



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: 801 Joseph E. Lowry Blvd. SW
APPLICATION: CA2-23-124
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923

Property Location: West side of Joseph E. Lowry Blvd. SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes removing the non-historic enclosure of the porch on the house. The Applicant also proposes restoration of the missing original windows and doors, which were removed as part of the earlier enclosure. The Applicant proposes removal of the non-historic vinyl siding and replacement with cementitious siding. The Applicant also proposes construction of an accessory dwelling unit, deck, and new fence.

Porch

The Applicant proposes to replace the original front porch which was enclosed. To do so will remove non historic vinyl siding and windows. The original square brick supports remain and will stay in place. Staff would note that all original features, including the distinctive supports in the gable on the porch and trim should be retained as part of the restoration of the porch. The Applicant will retain all original features extant on the porch. The Applicant proposes enclosing the porch with a new balustrade. The balustrade will be not higher than the window sill, and code compliance achieved with a plane extension of the top rail. Staff would note that the construction method of the proposed balustrades is not noted in the plans. The balustrade must use historically appropriate butt-joint construction. The Applicant will utilize butt-joint construction for the proposed balustrade.

Windows

As original windows on the street-facing façade we removed in entirety to facilitate the non-historic enclosure of the porch, restoration will require installation of new windows. The Applicant proposes installation of wood-framed, double-hung, three-over-one windows on the street-facing façade, which match the original historic windows present on the side and rear elevations of the house. The enclosure of the porch has been present since the district was listed, and as a result no pre-alteration photos of the property are available. A comparison of the contributing structures on the block face illustrates that the proposed window configuration is compatible with the historic character. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed window replacement on the street-facing façade but will require exact specifications for the proposed windows to be used. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement windows.

The Applicant also proposes the addition of one new window on the left elevation and reconfiguration of the existing windows on the right elevation. Staff finds that the proposal meets the requirement of the zoning ordinance Sec. 16-20G.006 (3) which permits, “(e) The replacement and reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms,” and “(g) New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.”

Doors

The Applicant proposes installation of three new doors on the house. Two on the street-facing

façade and one on the rear elevation. The rear door does not fall under the purview of the Commission. As with the other features on the street-facing façade, the existing doors are not original. Staff notes that the proposed duplex configuration is historically appropriate. No specifications for the doors have been submitted. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed doors to be utilized on the street-facing façade.

Siding

Staff notes that the existing structure is covered in non-historic vinyl siding and due to the enclosure of the porch, no original siding is present on the façade of the house. Staff also notes that smooth-face cementitious siding with a 6” reveal is proposed, but it is not clear if this replacement is just occurring on the façade or all elevations. It is also unclear if original siding may be present underneath the vinyl siding on the other elevations. The Applicant will clarify the scope of proposed siding replacement. The Applicant will clarify the presence of historic siding beneath the non-historic vinyl siding.

Deck

Staff does not have any concerns with the design of the proposed deck which meets the requirements of the zoning code.

Accessory Dwelling Unit

Staff does not have any concerns with the design of the proposed ADU, which meets the requirements of the zoning code in terms of lot placement.

Fence

It is noted on the site plan that an existing chain link fence will be replaced with a 6-foot wooden fence. It is not entirely clear exactly what the boundaries of the new fence will be. This is of concern as a 6-foot fence may not be permitted in some locations (which are shown as having a fence on the site plan). Staff would like clarification as per Sec. 16-20G.006 (14) (b), “Fences located in the front or half-depth front yard shall not exceed four feet in height. Front yard fences may exceed four feet in height provided the height is no more than the height of the adjacent, contiguous fencing on immediately adjacent properties.” The Applicant will clarify where the proposed fence would be installed. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed fencing to be used.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will retain all original features extant on the porch.
- 2.) The Applicant will utilize butt-joint construction for the proposed balustrade.
- 3.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement windows.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed doors to be utilized on the street-facing façade.

CA2-23-124 801 Joseph E. Lowry Blvd. SW

May 10, 2023

Page 4 of 4

- 5.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of proposed siding replacement.
- 6.) The Applicant will clarify the presence of historic siding beneath the non-historic vinyl siding.
- 7.) The Applicant will clarify where the proposed fence would be installed.
- 8.) The Applicant will provided specifications for the proposed fencing to be used.
- 9.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 870 Inman Village Pkwy
APPLICATION: CA3-23-023
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2003

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes. Deferred to the April 12, 2023 public hearing but did not appear on this agenda due to a typographical error. Updated text will appear in Arial font.

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Since the previous meeting the Applicant has consulted with Staff from the Office of Zoning and Development, the team within DCP that has authority to interpret the PD-MU zoning, who have confirmed that the proposal will not require an amendment to the site plan attached to the PD-MU zoning legislation.

Proposal

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

The Applicant has provided updated plans which conform to the conditions listed above.

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

CA3-23-023 – 870 Inman Village Pkwy.

March 10, 2023

Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 573 Westend Place
APPLICATION: CA3-23-030
MEETING DATE: May 10th deferred since March 8, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location East of Ralph David Abernathy and West of Eggleston

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

EDITS are in RED
Last Edits in GREEN

PLANS

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

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

The Applicant has provided lot coverage. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. Also, the Applicant has a proposed floor. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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

The Applicant has provided plans that reflect correct window position.

ADDITIONS

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

Windows

District regulations states, “new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.” The windows on the addition are not compatible with what is shown on the existing house. Staff recommend the Applicant install windows are compatible to what is on the house.

Deck

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

The Applicant has shown the lot coverage. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Front Porch

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing flat roof over the stoop and install a small gable roof with three 8x8 columns. The existing flat roof is probably not original to the house along with the rod iron railings. However, Staff does believe a flat roof probably was installed over the original stoop. This renovation would be considered a compatibility issue; however, the Applicant doesn't have any comparables on the blockface with this stoop porch for comparisons. Staff will lean on additional information from the District regulations to guide with recommendation. District regulations states, “new or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns, and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no

more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code". Examining the houses on the block, only one house showed a stoop, the rest were full porches. That house had a flat roof over the steps with no columns. Staff recommends the Applicant construct a flat roof over the stoop, and not install columns or the small gable roof. This would keep the originality of the house.

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

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

Same recommendation listed above.

Windows

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

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

The Applicant has made the correction. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes smooth face wood siding. Staff are not concerned with the wood siding. Staff does recommend the Applicant remove the language of smooth-faced from the plans.

Recommendation still stands.

Door

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

The Applicant has not proposed retaining the original wood door. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Facia, Soffit and Paint.

1x8 facia and 3/8 soffit is being proposed. Staff are not concerned with the facia and soffit proposal. The Applicant has also proposed to paint the wood lap siding. Staff are not concerned with this. Painting is not a purview regulated; only non-painted masonry is regulated. **No painting is permitted on non-painted masonry.**

Fence

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

Recommendation stands.

Driveway

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

Recommendations stands.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. All windows shall comply with the District regulations which relies on the new windows match in-kind the style, shape and size with no more than one-inch width or height difference of the original windows, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The fence shall be brick, wood or metal, not exceed six feet in height on the side and rear and only be 4feet in the front yard. No chain link fence are permitted, per Sec.16-20G.006(14)(a)(b)(c);
3. The driveway shall be 10ft wide and 20ft past the front of the house, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(c)
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1051 Peoples
APPLICATION: CA3-23-064
MEETING DATE: May 10th, deferred since April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1949

Property Location East of White Oak and West of Lawton

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

REVISIONS IN RED

PLANS

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

The Applicant has provided lot coverage and setbacks but not FAR information. Recommendation is to supply the FAR as required.

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

The Applicant has met this recommendation.

On the existing front elevation, the windows or trim are not accurate. Staff recommend the Applicant to depict the windows and trim accurately on the plans so that there is no confusion in the field of work.

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

The Applicant has met this recommendation.

ADDITION

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

Siding

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

The Applicant has met this recommendation and is showing on the elevations.

Windows

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

After careful reexamination, the proposed windows are not in-kind. The Applicant has depicted the trim on the proposed windows but have not depicted the trim on the existing windows. Staff recommends the window on the addition to make match in-kind in style, size, and shape on the existing windows. This would be one-over-one windows.

Deck

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

Foundation

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

The Applicant has changed the foundation and is now proposing the foundation to match the existing foundation as stucco finish. The photos show that the original foundation is cinder block. District regulations states, "Above-grade foundation materials. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete, or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface." Staff are not concerned with the cinder block construction.

ALTERATIONS

Windows.

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

The Applicant has met this recommendation.

Door

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

Recommendation stays the same.

Unannounced Work

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

Porch railings and Columns

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

On the revised plans, the Applicant is showing a deck railing for the front porch and not the two-part joint system. This is not acceptable. The recommendation listed above stays the same. Staff also recommends the railings appearance is corrected to show a two-part joint system.

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

Recommendation stands.

Siding

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

Staff have since learned the original siding on the house is wood, underneath the asbestos. Staff recommend the asbestos be removed and the wood be retained whether that be replaced or repaired in-kind.

Unauthorized car shed

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

Driveway

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the April 26th UDC meeting.

1. The Applicant shall submit a site plan, that show the FAR, per Sec. 16-20M.006;
2. The windows shall match the existing windows, in material, style, shape; one-over-one window with trim, per Sec. 16-20M.13(2)(n)(2);
3. The front door shall remain and repaired. However, if the door is unrepairable, the door must be wood panel or fixed glass panel in a wood frame, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
4. The railing shall be a two-part joint construction with the top railing being no higher than the bottom windowsill with a simple plain extension if needed to meet code and be shown on the elevations as such, per Sec.16-20M.013;
5. The columns on the porch shall be repaired in-kind to the original columns, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(e);
6. The unauthorized car shed shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20M.
7. The current driveway shall be repaired in -kind. If there is a need to replace the driveway, the driveway must be 10ft wide and 20feet past the front facade, per Sec.16-20M.013 and
8. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 683 Shelton Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-068
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Shelton Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

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

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

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

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

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

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

Front Yard Setbacks

Section 16-20 I.006 (1)(a)(1) states, “Front yard setbacks of new principal structures shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; or ii) shall be no closer to the street than the closest and no farther from the street than the farthest contributing structure of like use on that side of the block.” The Applicant has submitted a site plan which utilizes baseline setbacks for R4-A zoning, not based on the compatibility rule or the previously existing structure. Staff must have compatibility data provided to determine if the proposed setbacks meet the compatibility rule.

Side Yard Setbacks

Section 16-20 I.006 (1)(a)(2) states, “Side yards of new principal structures or additions shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; ii) conform to the setback of the existing building; iii) conform to any existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks previously established by a majority of the contributing buildings of like use on that side of the block; or iv) be of a width of not less than seven feet.” The Applicant has submitted a site plan which utilizes baseline setbacks for R4-A zoning (7 feet), which while technically meets the code, still is not based on the compatibility rule or the previously existing structure. While Staff is comfortable with the states setbacks as is, Staff would note that if the proposed front or rear yard setbacks change this also may necessitate changing the side yard setbacks out of necessity.

Overall Height

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

Scale and Massing

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

Foundation Materials

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

Cladding

It is not entirely clear what the Applicant proposes to utilize for cladding. The plans note lap siding, but also note cementitious siding. No specifications for proposed materials have been provided, so Staff is unable to determine the appropriateness of the proposal. **The Applicant has clarified that the siding would be cementitious. Staff is not concerned with this proposal but would note that the cementitious siding should be smooth-faced with a reveal between 4-6 inches. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding materials, illustrating how it meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance.**

Roof Form

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

Roof Pitch

No compatibility data has been submitted regarding roof pitch. The proposed roof form (pyramidal) also does not meet the compatibility rule. A Hipped roof, the required roof form will have a much shallower pitch. The Applicant will provide compatibility data for roof pitch on contributing structures. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to be in compliance with the compatibility rule in terms of pitch. **The roof form has been corrected. Staff notes that there is not a roof pitch which predominates on the block face, due to there being only three contributing structures, all with different roof pitches. The roof pitches as reported, are not entirely correct (the compatibility study often uses the front gabled portion, not the primary roof form for this measurement). Staff does find that one of the contributing properties on the block has a roof pitch of 6/12, which is the steepest on the block face. The proposed roof pitch of 8/12 does not exist anywhere on the block for the primary roof pitch, they are all shallower (3/12, 4/12, and 6/12). As such Staff cannot support the proposed roof pitch of 8/12. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to not exceed 6/12.**

Void/Solid Ratio

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

Porch

In terms of compatibility, none of the contributing structures on the block face have full-width porches. Based on the compatibility rule, which requires a change in massing the porch will also need to be modified to meet the compatibility rule. Staff is not opposed to having a full-width

porch, but it would need to be modified to engage with the required mass. Staff also finds that the integrated porch roof is not appropriate and should be modified to be an independent feature, which does not engage the primary roofline. The Applicant will redesign the proposed porch to be an independent feature which does not engage with the primary roofline. The Applicant will redesign the porch to conform to the revised massing of the house. The Applicant will provide data illustrating the compatibility of the proposed porch features including porch supports and balustrade.

Paving Materials

The applicant has not submitted compatibility data for paving materials.

Walkway

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

Driveway

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

Windows and Doors

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

Likewise, a color has been provided for the front door, but no specifications. Per Section 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(8), "New or replacement doors shall be made of wood and may contain a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion, placement, and style." The Applicant will install wood-framed, one-over-one, double-hung windows. The Applicant will revise the fenestration patterning to more closely mirror the historic patterning present on the block face. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed doors.

Site Plan

In addition to the concerns regarding lot coverage, Staff has additional concerns on the site plan regarding typography and tree coverage. The site plan shows six trees being removed. The

Applicant must ensure that they are in full compliance with the city of Atlanta Tree Ordinance. It also appears that there is a grade change across the property. It is not entirely clear how this will impact the proposed site plan in terms of grading. The Applicant will clarify the proposed grading and site changes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify if there are elements of the proposed design which may change based on the separate designs. **The Applicant has clarified this issue with submittal of new plans/**
- 2.) The Applicant will submit revised compatibility data including only information from contributing properties. **The Applicant has submitted a revised and correct compatibility study.**
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed house form to conform with that which predominates on the block face. **The updated plans have come into compliance.**
- 4.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding materials. **The Applicant has clarified that the siding would be cementitious. Staff is not concerned with this proposal but would note that the cementitious siding should be smooth-faced with a reveal between 4-6 inches. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding materials, illustrating how it meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 5.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to utilize a hipped roof to meet the compatibility rule. **The roof form has been corrected. Staff notes that there is not a roof pitch which predominates on the block face, due to there being only three contributing structures, all with different roof pitches. The roof pitches as, reported, are not entirely correct (the compatibility study often uses the front gabled portion, not the primary roof form for this measurement). Staff does find that one of the contributing properties on the block has a roof pitch of 6/12, which is the steepest on the block face. The proposed roof pitch of 8/12 does not exist anywhere on the block for the primary roof pitch, they are all shallower (3/12, 4/12, and 6/12). As such Staff cannot support the proposed roof pitch of 8/12. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to not exceed 6/12. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 6.) The Applicant will revise the proposed rear dormer to not engage the primary roofline. **The dormer design has been updated.**
- 7.) The Applicant will provide compatibility data for roof pitch on contributing structures. **As stated above the roof pitch must be revised not to exceed 6/12. The Applicant has updated the roof form and pitch.**
- 8.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof design to be in compliance with the compatibility rule in terms of pitch. **See comments above. The Applicant has updated the roof form and pitch.**
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed porch to be an independent feature which does not engage with the primary roofline. **The porch design has been updated.**

- 10.) The Applicant will redesign the porch to conform to the revised massing of the house. **The porch design has been updated.**
- 11.) The Applicant will provide data illustrating the compatibility of the proposed porch features including porch supports and balustrade. **The photographs submitted establish that the porch design is compatible with the contributing structures on the block face.**
- 12.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed driveway to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20I.006 (5)(a) and illustrate that they do not exceed maximum lot coverage. **No revised site plan has been submitted. The Applicant has updated the site plan. Staff does have concerns regarding the proposed 10-foot rear deck. The deck meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance, with the exception of the rear steps, which encroach on the rear yard setback. The steps must be redesigned to fall within the the buildable area of the lot.**
- 13.) The Applicant will install wood-framed, one-over-one, double-hung windows. **The Applicant has updated the window design to be a three-over-one pattern.**
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the fenestration patterning to more closely mirror the historic patterning present on the block face. **Staff is concerned with the proposed transom windows on the left elevation. These windows do not meet the requirements of Section 16-20I.006 (2)(a)(1), which states, "All building materials which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, shall be compatible with those which predominate in the subarea." These windows must be wood-framed, double-hung of similar style to the remainder of the house.**
- 15.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows. **No specifications have been provided. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 16.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed doors. **No specifications have been provided. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 17.) The Applicant must ensure that they are in full compliance with the city of Atlanta Tree Ordinance.
- 18.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed grading and site changes. **No details have been provided. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 19.) The Applicant will provide all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 995 Sparks
APPLICATION: CA3-23-069
MEETING DATE: May 10th deferred since April 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

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

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

Revisions in RED

Revisions in GREEN

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided 9 comparisons for the new construction.

975 Sparks

989 Sparks **New Construction**

991 Sparks New Construction

997 Sparks

999 Sparks

1009 Sparks

1013 Sparks

1015 Sparks

1027 Sparks

1031 Sparks

1037 Sparks

The Applicant had edited the compatibility analysis. There are now 6 comparable houses for Staff to review:

975 Sparks

1003 Sparks

1005 Sparks

1009 Sparks

1013 Sparks

1021 Sparks

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed 19 feet above grade new construction. Staff is not concerned with the highest roof height is 20 ft and the lowest is 16ft.

CA3-23-069 for 995 Sparks

May 10, 2023

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

Roof form

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

The Applicant has revised the roof plans for the project. The Applicant is only keeping the secondary roof which will meet with the primary roof and continue the gable formation. The dormers have been removed. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Dormers

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

The dormers have been removed. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Massing

The massing of the house is much more than the other houses on the blockface, this is due to the fact the lot size is much larger than those on the blockface at a size of 7,840,8 sf. Therefore, the width of this proposal appears to be wider especially with the extended wing sections—one on each side. The District regulations do not regulate width. Staff are not concerned; the setbacks are not being exceed. The lot coverage is being met. The only other option to utilize this land is to subdivide, however, the Applicant then would be required to submit evidence this large lot had a historical pattern of two lots. The Cadastral map doesn't support two lots but one large lot. Nor will the subdivision permit two distinct new housing which is a requirement for a subdivision.

The new proposal is substantially less in width. The removal of the dormers and instead of moving the house in an unorthodox manner that created this massing issue, the massing issue is not so much of a concern as before. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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

The Applicant has provided FAR and the proposal meets FAR. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

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

The Applicant has proposal smooth-faced cementitious siding with a 6-inch reveal. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

May 10, 2023

Windows

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

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

The predominate window pattern on the blockface is DH 3x5 no grid all vertical. On the front elevation, the Applicant proposes vertical one over one wood windows. These same windows are present on the right and left elevations. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. Also, on the front elevation, the Applicant proposes two over two vertical wood windows and on the right elevation the Applicant also proposes a vertical wood window that is not the same size as the others. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. The District regulations requires windows to be predominately vertical in orientation.

Fenestration Pattern

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

Staff recommendation stays the same.

Porch

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

Staff recommendation stays the same. The foundation is 22 inches off the ground, the Applicant proposes columns and a full slab with three steps. The District regulation states, "front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends." The predominate porch form on the blockface is a full porch. The proposed porch is a full porch except for the closed risers and ends. Staff recommends the Applicant install closed risers and ends. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

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

Foundation Material

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

The foundation is proposed as 22-inches above ground crawl space, with a concrete foundation with a brick veneer. District regulations states, “above-grade foundation materials. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete, or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.” Staff are not concerned with this proposal. The 22-inch is the lowest foundation grade and the highest is 24 inches. And the CMU is prohibited as a finish.

Sidewalk

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

The Applicant has shown the sidewalk in the revised site plan. However, Staff cannot determine the specifics of the sidewalk. Staff recommendation will stay the same.

Walkway

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

The Applicant has proposed a 4ft walkway from the front of the house to the sidewalk. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

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

Garage

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. A new window shall be installed on the left elevation where the rest room will be to even out the fenestration, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n);
2. The Applicant shall abide by the regulations set forth in District regulations for the construction of the sidewalk and state the specifics on the site plan, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c) and
3. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

CA3-23-069 for 995 Sparks

May 10, 2023

Neighborhood

File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKINS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

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

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

[The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)

- 7.) The Applicant will redesign the house to meet the compatibility rule. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 8.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed roof to meet the compatibility rule. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed roof pitch to meet the compatibility rule. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 10.) The Applicant will note roof pitch for the proposed new construction on all elevations. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 11.) The Applicant will submit new brick for approval as an exterior cladding material.
- 12.) The Applicant will clarify the position of the stairs. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 13.) The Applicant will install a balustrade (as shown), no taller than the bottom of the windows and of butt-joint construction. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the proposed porch columns to be of full brick construction. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 15.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to be clad in brick veneer. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 16.) The Applicant will revise the fenestration on the side elevations to be more consistent with the surrounding contributing structures. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 17.) The Applicant will remove the proposed fixed windows from the design. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 18.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to utilize a four-over-one lite pattern. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 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. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 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 PRINCE
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

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Doug Young
Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 742 Edgewood
APPLICATION: CA3-23-114
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Historic Inman Park (subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction New Construction

Property Location: Corner of Edgewood and Waddle

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior, site work of the new construction.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

COMPATIBILITY RULE

The Compatibility Rule states, “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.”

PROPOSAL

The Applicant proposes to construct a new building for a preschool. The comparable used for the analysis are small schedule buildings on the opposite side of the street and the existing preschool. The blockface for the proposed site doesn't have enough like-kind establishments for comparison.

Height

The proposed height is 9 ft. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. The height is significantly lower than what the city requires and from pictures provided this proposed height will be in align with the other retail buildings in the area.

Building Materials and Awnings

The proposed building material is brick and stack bond. Staff are not concerned about this proposal. The adopted brick material is in line with other comparable buildings including the existing preschool. The Applicant is also proposing the brick detail that is on the entrance of the historic cooperative preschool. The Applicant also proposes some stucco accent. The Stucco accent is not problematic, it adds a break from the brick and adds an interesting design element.

Awnings which replicate the awnings that are on the existing preschool are not problematic to Staff. Staff does recommend the Applicant verify how far the awning can be extended on to the sidewalk and comply with code.

Building Windows and Fenestration and Doors

Many of the proposed windows are vertical in proportion and the casings are in line with what is presented on the comparable. However, the proposed windows on the west elevation are horizontal. Staff recommend the windows reflect vertically to meet District regulations.

Staff are not concerned with the fenestration patterns on the building.

The Applicant proposes a double industrial door with lights on the front façade. This will mimic the double doors and lights of the existing preschool. This not problematic to Staff. The trellis proposal on the east elevation also adds interest to the building. Staff have no problem with this proposal.

Site Work

The Applicant proposes an outdoor patio which appears to employ brick landing, a garden planter, outdoor storage, a brick wall is on the premise and a fence and gate. None of these site elements are problematic. The fence on the north elevation appears to be 4ft and would comply with the District regulations requirements regarding fences. Staff does recommend the Applicant note the measurement of the fence on the elevations.

Signage

The proposed signage over the front entrance isn't problematic. Staff does recommend the signage comply to by the signage ordinance that will comply to the City and district, which can located at Sec.16-28A.007(v).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall comply with regulations that governs how far awnings can extend out on the public right way, per Sec. 16-20I;
2. The windows on the west elevation shall be vertical in design as stated in the District regulation, per Sec.16-20I.006(n)(1);
3. The fence measurement shall be noted on the elevations, per Sec.16-20I.006(l)(i);
4. The signage as well as the light feature is not attached to the masonry but to the mortar per Sec. 16-28A.007(v) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim-Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 88 Waddell
APPLICATION: CA3-23-119
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: East of Edgewood and West of Dixie

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition and rebuilding front porch.

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 Known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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.

ALTERATION

Front Porch

The Applicant proposes to demolish the double decker porch and reconstruct it in-kind. The provided photos show the porch leaning and in need of replacement. The proposed elevations show an in-kind replacement for every element of the porch.

Siding nor the windows or any other component on the house will be bothered. 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: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 715 Ponce De Leon Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-122
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** I-2

Date of Construction: 1968-1991

Property Location: South block face of Ponce De Leon Ave, west of the Somerset Ter. Intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant/Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Transitional Height Plane reduction

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

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

Sec. 16-20V.013(b)(i) require a transitional height plane for projects in Subarea 5 which are directly adjacent to Subareas 1, 2, & 6. Portions of the subject properties (the property located at 737 Ponce De Leon is also included in the proposal) are directly adjacent to properties located in Subarea 6 of the Historic District. Other portions are not directly adjacent but are within 150 feet of properties in Subarea 6. The District regulations would require heights within these areas to conform to a height plane that is staggered outwards from the “protected district.”

The District regulations also specify in Sec. 16-20V.014 – Table 4, that properties within 60 feet of subarea 1, 2, or 6, have a maximum allowable height of 52 feet.

When reviewing variance requests, the Commission is required to find that the request meets all 4 of the variance criteria. The requested variances would be to increase the allowable height of a building within 60 feet of properties in subarea 1, 2, or 6, from 52 feet (maximum) to 185 feet (proposed); and to remove the transitional height plane for properties in subarea 5 that are adjacent to properties in subarea 1, 2, or 6.

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

The Applicant cites the existence of a sub-grade sewer trunk line as well as the small area of the lot. The Applicant further states that the depth of the trunk line would prevent much of the parking from being provided sub-grade. The small area and the shape of the lot also restrict design flexibility that would be required to accommodate the parking in an otherwise compliant manner. - **MET**

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

The Applicant states that the site was previously conditionally zoned to MRC-3-C with a condition that allowed a maximum height of 185 feet. The Applicant states that with the site constraints mentioned previously, the property would be dramatically impacted by the height restrictions and transitional height plane. - **MET**

What conditions are peculiar to this particular piece of property?

The Applicant cites the sewer trunk line, the small lot size, and the location of the lot create a situation that is unique. Staff finds that while many of these issues would not be unusual taken on their own, the combination of site constraints is unusual and creates a condition where compliance would not be possible for this or any future development. – **MET**

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

The Applicant states that the location of the site, which is adjacent to several large scale developments, as well as the current use of the property as surface parking which would be

CA3-23-122 for 715 Ponce De Leon Ave.

May 10, 2023

Page 3 of 3

transformed into a new denser use would mitigate any potential negative effects of the variances were they to be granted. The Applicant also states that the project currently envisioned would fulfill several of the objectives of the District including increasing pedestrian connectivity, providing compatible commercial development without displacing long-standing businesses, and placing mixed use development along the Beltline. – **MET**

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

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: 646 Atwood Street SW

APPLICATION: CA3-23-123

MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction:

Property Location: East side of Atwood Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 23CAP-00000199

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

On February 11, 2023, the Applicant received a stop-work order for the unpermitted gutting of the interior of the house (23CAP-00000199).

The full interior of the structure has been removed; however, the exterior features remain extant. The Applicant proposes the addition of three dormers to create a full second story on the house, restoration of the existing windows, replacement of one non-original bathroom window, repairs to the fascia board and soffit, installation of a fence, and replacement of the front door.

Dormers

The Applicant proposes three dormers. The rear dormer would completely reconstruct and reconfigure the rear of the house from a hipped roof to a gabled roof. The two side dormers would be shed roofed and run approximately the full length of the roof. Staff has significant concerns with the proposed dormers which would completely change the roof shape and appearance of the structure. In terms of the rear dormer Staff cannot support the destruction of the primary roof and reconfiguration as a gable. Staff recommends that the rear roof remain as is and that a rear-facing dormer be added, which does not engage the primary roof line.

In terms of the side dormers, Staff is concerned about the design and size of them. Sec. 16-20G.006 requires that additions be compatible with the massing and design of the existing historic structure. Staff finds that the proposed dormers, which extend out almost the full depth of the roof and create essentially a secondary flat roof due to a pitch of 1/12 or 2/12 (it is not noted on the plans). While Staff would not be opposed to a shed dormer on the sides, the massive size of these essentially is just creating a secondary higher roof, squaring off the building. These dormers dominate the appearance of the house and add an incompatible second story, versus a more modified one-and-a-half story profile using dormers. The resulting gull-wing effect overtakes the historic appearance and massing of the structure. The size of the dormers must be drastically reduced to create true dormers which are secondary to the primary roof and set back as far as possible to minimize their appearance. Staff will further note that standing seam metal roofing is not an appropriate material for the dormers and at present their profile is such that Staff cannot support the use of skylights, as they would be highly visible from the public right-of-way which is prohibited by Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(e).

The Applicant will re-design the rear-facing dormer to be secondary and not engage the primary roofline. The Applicant will re-design the side dormers to diminish the size, not engage the primary roofline, and be secondary to the primary roofline. The Applicant will use a shed roof pitch on the proposed dormers no greater than 3/12. The Applicant remove the proposed standing seam metal roofing from the plans and will utilize roofing materials which match the primary roof on the proposed dormers. The Applicant will remove all skylights which are visible from the public right-of-way.

The Applicant has noted that the existing chimney will remain; however, it is not clear if any work

is proposed to the historic feature. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the historic chimney.

Window Restoration and Replacement

The Applicant proposes retention and restoration of the original wooden windows present on the structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The Applicant also propose replacement of a non-original window on the left side elevation with glass block for a bathroom. Per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(e), “The replacement and reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted.” Staff is not concerned with the proposed replacement as the bathroom window is not original and does not match the historic windows on the home, glass block is not an appropriate replacement material. The windows should be replaced with a wood-framed, double-hung window which matches the historic windows on the home in lite design with muntins permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass. Staff acknowledges that the non-historic window is not the same scale as the original windows. As the zoning code allows for reconfiguration of windows to accommodate bathrooms, Staff is not concerned with the replacement window being smaller in scale to fit the existing opening and not further destroy historic fabric of the structure. The Applicant will clarify the proposed size of the window. The Applicant will not utilize glass block for the proposed bathroom window on the right elevation. The Applicant will retain any historic trim present, or replicate the original trim in design, materials, and reveal.

Door Replacement

The Applicant proposes replacement of the front door based on damage. The only photos submitted show the door frame, not the door itself. Staff cannot determine the appropriateness of the proposal without seeing the condition of the door. It is possible that only the door framing will require repair. The Applicant will submit photos illustrating the condition of the existing door.

Fascia and Soffit Repairs

The Applicant proposes repairs to the soffit and fascia and has submitted photos showing the damage. Staff concurs that repairs are needed; however, require further clarification as to the precise nature of the proposed repairs, including materials. The existing has a distinctive patterning and Staff wants to ensure that the repairs replicate the historic appearance. The Applicant will clarify the scope and method of the repairs including providing specifications for replacement materials.

Fence

The Applicant proposes installation of a six-foot privacy fence “along the property line”. No indication of the fence location is noted on the submitted site plan, so it is not entirely clear to staff where this fence would be located. The Applicant has also not provided specifications for the proposed fencing materials. The Applicant will submit a site plan showing the location of the proposed fence. The Applicant will provide material specifications for the proposed fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will re-design the rear-facing dormer to be secondary and not engage the primary roofline.
- 2.) The Applicant will re-design the side dormers to diminish the size, not engage the primary roofline, and be secondary to the primary roofline.
- 3.) The Applicant will use a shed roof pitch on the proposed dormers no greater than 3/12.
- 4.) The Applicant remove the proposed standing seam metal roofing from the plans and will utilize roofing materials which match the primary roof on the proposed dormers.
- 5.) The Applicant will remove all skylights which are visible from the public right-of-way.
- 6.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the historic chimney.
- 7.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed size of the window.
- 8.) The Applicant will not utilize glass block for the proposed bathroom window on the right elevation.
- 9.) The Applicant will retain any historic trim present, or replicate the original trim in design, materials, and reveal.
- 10.) The Applicant will submit photos illustrating the condition of the existing door.
- 11.) The Applicant will clarify the scope and method of the fascia and soffit repairs including providing specifications for replacement materials.
- 12.) The Applicant will submit a site plan showing the location of the proposed fence.
- 13.) The Applicant will provide material specifications for the proposed fence.
- 14.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

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

Janide Prince
Commissioner

Design Studio
Doug Young
Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 171 Powell

APPLICATION: CA3-23-125

MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbage Town Landmark District (SA3) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1890

Property Location East of Gaskill and West of Kirkwood

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and Accessory Structure

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None, Known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD:

“The intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, a particular subarea (including appropriate reference to subarea style) or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use in that block face."

“For the purposes of the compatibility rule, height and width shall be measured at the front façade.”

ADDITION

The Applicant is proposing an addition 390 sf to the existing house for living space. The added space will not exceed the existing setbacks or lot coverage. Staff didn't see information regarding FAR. Staff recommend the Applicant provide FAR information. The roof additions are not exceeding the existing roof lines with matching corner boards. Staff is not concerned about this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes in-kind wood siding that match the existing in style and reveal. Staff are not concerned with the siding proposal.

Windows

The proposed window in the rear will match the other existing windows. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

Photos show segments of the foundation lap siding that has been applied in the rear. However, research also shows the certain sections such as the front facing did not have siding. Latticed covered the foundation. And at one point, the foundation may not have been there, and the area was possibly being is open. The foundation piers are brick so the foundation could also be brick. The Applicant is proposing lap siding only on the rear section where the addition is being proposed and not the front of the house. Because lap siding was there prior, Staff are not concerned with the proposed lap siding on the foundation in the rear.

Screen rear deck

The Applicant has proposed a new screened deck on the rear side of the house and will not go beyond the side of the existing structure. Staff are not concerned with his proposal.

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The proposed accessory is 305 sf and will sit directly behind the principal structure. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. Windows will match the windows of the principal structure. The siding proposed is cementitious siding with reveal to match the wood siding on the existing house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. All trim will match the trim on the principal house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

CA3-23-125 for 171 Powell

May 10, 2023

pg. 3

1. The FAR shall be included on the site plan, per Sec.16-20A.009(8) and
2. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1178 Greenwich Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-128
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Greenwich Street 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. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the May 24, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a home on the vacant lot at 1178 Greenwich Street SW. Historic aerial photography shows that a house did historically exist on the property, which was demolished between 1968 and 1972. The site plan shows that there is an existing non-conforming driveway measuring 17-feet in width present on the site. Historic aerial photography shows that this driveway, which appears to have been constructed to serve the neighboring property at 1182 Greenwich Street SW predates the creation of the historic district and has existed since the mid-1980s (1981-1988). The Applicant states that there is an existing easement agreement between their property and the adjacent parcel (1182 Greenwich Street SW) for shared use of the driveway, though based on the application materials provided the driveway is located entirely on the 1178 parcel. While an existing non-conforming driveway would be permitted to remain, so long as there are no alterations to the feature, Staff requires evidence of the legal easement agreement. The Applicant will submit evidence of the legal easement agreement regarding the driveway.

Massing

The Applicant proposes a full two-story house with a wider rear single-story portion. Staff has significant concerns with the proposed design. The Applicant has stated that the design has been formed around the need to retain the existing driveway. As noted above, the driveway is non-conforming and requires submission of information governing the details of the easement agreement. There are no contributing two-story structures on the block face. All the existing contributing structures are one-and-a-half stories. Staff cannot support a full two-story structure with such strong vertical massing. Staff notes that on the proposed site plan that the structure, as designed, is 82 feet from the proposed rear yard setback. Staff suggests removal of the full second story, and accommodation with side dormers, as well as pushing the massing of the structure back, removing the L-shape. Given the current roof design will need to change to meet the compatibility rule, Staff suggests that the proposed side projecting gables become gabled dormers, which do not engage the primary roofline. Staff also does not support the wider rear of the house, the massing of which does not appear anywhere in the contributing structures on the block face. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to meet the compatibility rule in terms of design and massing per Sec. 16-20G.006.

Overall Height

The proposed height of the structure is 23 feet. The Applicant has only provided height data for two of the three contributing structures on the block face (1162 and 166 Greenwich). Per the compatibility data supplied by the Applicant no contributing structure on the block face is taller than 22 feet. The extreme vertical massing and incompatible roof pitch contribute to this non-compliant height. The Applicant will revise the proposed height to meet the compatibility rule per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(g).

Roof Form

Staff finds that the proposed roof form, a front-gable, does meet the compatibility rule. However, Staff would not that given the discussion of massing and the discussion of pitch, the roof will need to be redesigned to meet the compatibility rule.

Roof Pitch

The proposed roof pitch is 8/12. Staff finds that this does not meet the regulations set by Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(d) which states, “The shape and pitch of roofs for new construction shall be subject to the compatibility rule.” None of the contributing structures on the block face have a roof pitch of 8/12. The three contributing structures feature roof pitches of 3/12 (1162 Greenwich), 5/12 (1166 Greenwich), and 5/12 (1182 Greenwich). As 5/12 is the roof pitch which predominated the roof must be redesigned with a roof pitch of 5/12. The Applicant will revise the roof design to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(d) in terms of form and pitch.

Foundation Height

Staff finds that the proposed foundation height meets the compatibility rule and the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Foundation Materials

Staff finds that the proposed foundation materials meet the compatibility rule and the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Cladding

The Applicant states that 6” wooden lap siding will be used on the house, while Staff finds that this meets the compatibility rule, no specifications have been provided for the exact material. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(d).

Windows

Based on the compatibility data provided by the Applicant, Staff notes that two of the three contributing structures feature three-over-one, double-hung windows. The Applicant has proposed one-over-one windows, which do not predominate on the block face. The Applicant will install three-over-one, wood-framed, double-hung windows which comply with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i). The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i).

Doors

While door style has been included in the compatibility study, no specifications for the proposed

doors have been provided. Per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(k), “New or replacement doors shall be made of wood and shall contain a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style to original doors within that block face.” The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed front door to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(k).

Front Yard Setbacks

Staff find that the proposed front yard setback meets the compatibility rule and the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Side and Rear Yard Setbacks

The Applicant has utilized the baseline setback for R4-A zoning, which Staff finds meet the requirement of the zoning ordinance.

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

- 1.) The Applicant will submit evidence of the legal easement agreement regarding the driveway.
- 2.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to meet the compatibility rule in terms of design and massing per Sec. 16-20G.006.
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed height to meet the compatibility rule per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(g).
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the roof design to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(d) in terms of form and pitch.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(d).
- 6.) The Applicant will install three-over-one, wood-framed, double-hung windows which comply with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i).
- 7.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i).
- 8.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed front door to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(k).
- 9.) 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.

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: Denial

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.

The Applicant has submitted materials sufficient to satisfy the baseline requirements for each of the criteria listed in the application for a demolition due to a threat to public health and safety. In reviewing the materials however, Staff does not find sufficient evidence that demolition is the only acceptable undertaking to mitigate the threat to public health and safety. While the structure may be currently unsound for habitation under the building code and has been further undermined by damage from the recent fire there has been no appreciable effort to develop and explore the possibility of rehabilitation. The Applicant

states that it would cost approximately \$400,000-\$500,000 to renovate and rehabilitate the property. The Applicant still has not submitted any estimate or evidence for how they arrived at this number or itemized what this rehabilitation would entail or how it meets the requirements for the zoning ordinance for the Sunset Avenue Historic District. The only information submitted is a \$700,000 estimate for new construction, which includes an estimate of approximately \$23,000 to demolish the historic home.

Staff has considerable concerns with the lack of information being presented by the Applicant who appears unwilling to explore any alternative to demolition and has not substantially established that renovation and rehabilitation of the structure is not possible. No estimate for rehabilitation has been provided. No details of how the structure could be rehabilitated have been submitted. The Applicant states that there are historic tax credits available, but it does not appear that this option has been explored beyond the statement that the tax credits exist. There is not a fully executed proposal for new construction; however, based on the description of the structure: three stories, mixed use, with a concrete block foundation none of these would be permitted by the zoning ordinance. All the reasons given for demolition hinge on a plan which would not meet the requirement of the zoning ordinance. Therefore, the estimate for new construction cannot be explored as an accurate representation by which to measure the need for demolition. The existing house is the tallest structure on the block face. No new construction may exceed its current height. The current brick foundation is listed as structurally unsound and in need of replacement with CMU. The compatibility rule dictates that the foundation materials on new construction must be that which predominates on the block face, which is brick.

The materials submitted only illustrate a desire to demolish, not that temporary measures such as closing the property and rehabilitation of the structure have been explored in any way. Staff finds that while the structure is not currently fit for habitation does not mean that the structure may not be secured to mitigate the threat or that rehabilitation and restoration is not possible. Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the application to demolish due to a threat to public health and safety.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1350 Howell Mill Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-109
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** I-2

Date of Construction:

Property Location: Northeast intersection of Howell Mill Rd. and Seventeenth St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infrastructure/park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

RC-23-109 for 1350 Howell Mill Rd.

May 10, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing the installation of new trails, seating areas, shade structures, and signage on the subject property. Staff has no general concerns with the proposal, but does note the lack of sidewalk and other pedestrian infrastructure along this block face of Howell Mill Rd. and Seventeenth St. Staff suggests the Applicant discuss whether new sidewalk infrastructure is proposed as part of this plan. Staff would also suggest the Applicant discuss plans for right of way improvements such as crosswalks and other interventions to ensure the safety of pedestrians accessing the site.

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

Cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 36 Northwood Dr.
APPLICATION: RC-23-126
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West block face of Northwood Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter with Comments to the Applicant.

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

The Applicant is proposing a new accessory structure to the rear of the historic structure. From the photographs, it is unclear whether work has begun already as the existing garage shown on the site plan appears to have been removed. In general, Staff has no concerns with the overall design of the proposed structure. Staff would note, however, that the plans appear to show an accessory structure that is much larger than would otherwise be allowed. Per Sec. 16-28.004(3) accessory structures cannot contain a total floor area (both heated and unheated) greater than 30 of the principal structures heated floor area.

Per the plans provided by the Applicant, the principal structure has a floor area of 4339 sf (heated space) which means that the proposed accessory structure could not be larger than 1301.7 sf total (both heated and unheated space). The proposed accessory structure would contain a total floor area of 1684 sf, which would exceed the allowable size. Staff suggests that the Applicant discuss this issue with Staff from the Office of Zoning and Development to discuss options for reducing the size of the accessory structure, or, applying for a variance to increase the allowable size.

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

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: 4531 Campbellton Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-126
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** MRC-1-C

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: North block face of Campbellton Rd. west of the County Line Rd. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

RC-23-126 for 4531 Campbellton Rd.

May 10, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a new public art piece on a proposed public safety facility. The work involves the installation of a steel support with wood members on the top. From the designs, it appears that the feature may be intended for use as a bench, though this is not specified in the materials received. In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposal but would suggest that the Applicant consider the different maintenance techniques and time-tables that are required for the mixture of metal and wood members used in the piece. Staff would also suggest that the Applicant include the ongoing maintenance of the piece as part of the ongoing maintenance of the plaza and site.

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

Cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 0 Northside Dr. (Haynes Manor Park)
APPLICATION: RC-23-172
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: East block face of Northside Dr., between the intersections of Peachtree Battle Ave. and Sagamore Dr.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Renaming/Dedication

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 6-4043 & Sec. 138-8

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter with the Commission's Comments to the appropriate City agencies.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043 & Sec. 138-8 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

Per Section 138-8 of the Atlanta City Code:

(e) *Urban design commission review and comment.* All street renaming and dedications located in the City of Atlanta must be reviewed by the urban design commission and be the subject of a regularly scheduled commission meeting. In advance of such a meeting, neighborhood associations, historical groups, historic preservation groups, and other interested parties will be notified that the street renaming or dedication has been placed on the commission's agenda. After the meeting, written findings regarding the street renaming or dedication must be forwarded to the city's commissioner of its department of public works and must be received by the commissioner before the commissioner is authorized to submit to the city council legislation authorizing the street renaming or dedication.

The naming or renaming of a park or any other City-related facility is a significant undertaking by the City. It is one of the few ways for a person or event to be honored by the City by granting a potentially permanent place in the City's future and thus its history. When streets, parks, and facilities are considered for renaming, the Staff finds that it is not appropriate to compare the significance of the existing name to the proposed name and by extension the people, events, or locations memorialized in those names. It is more appropriate to consider the respective honorees in relation to the era in which their significance is associated and how that significance is related to the City of Atlanta.

When taking this approach into account, Staff finds that Mr. Sam Roberts is a significant figure in the neighborhood's more recent history for several reasons. The information provided documents Mr. Robert's and his families residence in the neighborhood for the last two decades, and includes information on Mr. Robert's service to the community through restoring the park that is the subject of this proposal. As such, Staff supports the proposed renaming/dedication.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with the Commission's comments to the appropriate City agencies.

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: 1191 Metropolitan Pkwy
APPLICATION: RC-23-173
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** RG-3

Date of Construction:

Property Location: Northwest intersection of Metropolitan Parkway and University Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Apartment/Multi-family

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: NHRP Nomination

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter of support to the State Historic Preservation office.

RC-23-173 for 1191 Metropolitan Pkwy.

May 10, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The State Historic Preservation Office has nominated the property at 1191 Metropolitan Parkway, also known as the Capitol View Apartments, for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Staff would agree with the assessment of the property and buildings expressed in the Statement of Significance and concurs that the property would meet Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development, and Criterion C in the area of Architecture. As such, Staff supports the nomination as proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the State Historic Preservation office.

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: 565 Northside Dr.
APPLICATION: RC-23-174
MEETING DATE: May 10, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-29 (Subarea 9)

Date of Construction:

Property Location: Northwest intersection of Northside Drive and Wells St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Industrial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: NHRP Nomination

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter of support to the State Historic Preservation office.

RC-23-174 for 565 Northside Dr.
May 10, 2023
Page 2 of 2

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

The State Historic Preservation Office has nominated the property at 565 Northside Drive for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Staff would agree with the assessment of the property and buildings expressed in the Statement of Significance and concurs that the property would meet Criterion A in the area of Commerce, and Criterion C in the area of Architecture. As such, Staff supports the nomination as proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the State Historic Preservation office.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File