entire lot. As such, Staff finds that this would constitute an extraordinary and exceptional condition. – **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, they would not have full enjoyment of their rear yard. However, Staff does not find that this directly relates to the extraordinary or exceptional condition that the sewer easements create. Further, Staff is not convinced that the rear yard setback is impacted by the sanitary sewer easements. – **NOT MET**

What conditions are peculiar to this particular piece of property?

The Applicant cites the sewer easements on neighboring properties which result in those lots containing a larger rear yard setback. Again, Staff does not find that sewer easements directly affect the rear yard setback. – **NOT 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 due to the easements, no structure could be built to the rear of the property. Regardless of the existence of sewer easements, Staff finds that the rear yard setbacks would also prevent any development to the rear of the principal structure. – **NOT MET**

Staff finds that the Applicant's responses do not meet the criteria.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

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: April 12, 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

Edits in GREEN

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. The other windows appear not be the right size. Staff recommends the drawing accurately be depicted what is representative on the original house.

The Applicant has corrected the issues listed. While that Applicant has not truly matched the bump out, Staff sums this up to possibly the computer and not an attempt to manipulate the bump out on the left side. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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, plus 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.

The Applicant has modified the porch proposal to meet the recommendation set by Staff prior. Staff is not concerned with the porch proposal.

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.

The Applicant has noted the siding will be wood siding. Staff still notes it shall be in-kind to the existing.

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.

The Applicant has noted that the windows will have 6-inch mullions and 4-inch trim on the windows. This is not problematic to Staff. However, the windows are required to be wood, same size, same shape and same placement as the original windows. Staff still stand on this recommendation and ask the Applicant to put that on the elevations.

Corner Boards

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

Same recommendation
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

The Applicant has removed the faux gable roof.

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

The Applicant is showing a door that meets the District regulations. But Staff request the Applicant note that on the elevations.

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.

The Applicant has placed a brick chimney on the elevations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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.

The Applicant is showing a 10 feet wide driveway titled Gravel Landscape; however, the driveway is stopping short of the front yard, which is not permit. The driveway will have to extend 20ft past the front yard. It appears the Applicant will need to adjust the location of the driveway to make this happen. Staff recommends the driveway be redesigned to meet the District's regulation.

Walkway

The Applicant is proposing a walkway that is too close to the driveway and doesn't appear to have any 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.

The new site plan is showing the existing walkway. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. If the Applicant wish to repair or replace the walkway, it must be done in-kind.

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 replacement wood siding shall be noted on the elevations, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(p);
2. All windows shall be repaired or replaced with the original material, size, shape and placement of the original window which is wood, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o) (1);
3. All exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass in wood frame shall be noted on the elevations, per Sec.16-20M.013.002(r)(5);

4. The 10 ft driveway shall be redesigned to meet the District requirement of 20ft past the front of the house, per Sec.16-20M.12(4)(c);
5. 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
6. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

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: Matt Adam, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 537 Seminole

APPLICATION: CA3-23-011

MEETING DATE: April 12th deferred since February 22, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: North of Mansfield Ave and dead ends on Seminole

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

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

On the existing house the Applicant proposes to change the front roofline of the house and add an addition for added living space and renovations in the house. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing several alterations to the house.

Changing the Roofline

District Regulations states, “new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” The Applicant proposes to change the front roof top form a Mansard type roof to a Gable roof top. While this is different from the roof form, the change does not destroy historic material or feature of the house that characterize the property, nor does this change the overall massing of this property. Staff also reason, in order to allow for the addition the Gable roof will be needed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Addition

The addition roofline is not problematic to Staff, the highest ridge point does not supersede the point of the main roof. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Dormer

A proposed dormer on the front of the Gable roof with three windows. The dormer is small in appearance and does appear to be intrusive to the over house or roof. The three windows are predominantly vertical in proportion, a requirement of the District and match the existing windows on the house.

ALTERATIONS

Door removal and Window installation

The Applicant proposes to remove the door on the second level of the house. The removal of the door doesn't distract from the integrity of the historic property and the environment.

The Applicant proposes tripartite window to match the exiting windows on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Trans Windows

The Applicant proposes to reinstall transoms windows that had been covered internally with drywall. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Remove Side Shed and Added Side porch

The Applicant is proposing to remove what appear to be a nonoriginal side glass enclosure on the Cleburne Ave side elevation. In its place, the Applicant proposes a screened in side porch. Staff has no concern with this proposal. If removed in the future, the removal will not alter the historical significance of the property.

Staircase removal

The Applicant propose to remove the existing staircase on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CA3-23-011 for 537 Seminole

April 12, 2023

pg. 3

Windows

The Applicant proposes to install several windows in the rear of the house. 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: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 573 Westend Place
APPLICATION: CA3-23-030
MEETING DATE: April 12th deferred since 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 Eggleston

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

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: Defer to April 26th UDC Meeting

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

EDITS are in RED

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.

**The Applicant still has not provided lot coverage. Recommendation still stands
The Applicant has removed the proposed floor plan but has provided an existing floor plan. And the electrical plan shows the proposed floor plan. But the Applicant should also provide a proposed floor plan.**

The windows on the elevations are not precise in location which make it appear the windows are being moved. Staff recommends the Applicant check the location of each window and accurately place them on the elevations.

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 shows 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 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.

A 1949 Sanborn photo provided by the Applicant shows the house had a full-width porch. The Staff has no problem with the Applicant returning the stoop back to the full-width porch. Nor does Staff have a problem with the flat roof over porch.

The Applicant has proposed front porch wood butt joint railings. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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.

Staff recommendation still stands. Additionally, the Applicant has not shown the windows correctly on either the existing or proposed. Staff is adding a recommendation, that all windows be reflected correctly on the existing and proposed plans. For example, the front windows are not correct.

Siding

The Applicant proposes smooth face wood siding. Staff is not concerned with the wood siding. Staff does recommend the Applicant remove the language of smooth-faced and make the list the reveal as matching the existing.

Door

While the Applicant is showing a door with rectangular lights, it is a Craftsman door and not really suited for a Folk Victorian. Staff recommends the door be wood with a rectangular light.

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.**

Fence

The Applicant proposes a fence but has not specified the dimensions. District regulations state fence can be either brick, wood, or metal pickets. Fence shall not exceed six feet in height on the side and rear of the yard and not exceed four feet in the front. Chain link fence is not permitted. Staff recommends the Applicant note on the site plan what material the fence will be and height and abide by the District requirements for fences.

Driveway

The Applicant is showing a driveway. Staff recommends the driveway be 10ft and 20ft past the front of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the April 26th UDC Meeting

1. Lot Coverage shall be added to the final elevations and renderings, per Sec.16-20G.005;
2. The proposed floor plan shall be provided, per Sec.16-20G.005;

3. The windows shall be reflected accurately on each elevations and show no movement, per Sec.16-20G.005
4. The wood lap siding shall match the original wood siding in reveal, Sec.16-20G.006(2)(d);
5. 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);
6. The Applicant replicate the exact windows that are original and shown on the house, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(c);
7. The wood siding reveal shall match the original reveal on the house, per. Sec.16-20G.006(2)(d);
8. Door shall be wood with rectangular lights, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
9. The fence shall be brick, wood or metal, not exceed six feet in height on the side and rear and only be 4feet in the front yard. No chain link fence are permitted, per Sec.16-20G.006(14)(a)(b)(c);
10. The driveway shall be 10ft wide and 20ft past the front of the house, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(c)
11. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKINS
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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 255 Georgia Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-051
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: South side of Georgia Avenue SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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: CA2-22-478, 22CAP-00001867, 22CAP-00001963

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

In October of 2022, the Applicant came before the Commission for approval of façade alterations, including re-opening a porch which had been enclosed in the non-historic period, and removal of a non-compliant window also installed within the non-historic period. These alterations were approved with conditions under CA2-22-478 at the Urban Design Commission (UDC) hearing on November 9, 2022. The Applicant never received final approval from Staff, due to remaining outstanding conditions which had not been satisfied. There was additional proposed work to the structure, a rear addition, which was not taller than the existing ridgeline and would not be visible from the public right-of-way. As a result, this addition was not under the purview of the UDC. On December 4, 2022, the Applicant was in the process of constructing this rear addition when the foundation, rear, and side walls collapsed. As a result, 22CAP-00001867 was placed on the property for unsafe conditions, as the collapsed right wall of the structure was resting on the neighboring house. The Applicant then began total reconstruction of the house, without review or approval by the UDC, for which they were issued 22CAP-00001963 on December 28, 2022.

CA3-23-051 has been determined to cover new construction, due to the fact that only the front wall, enclosed porch, and portions of the original roof remain. The Applicant has stated that they intend to reconstruct the house to the exact previous dimensions. Staff has concerns with this proposal based on the submitted plans. Several concerns were raised regarding the accuracy of the plans during the review of CA2-22-478, and in reviewing the photos from code enforcement it appears that all interior load bearing walls, as well as far more of the roof and side structure were removed than was indicated on the plans, most likely a major contributing factor to the collapse. In looking at the plans, there are two rooflines, the front is a pyramidal roof, the rear is a hipped roof. On the elevations the front roof is not correctly depicted. The coversheet shows a roofline that appears to be sloppily hand-drawn in and does not have accurate or even slope on each side, while the actual elevations have not been corrected. Given the deficiencies that occurred using previously incorrect plans, Staff must insist on plans that are accurate in all aspects. The Applicant will submit plans accurately depicting all features proposed for the new construction. The Applicant will correct the roof form and include roof pitch on all roof planes on all elevations. The Applicant will annotate the elevations to show proposed materials, including dimensions of siding and trim.

The Applicant has not submitted any proposed materials to be utilized for the reconstruction. The proposed window to be utilized on the front elevation also is a remaining outstanding conditions of CA2-22-478. Given the massive material loss that resulted from the collapse of the historic home, Staff must have specification provided to determine if they meet district regulations. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials, siding, trim, windows, and doors which will be used for the new construction.

The submitted site plan also does not note any features other than the house. Staff wants to ensure that the site is accurately depicted, so that no additional historic features are lost during construction. The site plan should include all impervious surfaces, structures, and lot features. The Applicant will update the site plan to include all applicable site features.

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

- 1.) The Applicant will submit plans accurately depicting all features proposed for the new construction.
- 2.) The Applicant will correct the roof form and include roof pitch on all roof planes on all elevations.
- 3.) The Applicant will annotate the elevations to show proposed materials, including dimensions of siding and trim.
- 4.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding and trim.
- 6.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows and doors which will be used for the new construction.
- 7.) The Applicant will update the site plan to include all applicable site features.
- 8.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next Commission hearing.
- 9.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.



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: 938 Park Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-058
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: East side of Park Avenue SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Linear Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch 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: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes a partial-width, 10-foot deep by 24- feet in length, porch addition to the façade elevation. The proposed porch would be front-gabled and would require grading of the land to accommodate the foundation, as there is a grade change moving towards the right side of the house. There is an existing, non-conforming deck which would be removed as part of the proposed construction. The foundation appears to be poured concrete or CMU (it is not noted on the proposed plans), with a wooden fascia board fronting and supported by three square brick veneer columns matching the existing material of the home. The gable would be infilled with wooden shake shingles. Staff has several concerns with the proposed design. Sec. 16-20K.007 (c) states, “Alterations to non-contributing structures, for which a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be required, shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction set forth in subsection 16-20K.007(2)(B) above.”

Staff finds that the porch does meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B), in that it is parallel to the lot frontage, a minimum of 1/3 the width of the front façade, and at least 7 feet in depth. Staff has concerns with the proposed design because it is not consistent with the architectural character of the original structure. The structure is a Linear Ranch House, which while not a contributing feature to the district is an architecturally significant style in the history of Georgia. The Linear Ranch House is marked by distinguishing features including it’s low, horizontal profile, large, diverse fenestration, brick veneer exterior, and hipped roof. Linear Ranches seldom had porches, as they came of age in an era where air conditioning was common, and porches were no longer needed for shade and air circulation. The proposed porch design is more akin to a design that would be found on earlier architectural types such as bungalow or a Queen Anne cottage.

The gabled porch completely obscures and changes the distinguishing characteristic of the Linear Ranch, its low-slung horizontal profile, which is emphasized by the hipped roof, which would be largely obscured by the new porch. Staff recommend revising the porch design to be closer to the overhangs which are common to ranch houses, that feature an extension of the roof plane, or a simple shed roof. Staff also recommends minimizing the bulky proposed supports, and opting for a more period appropriate material, such as decorative wrought iron supports. The Applicant will redesign the proposed porch to a style which “reinforces the architectural character of the existing structure,” per Sec. Sec. 16-20K.007 (c).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed porch to a style which “reinforces the architectural character of the existing structure,” per Sec. Sec. 16-20K.007 (c).
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CA3-23-058 938 Park Avenue SE
April 12, 2023
Page 3 of 3



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: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1051 Peoples
APPLICATION: CA3-23-064
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1949

Property Location East of White Oak and West of Lawton

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

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. 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: BB has been granted for interior renovations and rear addition. The rear addition should not have been approved without UDC approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the April 26th UDC meeting

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

PLANS

Staff recommends, the Applicant provide a site plan, that show the FAR and Lot coverage information.

The Applicant has not shown the chimney on the plans, (both existing and proposed). The chimney is an important element for the house. Staff recommends Applicant put the chimney back on drawings. And if the intention was to remove the chimney that is not possible.

The Applicant has not shown the exposed roof rafters on the front elevation but instead applied trim. The roof rafters are also an important element on the house and must be retained. What appears to be trim maybe gutters. If this is the case, the Applicant must identify this as such on the plans. Gutters are essential for the restoration of the roof.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to add 758 sft to the existing house for living space. The addition will extend behind the existing house, and the double gable roof line will tuck nicely under the existing roofline. The addition will not supersede the setbacks. Staff is not concerned with the addition proposal.

Siding

The proposed siding for the addition is cementitious which is permitted for additions and new construction in the District. Staff is not concerned with the proposal. Staff does recommend the cementitious be smoothed face with a reveal 4 to 6 inches to match the original siding.

Windows

The windows the Applicant proposes on the addition appear to be in-kind to what is existing on the house with the exception mullions are being proposed. If this is the case, Staff recommends, if muntins or mullions are used, such muntins or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass.

Deck

The proposed deck is on the rear left elevations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

The foundation will continue with the same type of cinder block as the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Windows.

On the proposed right elevations, the back windows appear to have been altered to a smaller size. District regulations states, "replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening." Being this is the case; Staff recommends the Applicant return the windows on the right elevations back to their originality.

Door

Photo provided by the Applicant, shows the door is original but needs repair but in good condition. Staff recommends the Applicant keep the original door and repair it. However, if the door is unrepairable, the door must be wood panel or fixed glass panel in a wood frame.

Unannounced Work

The Applicant has not indicated any of the work listed below. However, Staff noticed the following does need work and is calling it out in this Staff Report:

Porch railings and Columns

A January 2023, Google Map view shows that most of the front porch railings are missing, and all are installed incorrectly. Staff recommends, the railing be reconstructed as a two-part head-butt system with the top railing be no higher than the bottom windowsill, with a simple plain extension if needed to meet code.

Columns appear to need repair and should be done in-kind to match the original.

Siding

Siding is asbestos and appears to be fairly good shape from the 2023 Google map photo. However, there are clear damaged piece of the siding. This means, the Applicant will need to replace the siding. Smooth face cementitious siding is permit in the District. Staff recommends, the reveal be 4 to 6 inches.

Unauthorized car shed

There appears to be an unauthorized and nonoriginal car shed on the driveway. The shed should be removed and not reconstructed.

Driveway

The driveway appears to be in good condition. Staff recommends if the Applicant repairs the driveway, it be done in-kind or if replaced; it must be 10ft wide and 20ft past the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the April 26th UDC meeting

1. The Applicant shall submit a site plan, that show the FAR, lot coverage, per Sec. 16-20M.006;
2. The house chimney shall be shown on the existing and proposed elevations, per Sec.16-20M.006(2);
3. The cementitious siding shall be smooth-faced and have a reveal of 4 to 6 inches, pr Sec.16-20M.013,(2)(q);
4. All windows with mullions or muntins shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass, per Sec. 16-20M.13(2)(n)(2);
5. Windows in the back of the existing corner shall be returned their original size and position to abide by the District regulations, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o)(1);
6. The front door shall remain and repaired. However, if the door is unrepairable, the door must be wood panel or fixed glass panel in a wood frame, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
7. The railing shall be a two-part head butt construction with the top railing being no higher than the bottom windowsill with a simple plain extension if needed to meet code, per Sec.16-20M.013;
8. The columns on the porch shall be repaired in-kind to the original columns, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(e);
9. The exterior front door shall be either a wood panel door or a fixed glass panel in wood frame, per Sec.16-20M.006(2)(r)(5);
10. The unauthorized car shed shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20M.
11. The current driveway shall be repaired in -kind. If there is a need to replace the driveway, the driveway must be 10ft week and 20feet past the front facade, per Sec.16-20M.013 and
12. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

CA3-23-064 for 1051 Peoples
April 12, 2023
Page 4 of 4

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: 683 Shelton Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-068
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Shelton Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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: Deferral until the April 26, 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.

The Applicant proposes construction of a new single-family home. It is not entirely clear to Staff what the intent of the Applicant is based on the submitted materials. The submission for external materials shows a radically different house than the one shown on the submitted elevations. The Applicant will clarify if there are elements of the proposed design which may change based on the separate designs.

Staff has significant concerns with the compatibility data submitted. The Applicant has included four properties (highlighted in red in the table below) which cannot be utilized for compatibility purposes, as they are non-contributing structures. The Applicant will submit revised compatibility data including only information from contributing properties.

Address
642 Shelton Avenue SW
646 Shelton Avenue SW
652 Shelton Avenue SW
656 Shelton Avenue SW
662 Shelton Avenue SW
668 Shelton Avenue SW
672 Shelton Avenue SW
676 Shelton Avenue SW (vacant, historic property demolished)*
682 Shelton Avenue SW (vacant, historic property demolished)*
688 Shelton Avenue SW

*historic features may be noted for compatibility purposes, particularly for the former contributing structure on the property

In addition, the only data which has been provided for compatibility is overall height. Staff has compiled a table below illustrating the features which are subject to the compatibility rule, which have not been provided. Staff has elaborated in the text below precisely the issues with these features. The Applicant will submit complete compatibility data for all outstanding features.

Feature Subject to the Compatibility Rule	Data Included	Data Missing
Front Yard Setbacks		X
Side Yard Setbacks		X
Overall Height	X	
Scale and Massing	X	
Building Materials (cladding)		X
Roof Form		X
Roof Pitch		X
Foundation Materials		X
Void/Solid Ratio		X
Scale, Size, Proportion of Openings		X
Porch (required)	X	
Paving Materials		X
Driveway/Walkway/Patio Design		X
Door Style		X
Door Material (required)	X	
Window Style		X

Front Yard Setbacks

Section 16-20 I.006 (1)(a)(1) states, “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.” The Applicant has submitted a site plan which utilizes baseline setbacks for R4-A zoning, not based on the compatibility rule or the previously existing structure. Staff must have compatibility data provided to determine if the proposed setbacks meet the compatibility rule.

Side Yard Setbacks

Section 16-20 I.006 (1)(a)(2) states, “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.” The Applicant has submitted a site plan which utilizes baseline setbacks for R4-A zoning (7 feet), which while technically meets the code, still is not based on the compatibility rule or the previously existing structure. While Staff is comfortable with the states setbacks as is, Staff would note that if the proposed front or rear yard setbacks change this also may necessitate changing the side yard setbacks out of necessity.

Overall Height

The proposed height of 22 feet 11 ½ inches does fall within the acceptable range to meet the compatibility rule (18-24 feet); however, Staff would note that given the degree of redesign needed, particularly the roof form, this height may change as a result.

Scale and Massing

The Applicant proposes a pyramidal cottage house form. This is largely based on the non-contributing structures present on the block face. The predominant form, and by extension massing is the New South Cottage, which an extending front gabled extension from the hipped roof. The Applicant will revise the proposed house form to conform with that which predominates on the block face.

Foundation Materials

The Applicant proposes use of brick for the foundation material. The photos submitted show that 652 and 656 Shelton Avenue SW have brick foundations; however, materials are not shown on the other contributing structures. As a result, Staff cannot determine if this material meets the compatibility rule.

Cladding

It is not entirely clear what the Applicant proposes to utilize for cladding. The plans note lap siding, but also note cementitious siding. No specifications for proposed materials have been provided, so Staff is unable to determine the appropriateness of the proposal. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding materials.

Roof Form

The predominant roof form present on the block face is a true hipped roof (versus a pyramidal form) and has not been utilized. Staff also notes that to achieve a second story the Applicant is proposing a rear gable, so that the roof form is also not truly hipped. Any dormer proposed on the second story should not engage the primary roofline. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to utilize a hipped roof to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant will revise the proposed rear dormer to not engage the primary roofline.

Roof Pitch

No compatibility data has been submitted regarding roof pitch. The proposed roof form (pyramidal) also does not meet the compatibility rule. A Hipped roof, the required roof form will have a much shallower pitch. The Applicant will provide compatibility data for roof pitch on contributing structures. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to be in compliance with the compatibility rule in terms of pitch.

Void/Solid Ratio

Staff has significant concerns with the lack of fenestration on the side elevations. There is no fenestration on the right elevation and only a pair of windows on the left. This is a substantial deviation from the existing contributing historic structures on the block face.

Porch

In terms of compatibility, none of the contributing structures on the block face have full-width porches. Based on the compatibility rule, which requires a change in massing the porch will also need to be modified to meet the compatibility rule. Staff is not opposed to having a full-width porch, but it would need to be modified to engage with the required mass. Staff also finds that the integrated porch roof is not appropriate and should be modified to be an independent feature, which does not engage the primary roofline. The Applicant will redesign the proposed porch to be an independent feature which does not engage with the primary roofline. The Applicant will redesign the porch to conform to the revised massing of the house. The Applicant will provide data illustrating the compatibility of the proposed porch features including porch supports and balustrade.

Paving Materials

The applicant has not submitted compatibility data for paving materials.

Walkway

Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed walkway design.

Driveway

The driveway shown on the site plan does not meet district regulations. Sec. 16-20I.006 (5)(a) states, "Off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard." The proposed driveway does not extend to the front façade, let alone the required 20 feet past. Given the very narrow proposed side yard setback of exactly 7 feet the drive will have to be narrowed to come into compliance. This is of particular concern as the proposed site plan is extremely close to maximum lot coverage. The Applicant will redesign the proposed driveway to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20I.006 (5)(a) and illustrate that they do not exceed maximum lot coverage.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant proposes one-over-one, double-hung windows. Staff does not have concerns about this, as it is the window style which predominates on the block face. No specifications have been provided for the proposed windows to be used, but Staff would note that based on Section 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(3) they must be wood-framed. Staff also has concerns with the paired, large windows which do not conform to the historic patterning and almost total lack of fenestration on the side elevations.

Likewise, a color has been provided for the front door, but no specifications. Per Section 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(8), "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." The Applicant will install wood-framed, one-over-one, double-hung windows. The Applicant will revise the fenestration patterning to more closely mirror the historic patterning present on the block face. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed doors.

Site Plan

In addition to the concerns regarding lot coverage, Staff has additional concerns on the site plan regarding typography and tree coverage. The site plan shows six trees being removed. The Applicant must ensure that they are in full compliance with the city of Atlanta Tree Ordinance. It also appears that there is a grade change across the property. It is not entirely clear how this will impact the proposed site plan in terms of grading. The Applicant will clarify the proposed grading and site changes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify if there are elements of the proposed design which may change based on the separate designs.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit revised compatibility data including only information from contributing properties.
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed house form to conform with that which predominates on the block face.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding materials.
- 5.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to utilize a hipped roof to meet the compatibility rule.
- 6.) The Applicant will revise the proposed rear dormer to not engage the primary roofline.
- 7.) The Applicant will provide compatibility data for roof pitch on contributing structures.
- 8.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to be in compliance with the compatibility rule in terms of pitch.
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed porch to be an independent feature which does not engage with the primary roofline.
- 10.) The Applicant will redesign the porch to conform to the revised massing of the house.
- 11.) The Applicant will provide data illustrating the compatibility of the proposed porch features including porch supports and balustrade.
- 12.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed driveway to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20I.006 (5)(a) and illustrate that they do not exceed maximum lot coverage.
- 13.) The Applicant will install wood-framed, one-over-one, double-hung windows.
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the fenestration patterning to more closely mirror the historic patterning present on the block face.
- 15.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows.
- 16.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed doors.
- 17.) The Applicant must ensure that they are in full compliance with the city of Atlanta Tree Ordinance.
- 18.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed grading and site changes.
- 19.) 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.



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
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 995 Sparks

APPLICATION: CA3-23-069

MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lee Street and East of Peeples Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior of the new construction

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: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “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.”

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided 9 comparisons for the new construction.

975 Sparks
989 Sparks
997 Sparks
999 Sparks
1009 Sparks
1013 Sparks
1015 Sparks
1031 Sparks
1037 Sparks

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed 19 feet above grade new construction. Staff is not concerned with the highest roof height is 22 ft and the lowest is 16ft.

The proposed pitch is 4:12. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; the highest proposal is 6:12 and the lowest on the blockface is 3:12 on the blockface.

Roof form

The proposes roof form for the new construction is double front gable with a side gable and ending gable. It appears the predominate roof form is a gable roof line of some sort. Staff is not concerned with the gable roof form overall.

Dormers

The dormers do not concern Staff, both are not exceeding the roof line and setbacks

Massing

The massing of the house is much more than the other houses on the blockface, this is due to the fact the lot size is much larger than those on the blockface at a size of 7, 840,8 sf. Therefore, the width of this house is wider especially with that extended wing section. Staff is not concerned because the land is so large, and the setbacks are not being exceed. The lot coverage is being met.

The Applicant hasn't supplied the FAR for this proposal to see if that is being met. Staff recommends the Applicant supply the FAR and make sure the FAR is not being exceeded.

Siding

The Applicant proposes a wood grained cementitious siding. Cementitious siding is permitted in the District. However, it must be smooth-faced and have a reveal between 4 to 6 inches. This is what the Staff recommends.

Windows

The proposed windows appear to be single hung with exterior grids. While the comparison houses on the blockface are 3x5 double hung windows with no grids. Because windows are a compatibility standard, Staff recommends all proposed windows be wood and double hung with no grids with wood trim to match what is on the blockface.

The three transoms' windows on the left elevations and the transom's window on the right elevation are problematic, all windows must be vertical and match windows on the house. Staff recommends those proposed windows be vertical with the appearance of the other windows, with trim and no grids.

Fenestration Pattern

There is a fenestration issue on the left elevation at the front. There is too much space in relationship to the opening. While that space appears to be a restroom, windows can be added to a restroom. Staff recommends a window be added to that space.

Porch

The Applicant is proposing a full slab concrete porch with columns. While the predominant porch form on the blockface is a full porch and not a full slab concrete porch with the exception of one that has a slight lift off the ground, technically the Applicant has met the compatibility standard. However, Staff would recommend the Applicant consider adding at least a small platform off the concrete.

Doors

The proposed door is a Craftsman style door. While this is not a Craftsman style house, the door does meet the District regulations which is either a full wood door or a wood door with lite panels. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

The Applicant proposes a brick veneer on the concrete for the foundation material. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, most of predominate foundation material is concrete.

Sidewalk

On the site plan the Applicant has not provided information on an actual sidewalk. District regulation requires a sidewalk and states that "the sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick." Staff

recommends the Applicant abide by the specific laid out in the District's requirement regarding sidewalks.

Walkway

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant has shown on the site plan a proposed sidewalk, but Staff deems this was probably labelled in error. Staff recommends, the Applicant label he walkway correctly on the site plan.

Driveway

The proposed is for a 10 ft drive that will extend 20ft from the front elevation. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

Garage

The proposed garage will sit behind the main structure and will not exceed the rear or side setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. The cementitious siding shall be smooth-faced with a reveal between 4 to 6 inches, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. All proposed windows shall be vertical in orientation, wood and double hung with no grids and have wood trim to match what is on the blockface, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(1);
3. A new window shall be installed on the left elevation where the rest room will be to even out the fenestration, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n);
4. The Applicant shall abide by the regulations set forth in District regulations for the construction of the sidewalk, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c);
5. The Applicant shall install a walkway per district regulations and label it on the site plans, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d) and
6. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKINS
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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1191 Fairview Road NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-073
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2022

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: n/a

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: South side of Fairview Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Colonial Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B

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. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes reconstruction of an existing deck. In conjunction an exterior metal spiral stair will be removed and a portion of the paving beneath removed, as the new deck will require less footings due to the modified design. An existing side patio will also be removed. The existing lot is non-conforming, requirements for the district state a minimum lot size of 18,000 square feet on the south side of Fairview Road NE, between Moreland and Springdale Avenues. The existing lot is on 15,608 square feet and as a result exceeds the allowable lot coverage (current coverage is 69.7%). The removal of the impermeable paving will reduce the lot coverage by 126.74 square feet. As the proposed alterations will increase conformity, Staff finds that the proposal does not require a variance to the code to permit its undertaking. Staff finds further that all the existing features to be removed are non-historic and is not concerned with the proposal to remove them. Staff does require clarification on a note which discusses addition of pavers, noting they will be either stone or concrete to match the existing walkway. This landscaping is not addressed in the site plan or description. As this could potentially add impermeable surface and increase non-conformity, Staff needs clarification on this scope. The Applicant will clarify the proposed addition of a walkway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed addition of a walkway.
- 2.) 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

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1297 Lucile
APPLICATION: CA3-23-075
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923

Property Location East of Hopkins and West of Atwood

Contributing (Y/N)? **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** non-descript

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: SWO was place with a complainant that states an original retaining wall has been removed, without UDC approval, or permit. ---- 2/14/22 Additional complaint received on 2/12/22 that work has continued the house. Brick chimney was a painted against historic regulations; they have also built a rear deck and installed a rear fence, without AUDC approval and without permits.

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

Retaining Wall

Photo shows the original stone retaining wall and is a significant element on the house. The original retaining wall has been removed, and a cinder block wall has been built. For new retaining wall, cinder blocks are permitted, however, for a wall that was original and significant to the property, the replacement of the wall must replicate what was torn down. Staff recommends the retaining wall replicate the stone wall that was torn down and only be stone.

Windows

The Applicant once again, has proposed work on the windows that is not shown on the elevations. The Applicant proposes to repair the trim on the windows and in-kind to match and replace the broken glass in the windows. None of this is troubling to Staff. However, what is problematic is the Applicant has not clearly written this information on the elevations. Staff recommends the Applicant clearly define all proposed work on the plans.

Front Door

The current door is covered, and the Applicant proposes a new door with surrounding transoms. Inventory photos show and the door submitted by the Applicant shows a double door that appears to be original to the house. District regulations state, "new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors... and contain a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style to original doors within that block face." Staff reminds the door replacement be a double door to replicate the style of door that was there prior.

Roof and Routine Additions

The Applicant proposes to replace the roof but has not shown this or indicated this line of work on the elevation. The Applicant also proposes adding down sprouts and gutters. With this information and the elevations showing no change in the roof line, Staff can only imagine the Applicant means shingle replacement on the roof. Staff is not concerned with the roof and routine additions on the roof.

Painting

The Applicant mention painting the exterior siding and the chimney being painted for over 20 years. It appears the siding is wood siding and Staff is not concerned with painting the siding. It appears in the department 2010 inventory photo; the chimney was painted. This is important because, unpainted masonry is not permitted. While the Applicant has stated this proposed work, the photo submitted shows, the painted has been removed from the chimney. So, this this appears to be a moot point, and the Applicant will need to clarify the intent.

Fence and Deck

The Applicant has replaced the deck in the rear of the house and built a fence that surrounds the property. The Applicant has only provided an existing site plan but not a proposed site plan. While the fence appears to be built correctly by looking at photos and the deck also is built correctly. Staff recommends the Applicant provided a site plan that shows the proposed fence and new deck.

Driveway

On the existing site plan, the Applicant has shown a parking pad at the front, there is not a parking pad at the front. Staff recommends the Applicant show the driveway correctly, 10ft wide and extends back 20ft from front of the front. A parking pad is not permitted in the District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The retaining wall shall replicate the original stone retaining wall and only be stone, per Sec.16-20G.006(15)(a);
2. The Applicant shall clearly note all proposed work on the elevations, including the windows, Sec.16-20G.006;
3. The front door shall be a double door that is compatible in size, proportion, placement and style and be wood, contain per Sec.16-20.006(3)(c);
4. The front door shall be wood and contain a rectangular light, per Sec.16-20.006(3)(k);
5. The Applicant shall clarify the intent of the painting of the chimney, per Sec.16-20G.006;
6. The Applicant shall provide a proposed site plan, that shows the correct driveway as 10ft wide, 20ft past the front of the house, has the fence with height on it and show the proposed rear deck with the setback and lot coverage on it, per Sec.16-20.006 and
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKINS
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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1122 Donnelly Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-079
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Donnelly Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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: Deferral until the April 26, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a two-story home at 1122 Donnelly Avenue SW. The proposed new construction would require the demolition of the existing foundation on the property, from a previously demolished structure. Staff is unsure what this foundation is from. This stretch of 27 houses along Donnelly stretching from the intersection with Lawton to the east, and Oakland to the west was developed in 1928-1930. Aerial photography, dating back to 1938 shows that this lot has always been vacant. While it is possible that a house was built and demolished within the first ten years of the subdivision's existence, Staff would like photographs illustrating the existing conditions on the site to see exactly what is proposed for demolition. The Applicant will provide photos of the existing foundation present on the site.

The Applicant has submitted compatibility data for the block face. Staff has several concerns with the compatibility data submitted. 1118 and 1092 Donnelly Avenue are non-contributing structures and cannot be used for compatibility purposes. In addition, the submitted compatibility data leaves a number of items without data. These items are discussed in the subsections below.

Setbacks

The Applicant proposes a 50-foot front-yard setback, 10-foot, 9-inch left side-yard setback, 10-foot right side-yard setback, and a 15-foot rear yard setback. Only data has been supplied for front-yard setbacks, and Staff finds that the proposed 50-foot front-yard setback meets the compatibility rule. The proposed rear-yard setback of 15-feet also meets the code, which requires a minimum rear yard setback of 7-feet. No compatibility data has been provided to support the proposed unequal side-yard setbacks. The Applicant will submit data illustrating how the compatibility data supports the proposed side-yard setbacks.

Site Plan

Per Sec. 16-20M.012 (4)(a), "Off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard or half-depth front yard. Off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard or half-depth front yard." The proposed driveway design stops at the front façade of the house. As parking is not permitted in the front yard, the driveway must be extended a minimum of 20-feet past the front of the house to comply with the code. The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway design to comply with Sec. 16-20M.012 (4)(a).

There is an existing concrete sidewalk noted on the plans. Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(d) states, "A paved walkway from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure shall be provided." No walkway connecting to the existing sidewalk is shown. The Applicant will add a walkway to the site plans to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(d).

Overall Height

The Applicant has supplied compatibility data showing that height on the block face ranges from

15-feet, 3-inches (1102 Donnelly) to 22-feet, 8-inches (1128 Donnelly). Staff finds that the proposed height off 21-feet, 8-inches does meet the compatibility rule; however, the massing and style of the house do not. As such the proposed height will likely change when the structure is re-designed.

Foundation Height

The Applicant proposes a 2-foot foundation (overall), with a 4-foot foundation on the front elevation at the porch. No compatibility data has been provided for the foundation height; however, Staff has determined that the overall cladding material should be brick, so separate compatibility data for the overall foundation height is not needed. The Applicant will submit data illustrating how the compatibility data supports the proposed porch foundation height.

House Form and Massing

Staff has significant concerns regarding the proposed house design. While the front elevation shows a degree of compatibility with the surrounding contributing housing stock, the massive second story rear-portion of the house with an almost flat roof does not. The only house on the block face which has a full second story is 1128 Donnelly, also the tallest on the block, which is built into the slope of the hill and presents as a single-story home. Two-story homes do not predominate on the block-face, and Staff finds that the proposed home does not meet the compatibility rule. The proposed design of five bedrooms and 4.5 bathrooms is significantly larger than what has historically existed in the area, and the massing required to accommodate this number of rooms looks significantly out of place. Staff can support the use of dormers to make the structure have livable space on the upper story, but a full second story is not appropriate and does not meet district regulations. In addition, the hodge-podge of roof forms is inconsistent and does not support a design which integrates with the surrounding contributing structures. The Applicant will redesign the proposed house to be a single-story house with dormers. The Applicant will redesign the house to meet the compatibility rule.

Roof Form

The design uses at least three different roof forms. The front portion of the roof is side-gabled with a reverse saltbox form, with a front-gabled dormer and a smaller, lower decorative gable over the right side of the front porch. The predominant roof form is a very shallow, almost flat (1/12 or 2/12), end-gabled roof that extends back from the front portion of the house. The roof form which predominates on the block face is gabled, with a steeper pitch. While Staff can support the use of dormers (several other structures on the block face do) the house must be substantially redesigned to accommodate this. Staff recommends revision of the design to be cross-gabled, similar to 1114 Donnelly to lower the overall height, provide a roofline more in keeping with the historic structures on the block face, and provide consistency of design. The Applicant will redesign the proposed roof to meet the compatibility rule.

Roof Pitch

The roof pitch which appears to predominate on the block face is 6/12. While portions of the front of the house appear to be close to matching the compatibility rule (roof pitch is not provided on the elevations), the rear absolutely does not, and the proposed massing and nearly flat roof pitch must be redesigned. The Applicant will redesign the proposed roof pitch to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant will note roof pitch for the proposed new construction on all elevations.

Foundation

The Applicant has provided compatibility data for the foundation materials, and Staff agrees that brick is the appropriate material. As noted below, per the compatibility rule the entire exterior needs to be clad in brick. Staff would note that the proposed veneer brick submitted with the application is not appropriate. The Applicant will submit new brick for approval as an exterior cladding material.

Porch

In terms of compatibility Staff finds that the block face is equally divided between porches and stoops, as such the proposed porch would meet the compatibility rule. The porch stairs (existing on the side) also meet the compatibility rule. Staff was confused as to why the stairs would be oriented away from the driveway and there is no proposed walkway (as noted above). There appears to be a discrepancy between the site plan (where stairs are shown existing to the right) and the elevations (showing them existing to the left). The Applicant will clarify the position of the stairs.

The porch design largely replicates the porch design of 1110 Donnelly, with a balustrade replacing a knee wall. Staff is not concerned with the overall design of the porch. The Applicant will install a balustrade (as shown), no taller than the bottom of the windows and of butt-joint construction. There are no contributing structures on the block face that utilize porch supports made of wood. The Applicant will revise the proposed porch columns to be of full brick construction.

Siding

Staff finds that the dominant cladding material present on the block face is brick. The design must be revised to use brick as the cladding material rather than cementitious siding. Staff would also note that the mock brick veneer that was submitted as a foundation and porch column material is not appropriate. The exterior must be clad in real brick veneer which matches the historic materials present on the block face. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to be clad in brick veneer.

Fenestration Patterning

Staff notes that the fenestration patterning on the side elevations is very inconsistent with the surrounding historic housing stock. There are several fixed narrow windows that are not appropriate and large stretches of wall with no fenestration. The Applicant will revise the

fenestration on the side elevations to be more consistent with the surrounding contributing structures. The Applicant will remove the proposed fixed windows from the design.

Windows

The Applicant proposed one-over-one windows. No specifications have been supplied for the actual materials to be used. In looking at the compatibility study, one-over-one windows do predominate on the block face; however, it is clear that none of these are original to the structures and many were installed in the non-historic period. In looking at the contributing structures which do retain their original wood windows (specifically 1110 Donnelly and portions of 1114 Donnelly) it appears that the original style was likely a four-over-one lite pattern. Staff also recommend using no more than two window sizes throughout the structure, the current proposal shows several different size windows leading to an inconsistent design. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to utilize a four-over-one lite pattern. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows.

Doors

The Applicant proposes use of a wooden door with a full length lite and a single sidelite on the right side. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed door design.

Deck

The Applicant proposes a full two-story deck on the rear elevation. The deck is no wider than the existing structure, which does meet district regulations. As has been previously stated, a two-story house does not meet the compatibility rule and given the substantial amount of redesign proposed, the deck will also need to be redesigned. Once the house is redesigned the two-story deck will no longer be necessary. The Applicant will redesign the proposed deck to be a single level in height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will provide photos of the existing foundation present on the site.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit data illustrating how the compatibility data supports the proposed side-yard setbacks.
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway design to comply with Sec. 16-20M.012 (4)(a).
- 4.) The Applicant will add a walkway to the site plans to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(d).
- 5.) The Applicant will submit data illustrating how the compatibility data supports the proposed porch foundation height.
- 6.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed house to be a single-story house with dormers.
- 7.) The Applicant will redesign the house to meet the compatibility rule.
- 8.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed roof to meet the compatibility rule.
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed roof pitch to meet the compatibility rule.

- 10.) The Applicant will note roof pitch for the proposed new construction on all elevations.
- 11.) The Applicant will submit new brick for approval as an exterior cladding material.
- 12.) The Applicant will clarify the position of the stairs.
- 13.) The Applicant will install a balustrade (as shown), no taller than the bottom of the windows and of butt-join construction.
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the proposed porch columns to be of full brick construction.
- 15.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to be clad in brick veneer.
- 16.) The Applicant will revise the fenestration on the side elevations to be more consistent with the surrounding contributing structures.
- 17.) The Applicant will remove the proposed fixed windows from the design.
- 18.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to utilize a four-over-one lite pattern.
- 19.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows.
- 20.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed deck to be a single level in height.
- 21.) The Applicant will provide all proposed materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next Commission hearing.

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
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1110 Oakland

APPLICATION: CA3-23-082

MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: West of Wilmington and East of Arlington

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. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Working without a permit. It appears the siding has been removed and the front porch has been altered. Possible start of the renovation of the windows next. An exterior permit and approval are needed. Interior building and plumbing permits are also needed.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

April 12, 2023

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “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.”

ALTERATIONS

Siding

From research photos, Staff cannot determine the original siding material on the house. The Applicant is proposing cementitious siding for the whole sale replacement. Cementitious siding is a permissible material in the community. However, if the original siding was wood, since the District’s designation, Staff will expect the original siding be replaced especially since this was an unauthorized removal of siding. Staff is not opposed to cementitious siding if it is smooth faced with a reveal between 4 to 6 inches if the Applicant can show the siding has been vinyl since the District’s designation.

Windows

The Applicant is proposing wood windows. Staff is not concerned with the proposal of wood windows since the photos clearly show the original woods were wood. Staff also recommend the windows opening, position, shape and style remain the same as the original windows.

Porch

Photos show a non-original porch enclosure with iron railings. The Applicant proposes to remove this enclosure and railings and proposes wood post and wood railings. Staff is not concerned with this proposes. Staff does recommend the railing be a two-part rail (head butt) system with the railings be no higher than lower front windowsill and any need to meet code for height be done with a simple rail extension.

Front Door

The Applicant proposes a Craftsman door. While the house is not a Craftsman house, the door is not problematic because District regulations requires exterior doors be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. The siding shall be wood and in-kind to the previous original siding, if the Applicant could show vinyl siding prior to the District designation, the Applicant can install smooth-faced cementitious with a 4 to 6 reveal, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. The windows shall retain their original size, shape, position or the original openings, per Sec.16-20M.013(o)(1);
3. The Applicant shall wood railings shall be a two-part (head butt) construction with the top rail being no higher than the window sill of the front window; any need to meet code is done with a simple rail extension, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i) and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

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: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2014 Jones Road

APPLICATION: CA3-23-083

MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Historic Collier Heights

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1962

Property Location: East of Hobert Drive and East of Amhurst Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to allow the paint to remain

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work was placed on the property

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

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

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking allow the paint to remain on the brick:

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

1) What are the extraordinary and exceptional condition on the property?

Applicant writes: **“The brick on the home is too porous/textured for the current primer/paint to be removed.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“Three different compounds were used to remove the paint without success. I also spoke with Mr. Morton in regard to the paint removal. He was supposed to get me a contact for a company who uses a special "soft pellet" process. However, despite attempting to get this information of several times over a two-week period, Mr Horton never followed.”**

3) What are the conditions that are peculiar to this piece of property?

Applicant writes: **“The brick is too porous and now painted and can't be removed. What is the solution to move forward?”**

4) If granted relief, would it cause substantial detriment to the public good or zoning ordinance?

Applicant writes: **“During the last 6 months, several painted homes have sold at or near asking price suggesting values are higher than non-painted homes and are very desirable to new buyers.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff deems the Applicant has provided information to support the variance. The photo provided shows the brick is extremely porous. In previous cases, that have been before the Commission that presented the porous brick has been granted approval for the paint to remain. Additionally, the Applicant has attempted to remove the paint and the paint will not come off of the this porous brick. Since the Commission has established a precedent that exempts houses with porous brick of having the rigor of removing paint, the same must be applied here. Staff is support of this application.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKINS
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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1493 Fairview Road NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-084
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2022

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: n/a

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: South side of Fairview Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Colonial Revival

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. 16-20B

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. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes a three-story addition to the rear elevation. The elevation would be below the existing ridgeline of the roof, and not visible from the public right-of-way. The Addition would require the removal of three non-historic windows previously installed on the rear elevation. The addition would have a brick foundation, encompassing the entire lower level, which would match the existing foundation on the building. The upper portion of the addition would be clad in poly-ash siding. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposal, so long as the siding used is smooth face and matches the historic wooden siding present on the body of the house in profile and reveal. The Applicant will utilize smooth-face poly-ash siding, which matches the historic wooden siding present on the house in profile and reveal.

The Applicant proposes installation of a secondary front door, which would replicate the existing historic door in dimensions and framing, but with panels of glass inset. This proposal is to allow the Applicant to allow light into their house, while retaining the historic door, and overall appearance of the front of the house, and offering a higher level of security versus a storm door. Section 16-20.009 (2) states, “The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.” Section 16-20.009(6 & 7), further states, “Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment... Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to buildings, structures or sites shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building, structure or site would be unimpaired.” Staff finds that the proposed door addition would meet the requirements of the code. It would not remove the historic door and would provide an extra level of protection for the historic feature. The design would replicate the patterning and not obscure the historic feature and could be removed in the future without damaging the historic fabric. Staff is concerned with the depth of the door frame and how the proposed new door would engage with this. The Applicant will clarify the installation of the door and show how the existing door frame will accommodate the proposed alteration.

The proposed alterations also include replacement of four non-original basement windows, two on the right elevation and two on the rear elevation. The replacement is to meet the life safety code. As these features are not original, Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The Applicant has submitted specifications for the proposed replacement windows (which would also be used on the addition). Staff finds the proposed replacements meet the district regulations. Staff would note that the replacement windows must replicate the existing lite pattern on the historic home, which is a six-over-six muntin pattern. The Applicant will install replacement windows on the basement level which match the historic windows in lite pattern.

The proposed alterations also include reconstruction of the non-historic fence. The fence is currently wooden picket with brick supports framing the drive. The existing gate opening does not

accommodate the owner's vehicle. The proposal would widen the opening and reconstruct the brick pillars. The overall design of the fence would not change except for the spacing. Staff finds that the overall aesthetic would not change and this alteration to the non-historic feature does not concern Staff. Staff would note that the driveway itself is not proposed for alteration. The gate, at present, only covers a portion of the gravel drive. The Applicant will retain the existing driveway and not widen it. The Applicant will reconstruct the fence utilizing the same height and aesthetic with the alterations to the gate as noted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will utilize smooth-face poly-ash siding, which matches the historic wooden siding present on the house in profile and reveal.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify the installation of the door and show how the existing door frame will accommodate the proposed alteration.
- 3.) The Applicant will install replacement windows on the basement level which match the historic windows in lite pattern.
- 4.) The Applicant will retain the existing driveway and not widen it.
- 5.) The Applicant will reconstruct the fence utilizing the same height and aesthetic with the alterations to the gate as noted.
- 6.) 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: 316 Sunset Avenue NW
APPLICATION: CA4PH-23-062
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Sunset Avenue Historic District

Other Zoning: SPI 19, SA8

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: West side of Sunset Avenue NW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: American Four Square

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20P

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes demolition of the contributing structure due a threat to public health and safety. During the pre-hearing assessment of application materials required by Section 16-20.008(d)(3)(a), which states that the Executive Director is required “to notify the applicant of any deficiencies in the documentation or other evidence provided. Failure of the applicant to submit said required documentation and/or evidence shall be construed as a failure on the part of the applicant to meet the standard for which the documentation and/or evidence is lacking.” As such, Staff has determined that the following items, which are required to complete the review of the application are missing:

Criteria 1, 2, 3a, 3bii, 9a, 10a, 10b, 10c, 10d, 10e, & 11.

The pre-assessment notification was sent to the Applicant on March 23, 2023. As of April 4, 2023, the deadline for submission of new materials, no response had been received from the Applicant. As such, Staff is recommending deferral of the application to allow the Applicant to submit the missing information.

Staff received additional information from the Applicant on April 4, 2023. Staff finds that with the additional information Criteria 1 and 10a have been satisfied. Criteria 2, 3a, 3bii, 9a, 10b, 10c, 10d, 10e, & 11 still have not been adequately answered.

Staff finds that the responses given show a lack of understanding regarding the requirements of the process for demolition. The Applicant has not considered any alternatives to demolition, all of their responses are in regards to their desire for that outcome. Staff must see estimates for rehabilitation and alternatives, including rental/income potential, which leave the existing home in place. Staff also notes that a fire, which occurs after the submission of application materials is now being used for evidence of the need for demolition. Other than an article in the Atlanta Journal Constitution, no report or photos showing the additional fire damage have been submitted. This is particularly concerning as no interior photos were previously submitted, and the exterior photos did not illustrate all elevations. The structural analysis submitted to satisfy Criteria 1 and 10a was completed after the fire. It appears that the fire is the cause of much of the structural instability based on the language of the report. Staff needs evidence of this in the form of an official report from the AFD and photographic evidence. Overall, the only information presented has been to argue for demolition to facilitate planned new construction, no alternatives have been explored. Demolition is only approved when there are no other alternatives. The Applicant has also failed to explore tax incentives etc. which may be available for use in restoring the property. Staff must have information regarding alternatives including rehabilitation and restoration. Each of the criteria listed below must be addressed. The Applicant’s desire to demolish and undertake new construction is not an acceptable statement to satisfy these criteria.

2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.
3. Demonstrate that the costs associated with rectifying the threat would create a condition whereby the investments in the project are incapable of earning a reasonable economic return. This finding shall be made by considering, and the applicant shall submit to the commission evidence establishing, each of the following factors:

— a. The applicant's knowledge of the landmark designation at the time of acquisition, or whether the property was designated subsequent to acquisition.

b. The current level of economic return on the property as considered in relation to the following:

ii. The annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.

9. That the property if not marketable or able to be sold, considered in relation to any listing of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any, within the previous two (2) years. Including testimony and relevant documents regarding:

a. Any real estate broker or firm engaged to sell or lease the property.

b. Reasonableness of the price or rent sought by the applicant. Any advertisement placed for the sale or rent of the property.

10. The infeasibility of alternative uses that can earn a reasonable economic return for the property as considered in relation to the following:

b. Estimate of the cost of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal, and

an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendation and decision of the commission concerning the appropriateness of the proposed alterations.

c. Estimated market value of the property in the current condition; after completion of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal; and, in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing property for continued use.

d. In the case of a proposed demolition, the testimony of an architect, developer, real estate consultant, appraiser, or other real estate professional experienced in rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure on the property.

e. The infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer or development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances.

11. Economic incentives and/or funding available to the applicant through federal, state, city, or private programs.

12. Provide photographs of the existing conditions of the building, both exterior and interior.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 26, 2023 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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 79 Brighton Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-078
MEETING DATE: April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4 / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: South block face of Brighton Rd. between the Montclair Dr and Wakefield Dr. intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of Colonial Revival Architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance and Site Work.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: the HP Studio Staff has previously reviewed applications CA2S-18-474 for site work, CA2S-19-395 for minor alterations to non-street facing façades, and CA2S-22-335 for additions to non-street facing façades.

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

RC-23-078 for 79 Brighton Rd.

April 12, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

Variance

The Applicant has requested a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment to reduce the side yard setback from 7 feet (required) to 3 inches (proposed). In general, Staff finds that the approval of this variance would not impact the ability of the Commission to apply the requirements of Chapter 20 of the Zoning ordinance to this property.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a car-port with a second story deck in the area for which the setback is requested. As Staff does not have plans for this structure, the ability to comment on the proposed design will be limited. As such, Staff recommends that the structure conform to the architecture of the historic principal structure, while remaining distinctly secondary to said principal structure. This can be accomplished through the use of compatible materials such as brick or wood, as well as through the incorporation of simplified details and ornamentation from the historic principal structure. Staff finds that these accommodations would mitigate the visibility of the new structure from the public right of way by allowing the new structure to maintain the overall character of the site and the neighborhood.

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

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File