



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: 714 Shorter Terrace

APPLICATION: CA2-23-065

MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1963

Property Location: Corner Shorter Terrace and Waterford Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to change out the glass panels due to failed seals. The Applicant will retain the existing overall frame and stops system. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with 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 26, 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.

This case was differed due to loss of quorum at the April 12, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 551 Cherokee Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA2-23-100
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: West side of Cherokee Avenue SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA3-18-501

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 existing house experienced extensive damage from a fallen tree in 2018. Repairs to close the damaged roof were previously addressed in CA3-18-501.

The Applicant proposes a second story addition to the existing historic house, alterations including window replacement, siding replacement, railing and porch support replacement, door replacement, and construction of a new accessory structure. Staff also notes that the original house exhibits exposed rafter tails along the roofline, which are not shown on the existing or proposed elevations. The Applicant will update the existing and proposed elevations to show all historic details present on the structure, including exposed rafter tails. The Applicant will incorporate exposed rafter tails into any proposed roof design for consistency of design.

Staff has significant concerns regarding the proposed scope of alterations. Based on the elevations, it is noted that there is proposed total siding replacement, trim replacement, corner board replacement, window, and door replacement. Only specifications have been given for the windows, doors, and balustrade profile. The balustrade proposed does not appear to be of butt-joint construction. The Applicant will revise the proposed balustrade design to utilize butt-jointed construction. The Applicant will provide clarification on the scope of the proposed siding and corner board replacement. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding and corner boards to be utilized. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed porch supports to be utilized.

No scope has been given for the replacement of the porch flooring, which is partially collapsed. Staff would note that the replacement should be tongue-in-groove flooring, installed horizontal to the façade of the house. The Applicant will replace the deteriorated porch flooring with tongue-in-groove flooring, installed horizontal to the façade of the house.

The proposed window design is a three-over-one, double-hung window. Staff notes from the photos provided that few windows are fully extant on the house, which was significantly damaged due to a tree fall. Staff does note a fixed, four-lite window show in the interior photos that is extant in the front gable. The Applicant will retain and restore the extant fixed window on the facade gable. The elevations show this window being replaced. Staff cannot support this proposal.

Staff is not concerned with the replacement of most of the missing remaining windows except for the lite patterning. What currently exists on the house is a four-over-one lite pattern, not three-over-one. To be internally consistent, the proposed windows must match the existing. The Applicant will modify the proposed lite pattern on the windows to be a four-over-one lite pattern, which matches the existing on the house.

Staff does note that a temporary door has been installed to secure the property, but the Applicant has noted that this will be removed and the trim will replicate the original present on the house. Staff does not have any concerns with the submitted proposed door replacements.

The proposed carriage house meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance; however, Staff notes there is an area to park a vehicle. No driveway is shown on the proposed site plan nor has paving been calculated in the lot coverage. An examination of photos of the house show a driveway on the right side of the house. This is not shown and accounted for on the plans. This is of particular concern as the calculated lot coverage is currently 39%, with neither the drive nor walkway accounted for. This must be shown and calculated, as well as any proposed extension of the drive to connect the proposed carriage house. The Applicant will update the proposed site plan to show all existing and proposed paved surfaces and update the lot coverage accordingly to reflect these changes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will update the existing and proposed elevations to show all historic details present on the structure, including exposed rafter tails.
- 2.) The Applicant will incorporate exposed rafter tails into any proposed roof design for consistency of design.
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed balustrade design to utilize butt-jointed construction.
- 4.) The Applicant will provide clarification on the scope of the proposed siding and corner board replacement.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding and corner boards to be utilized.
- 6.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed porch supports to be utilized.
- 7.) The Applicant will replace the deteriorated porch flooring with tongue-in-groove flooring, installed horizontal to the façade of the house.
- 8.) The Applicant will retain and restore the extant fixed window on the facade gable.
- 9.) The Applicant will modify the proposed lite pattern on the windows to be a four-over-one lite pattern, which matches the existing on the house.
- 10.) The Applicant will update the proposed site plan to show all existing and proposed paved surfaces and update the lot coverage accordingly to reflect these changes.
- 11.) 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
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 941 Austin Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-23-102
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1928

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

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

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: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferred to allow the Applicant to submit for a variance

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

COMPATIBILITY RULE:

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

To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows:

Where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) it shall be compatible with that which predominates in contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

ADDITIONS

Second Story Addition

While the Applicant has stated the proposed work as only adding space in the rear and constructing an ADU. The work being proposed also includes removing the entire roof line to construct a 2nd story. In doing this work the front awning roof will be removed and be returned in-kind once the 2nd story is in tack.

Height

The height of the house is 37.3 which includes the basement. This is problematic, the house cannot be more than 35 ft. in height. Staff recommends the Applicant decrease the house by two feet to abide by District's regulations. Or the Applicant can change the pitch, right now it appears the pitch is extremely deep.

Back Addition

The Applicant proposes the enclosure of an original back deck.

ADU

The Applicant proposes a 428 sf ADU at the rear of the existing house.

Windows

The proposed windows do not concern Staff, they are not visible from the public right away.

Skylights

CA2-23-102 for 941 Austin Ave.

April 26, 2023

pg. 3

The proposed skylights are in-kind with the existing skylights at the front of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferred to allow for the Staff to submit for a variance.

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
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 749 Bonnie Brae Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA2-23-105
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1952 (Fulton County Tax Assessor), 1929 (Adair Park Historic District survey, 1991)

Property Location: North side of Bonnie Brae Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: American Small House/ Minimal Traditional

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, rear deck

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: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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 enlargement of the existing deck on the rear of the house. The proposal would remove the existing deck and construct a new one in an enlarged footprint. Staff is not concerned with this proposal as the enlarged deck would still be located totally to the rear of the existing house.

The Applicant also proposes repaving of the existing drive. The existing driveway is currently two paved strips. The repaving would make the drive a solid piece of pavement 6 feet in width by 58 feet in length. Staff finds this proposal meets district regulations and has no concerns with the proposal.

The Applicant also proposes the opening of an existing window which has been enclosed. This window opening is located in the left elevation gable. Staff notes the opening on the photos, but it is not shown on the existing or proposed elevations. The Applicant will update the elevations to show this window. The Applicant has also not provided specifications for the proposed window replacement. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed window replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will update the elevations to show this window.
- 2.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed window replacement.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1037 Metropolitan Parkway SW
APPLICATION: CA3-22-591
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West side of Metropolitan Parkway.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

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

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

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

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

Foundation

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

Siding

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

Windows

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

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

Doors

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

Dormer

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

Porch

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

Driveway/ Parking Pad

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

As no new materials have been submitted and the Applicant has reached the maximum permissible deferral cycles, Staff has recommended denial without prejudice of this application. The Applicant has provided updated proposed elevations to satisfy Condition#2, the remaining conditions are outstanding.

New materials were submitted on April 21, 2023. Staff still finds that there are too many outstanding items to move forward on this application. The Applicant has exceeded the maximum number of allowable deferrals without substantive progress on the applications, and Staff must recommend denial of the application without prejudice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

- 1.) The Applicant will update the existing elevations using historic images of the property to accurately depict the state prior to the unpermitted work. **No new elevations have been submitted.** New elevations have been submitted. The “existing” elevations do not show what is currently existing. They show the property prior to the unpermitted second story addition. Staff also still has concerns with particularly the proposed porch design, which does not follow the historic photos of the property and the extensive discussion in the Staff Report.
- 2.) The Applicant will update the proposed elevations to illustrate an exact reconstruction of the porch roof, which was removed. **No new elevations have been submitted.** Elevations have been submitted, but as noted below the porch roof appears to be narrower in dimensions. The porch roof must be reconstructed to its exact former dimensions.
- 3.) The Applicant will remove the framing for the non-compliant second story addition that was added to the property unpermitted. **This needs to be shown on the plans. The existing plans need to show the property as is, not just what is proposed. A massive change was made to the historic structure, so the plans must show the existing conditions, and the framing plans for how the original conditions will be reconstructed.** The newly submitted plans show the house pre-unpermitted addition. This is of major concern to Staff as those conditions no longer exist. Staff assumes that when the unpermitted addition was put on at least some plans existed for the alteration. Staff would be satisfied to see these plans. The structural integrity of the house, based on unpermitted work is of major concern, as is the demolition plans for this unpermitted addition. Staff needs to see exactly what was done and will be done from a life safety perspective. Staff also feels strongly that a structural engineer should assess the damage done to the house based on the unpermitted work.
- 4.) The Applicant will re-build the hipped roof to the original scale, complete with the historic exposed rafter tails. **Staff needs to see plans depicting this to ensure accuracy. Simply stating this in your responses is not concrete evidence, and you will need these plans when you apply for your building permit.** Staff still has significant concerns as it appears that the porch roof is not being reconstructed to the previous dimensions. Staff is also concerned with the proposed material (standing seam metal roofing) which is not an acceptable change to the design. The porch roof must be returned to its original design, dimensions, and materials.

- 5.) The Applicant will clarify the reason for the brick foundation removal. Staff understands that this was the existing condition when the Applicant purchased the property.
- 6.) The Applicant will submit a scope of work for the proposed foundation repair. This needs to be specific, including the proposed materials. When Staff requests specifications that means we need the exact manufacturers specifications on the materials, not just a promise to try and match. Staff also needs a drawing showing the proposed repairs. There is a gaping hole in the foundation. Will the brick just be repointed? Is there going to be any other structural support work? This condition has not been satisfied. The Applicant states: Repair bricks to normal state much possible /similar bricks : MAKE NECESSARY REPAIRS TO BRICK THAT ARE MISSING ONLY , NO NEW ARRANGEMENT OF BRICKS Materials : 1. Masonry Mix QUIKRETE 2. BRICKS SIMILAR TO SAME COLOR/BLEND 3. WATER TO MIX 4. WHITE SAND MIX. Staff has concerns with this vague description of materials and techniques for repairing historic masonry and needs additional, detailed description of materials and techniques.
- 7.) The Applicant will install wooden lap siding, with a reveal between 4-6 inches. No specifications have been provided. When Staff requests specifications that means we need the exact manufacturers specifications on the materials. This condition has not been satisfied
- 8.) The Applicant will provided specifications for the proposed replacement siding. No specifications have been provided. When Staff requests specifications that means we need the exact manufacturers specifications on the materials. This condition has not been satisfied.
- 9.) The Applicant will provide compatibility data for the proposed window replacements. No compatibility data has been supplied. The Applicant must show how the proposed replacement windows meet the compatibility rule. The compatibility rule states, *"The compatibility rule is a method of ensuring that alterations to existing structures and the design of proposed new construction are sensitive to and sympathetic toward existing elements of design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The elements in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face, or where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), shall be no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to "compatibility rule." As the original windows are no longer extant, the compatibility rule must be used to determine the appropriate window style. Staff finds that the proposed one-over-one windows meet the compatibility rule.*
- 10.) The Applicant will provided specifications for the proposed window replacements, once compatibility data has been confirmed. As no data has been provided, Staff cannot determine the appropriateness of the proposed replacements. In addition, the Applicant has stated the proposed windows would be wood. The submitted window design appears to be vinyl, which would not meet district regulations. Staff still has not

received exact specifications for the proposed windows to be used, but does not that they are listed as wood on the elevations.

- 11.) The Applicant will match the size of the window openings on the front elevation to the historic scale present on the side elevations. **No new elevations have been supplied, so this condition has not been satisfied.** The windows appear to match what was the existing window size on the side elevations. Staff cannot support only having two windows on the street-facing facade. The proposed French doors should be removed from the plans and replaced with windows.
- 12.) The Applicant will restore and replace these doors that were removed from the structure. **Historic doors were present in the house at the time the stop work order was issued (see attached photos). The Applicant states that no historic doors were present on the structure, this appears to be false as two historic doors are clearly visible in the photos that were provided by the code enforcement team. If retained these doors must be replaced on the structure. If the doors are no longer extant, they must be replaced with doors of wood construction that match the historic in design and dimensions. It is not clear from the submitted materials if this will be done.** The Applicant is proposing a pair of French doors on the façade, which staff Cannot support. The proposed front door does appear to match what was historically present; however, it is not clear if this will be the actual restored door or a replacement.
- 13.) The Applicant will expose the historic square porch supports to illustrate the original porch design on the front façade. **Staff is extremely confused by the response to this question. As no new elevations have been submitted Staff cannot confirm that this condition will be complied with. This must be shown on the proposed elevations.** The Applicant has submitted the following statement in writing: EVERY OTHER COLUMN WILL BE ONE LONG ONE SHORT BEING SURE NO COLUMN BLOCKS THE VIEW OF THE WINDOWS. This does not address the condition. No information has been provided to establish if all the porch supports remain. The plans show all new materials being used, which Staff does not support (as some original materials are clearly visible). The existing conditions still require clarification.
- 14.) The Applicant will not add additional non-historic porch supports to the front elevation. **The Applicant has agreed to this condition in their responses; however, this must be shown on the proposed elevations.** The proposed porch design does not match what was present historically. There are far fewer porch supports. Staff has provided the Applicant with historic photos of the property, showing the exact design of the porch supports, the proposed design still does not match this.
- 15.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the non-compliant driveway/parking pad. **Driving is not allowed in the front yard per Sec. 16-20I.006 (5)(a). The existing parking conditions are non-compliant and cannot remain.** The Applicant must propose an alternate parking arrangement that meets the requirement of the code. The Applicant has not supplied an updated site plan. The Applicant has not addressed the issue of parking in any application materials.
- 16.) The Applicant will supply a site plan for the property. **The site plan has been submitted, but per Condition 15, must be updated to show a compliant parking proposal.** The Applicant has not supplied an updated site plan.

- 17.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission. Revised materials have been submitted; however, as annotated above, Staff finds that a significant number of items remain outstanding. Revised materials have been submitted; however, as annotated above, Staff finds that a significant number of items remain outstanding.
- 18.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 661 Brookline Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-021 & CA3-22-022 (variance)
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: North side of Brookline Street Sw.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

Denial with out Prejudice

CA3-23-022: Denial This application was denied at the April 12, 2023 hearing of the UDC

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

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

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

Second-Story Addition

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

Rear Garage Addition

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

Windows and Doors

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

Porch

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

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

Site Plan

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

The Applicant has not submitted any new materials since the initial application. This application has exceeded the maximum number of deferrals permitted. As such, Staff has recommended denial without prejudice for application CA3-23-021. Application CA3-23-022 was already denied at the April 12, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

- 1.) The Applicant will provide existing elevations.
- 2.) The Applicant will provide existing photographs of all four elevations and all features proposed for replacement so Staff may assess their condition.
- 3.) The Applicant will provide photographs detailing the current conditions of the siding.
- 4.) The Applicant will clarify where new siding will be required due to the opening of the porch.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement siding.
- 6.) The Applicant will not construct the proposed second-story addition.
- 7.) The Applicant will not alter or remove the historic chimneys present on the house.
- 8.) The Applicant will not construct the proposed garage addition.
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed garage as a freestanding accessory structure.
- 10.) The Applicant will provide a door and window schedule, keying all proposed replacement features to their location on the elevations.
- 11.) The Applicant will provide compatibility data for any proposed non-historic replacements where the original specifications remain unknown.
- 12.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement materials.
- 13.) The Applicant will provide documentation supporting the proposed moving of the front door.
- 14.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed porch design and provide documentation for the historic justification of the proposed changes.
- 15.) The Applicant will update the existing (still required) and proposed elevations to accurately depict the porch and all historic features.
- 16.) The Applicant will submit a proposed site plan.
- 17.) The Applicant will update the existing and proposed site plan to show all features and include calculation of lot coverage.

- 18.) The Applicant will provide all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

Variance CA3-23-022

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

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

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

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

The Applicant states that no unnecessary hardship is created.

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

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

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

The Applicant does not make any statement in response to this inquiry.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial (CA3-23-022) The denial of this application was confirmed at the April 12, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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 26, 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: 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.

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: Approval with the following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit plans accurately depicting all features proposed for the new construction. **The Applicant has submitted new updated plans.**
- 2.) The Applicant will correct the roof form and include roof pitch on all roof planes on all elevations. **The Applicant has submitted new updated plans.**
- 3.) The Applicant will annotate the elevations to show proposed materials, including dimensions of siding and trim. **The Applicant has submitted new updated plans.**
- 4.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials. **The Applicant has noted that no new foundation materials will be installed.**
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding and trim. **The Applicant has provided specifications.**
- 6.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows and doors which will be used for the new construction. **The Applicant has provided specifications.**
- 7.) The Applicant will update the site plan to include all applicable site features. **The Applicant has provided specifications.**
- 8.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.



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 26, 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 May 10, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission at the Applicant's request

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.

The Applicant has submitted some of the required materials, but was unable to secure all of the necessary information prior to the April 26th hearing, and has requested an additional deferral.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the May 10, 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

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1090 Peoples Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-098
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: Southeast corner of the intersection of Peoples Street SW and Tucker 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: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes a new construction home, garage, and accessory dwelling unit on the vacant lot at 1090 Peebles Street SW. The new construction home would meet the compatibility rule for the following features: setbacks, scale and massing, overall height, foundation height, cladding material, roof form, roof pitch, porch design (in this case, stoop design), front step orientation, fenestration patterning, and window style. Based on the compatibility rule, brick is not the foundation material that predominates on the block face, it is CMU. Per Sec. 16-20M.013 (r)(10), “Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade’s exterior material and exposed concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.” The compatibility rule would not permit brick, the foundation must be constructed of CMU and covered with a parge coat of stucco to meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The Applicant will revise the proposed foundation material to be composed of CMU covered with a parge coat of stucco.

The Applicant has not provided and specifications for the proposed siding. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed lap siding to be used.

The Applicant has provided specifications for the proposed front door. There is no material listed on the specifications provided. Per Sec. 16-20M.013 (r)(5), “Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.” The Applicant will provide more detailed specifications for the proposed doors, which illustrate that it meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (r)(5) in terms of materiality.

The site plan meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance in terms of driveway, walkway, and fencing. Staff does note that there are stairs and a retaining wall existing on the property. These features are shown, but it is not clear if the existing features will remain or they will be rebuilt. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in terms of the existing retaining wall and steps.

Staff does have several concerns about the proposed accessory structures. The Applicant proposes a 468 square foot garage and a 1176 square foot two-story, accessory dwelling unit. Sec. 16-20M.015 (5)(c) states, “Accessory structures shall not cover more than 25 percent of the rear yard.” The rear yard measures 5,650 square feet. The proposed accessory structures would total 1,644 square feet, or 29% of the rear yard. Sec. 16-20M.015 (5)(e) states, “Accessory structures shall not exceed 25 feet in height or the height of the principal structure, whichever is less, and shall not contain a total floor area greater than 30 percent of the floor area of the principal structure.” Staff finds that the height of both proposed accessory structures meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The total square footage of these structures, at 1,644 square feet exceeds the total square footage of the primary structure (1,611 square feet). The Applicant will revise the design of the proposed accessory structures to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.015 (5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will revise the proposed foundation material to be composed of CMU covered with a parge coat of stucco.
- 2.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed lap siding to be used.
- 3.) The Applicant will provided more detailed specifications for the proposed doors, which illustrate that it meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (r)(5) in terms of materiality.
- 4.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in terms of the existing retaining wall and steps.
- 5.) The Applicant will revise the design of the proposed accessory structures to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.015 (5).

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: 1130 Alta Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-23-099
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

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

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

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

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: None

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.

COMPATIBILITY RULE:

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

To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows:

Where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) it shall be compatible with that which predominates in contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes a two-story 645 rear addition with a 510-sf new patio and 95 sf new stairs that will lead down to the back yard. The proposed addition and patio and stairs all meet the FAR and Lot coverage that is required for the District. The side setbacks of the addition and the patio and stairs will not be less than the respective setback or its closest point of the existing structure. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The proposed windows do not concern Staff, they are not visible from the public right away.

Skylights

The proposed skylights are in-kind with the existing skylights at the front of the house. Staff are 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
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 585 Cherokee Street

APPLICATION: CA3-23-104

MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1906

Property Location: Corner of Milledge Avenue and Cherokee Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes two additions to the house to allow for added living space. The lower-level addition will sit directly behind the existing structure. The second level addition will be inserted in the existing structure but will not supersede the existing structure and will sit behind the existing bay windows. Both additions will meet the setback requirements. Both additions meet FAR and Lot Coverage. Both additions roofline will not exceed the existing roofline. Shingles are proposed for the second level to match existing and metal on the lower addition is proposed. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The Applicant proposes one-over-one wood windows on the first level of the house that is in-kind to the one-over-one windows on the lower existing level. Additionally, the Applicant proposes 12 over one wood lite windows on the second level of the house that mimics the existing windows on the second level. All trim and brackets will match. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The proposed siding will be wood that will be in-kind to the existing wood windows. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

A concrete block foundation is proposed for the addition. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 761 Elbert Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-106
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1913

Property Location: North side of Elbert Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition, rear deck

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: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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 a rear addition including a new integrated deck on the rear elevation. The rear addition would be narrower than the existing width of the house, and the additional portion of the rear elevation would incorporate the new deck. The addition would slightly exceed the height of the existing roofline and would alter the roof form to be gabled, rather than hipped. The proposed addition would retain the four windows which are currently located on the rear of the structure and reuse them. The addition would be clad in cedar shake to match the existing. The addition foundation would be CMU. Staff has concerns with this proposal. Sec. 16-20I.006 states, "Foundation materials, including infill materials, shall replicate the original materials in size, shape, color, texture and mortar, and shall be installed using construction techniques similar to the original." The existing foundation material is brick, not CMU. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to utilize brick for the addition foundation.

Staff also has concerns with the proposed roof form, which would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The gabled end is inconsistent with the existing design of the house, and the proposed deck, with timbers extending 17 feet in height up to the roof to create a covered portion is also not consistent with the historic form of the home. It is not clear to staff the need for the gabled roof form and proposed height. There is not a second story proposed. Staff recommends a redesign of the proposed roofline to utilize a hipped roof with a matching pitch consistent with the historic roofline. While Staff does not have concerns with the idea of a covered deck, and this could be integrated, the design must use a consistent roof form and not rely on the tall porch supports which are far more contemporary in design. The Applicant will redesign the proposed addition to utilize a hipped roof, situated below the existing roofline, which matches the pitch and form of the original house. The Applicant will lower the height of the roof covering the proposed deck, to not utilize exaggerated porch supports. Staff also notes there is a n inconsistent height of the balustrade on the proposed rear deck, as this feature will likely be redesigned it is a minor concern, but all balustrades must meet the life safety code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to utilize brick for the addition foundation.
- 2.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed addition to utilize a hipped roof, situated below the existing roofline, which matches the pitch and form of the original house.
- 3.) The Applicant will lower the height of the roof covering the proposed deck, to not utilize exaggerated porch supports.
- 4.) Staff shall review, and if appropriated, issue final approval of the proposed design.

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
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 682 Lexington Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-107
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: South side of Lexington Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

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

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: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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 a rear addition, total window and door replacement, and a new enlarged deck on the rear elevation. The rear addition would require the removal of a small non-original shed addition on the left elevation, Staff is not concerned with the removal of this feature as it is not original to the structure. The addition would be accomplished through a direct extension of the existing hipped roof and be situated fully behind the existing house. No specifications have been provided for the proposed cladding or foundation materials on the addition. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials to be used on the addition. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding to be used on the addition.

The Applicant proposes repair and replacement of portion of the original siding present on the house. The scope of this proposed work needs clarification. The Applicant will provide additional scope and photos illustrating specifically which portions of the siding are proposed for replacement.

The existing windows are non-compliant and not original to the house. The existing windows are also significantly smaller than the original windows present on the house, which is clear from the siding infill around the windows. The Applicant proposes full replacement of the windows, unfortunately publicly available photography shows that the non-compliant windows have been installed for at least 15 years. The provided specifications meet district regulations in terms of size and materials, but there is no evidence to support the proposed one-over-one light pattern (which would match the existing, but not necessarily the original windows present on the house). Therefore, there is no evidence of the original window style, or the historic trim present. As a result, Staff recommends submission of compatibility data to establish the appropriate window style and trim design. The Applicant will submit compatibility data for the proposed windows and trim.

The Applicant also proposes replacement of all doors present on the structure. Staff notes that the rear door is clearly not original and has no concerns with its replacement. No photos showing the existing front door have been provided. The Applicant will provide photographs illustrating the current state of the existing front door. The Applicant has also provided specifications for a number of doors, it is not clear exactly which doors would be used. The Applicant will clarify the specific doors proposed for use.

Re-roofing is proposed as part of the proposed alterations but is not under the purview of the Commission. The Applicant proposes repairs to eaves and soffits, but not details have been given regarding the scope or location of these repairs. The Applicant will clarify the scope and location of the proposed repairs to eaves and soffit.

The site plan is unclear to Staff. It appears that a swimming pool is being installed, but not details regarding this have been supplied. Likewise no specifications for or indications of new fencing are proposed, which is a major life safety concern. The Applicant will clarify the proposed scope of work in terms of the installation of a swimming pool. The Applicant will provide specifications

for the proposed fencing. The site plan also only shows existing lot coverage, not proposed. The Applicant will provide a proposed site plan, showing all features with calculations of the new lot coverage. There is an existing shared driveway present on the property. The Applicant proposes a shared parking pad that straddles the two properties. The Commission cannot approve alterations on any lot other than the property owner. The adjoining property owner must file a separate Application for the portion of the parking pad not located on 682 Lexington Avenue SW. The Applicant will not construct the portion of the parking pad not located on their property until a separate COA application has been filed and approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials to be used on the addition.
- 2.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding to be used on the addition.
- 3.) The Applicant will provide additional scope and photos specifically which portions of the siding are proposed for replacement.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit compatibility data for the proposed windows and trim.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide photographs illustrating the current state of the existing front door.
- 6.) The Applicant will clarify the specific doors proposed for use.
- 7.) The Applicant will clarify the scope and location of the proposed repairs to eaves and soffit.
- 8.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed scope of work in terms of the installation of a swimming pool.
- 9.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed fencing.
- 10.) The Applicant will provide a proposed site plan, showing all features with calculations of the new lot coverage.
- 11.) The Applicant will not construct the portion of the parking pad not located on their property until a separate COA application has been filed and approved.

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 26, 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 May 10, 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.

The Applicant has submitted some of the outstanding materials, but still requires additional time to submit the remainder for full evaluation of the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the May 10, 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: 4469 Stella Dr (Chastain Park)
APPLICATION: RC-23-120
MEETING DATE: April 26, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: 1944 (Amphitheater)

Property Location: Northeast intersection of Powers Ferry Dr. and Stella Dr.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Park / Amphitheater

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: ADA Accommodation alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

RC-23-120 for 4469 Stella Dr. (Chastain Park)

April 26, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

the current proposal is for the removal of existing seating for the purposes of installing new ADA compliant seating locations. Due to the age of the amphitheater, which was constructed in 1944, accessible seating would not have been required during the original construction. In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposal, and finds the location, materials, and methodology of the work to be appropriate.

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

Cc: Applicant
File