



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: 898 Beecher Street SW
APPLICATION: CA2-23-131
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923

Property Location: South side of Beecher Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

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

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: Yes, 23CAP-00000413

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 was issued a stop-work order (23CAP-00000413) on March 16, 2023. The Applicant has replaced the porch railings without a permit, with non-compliant materials which do not meet the requirements of Sec.16-20G.006 (9). The railing which was installed is wood-framed, with metal pickets. The materials and methods of construction do not match the original design and workmanship of the historic railing, which was replaced. The Applicant will remove the non-compliant balustrade and replace it with one of butt-jointed construction, where the top rail does not exceed 33 inches in height per Sec.16-20G.006 (9) (d).

The Applicant also proposes replacement of the front door. They have submitted photos showing that the existing door is damaged and does not fit the frame. It appears to Staff that this door is not original to the structure and Staff is not concerned with the replacement of this feature. The Applicant proposes a custom door to fit the door frame of wood construction with a large rectangular light. Staff finds that this proposal meets the requirements of Sec.16-20G.006 (3) (k).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will remove the non-compliant balustrade and replace it with one of butt-jointed construction, where the top rail does not exceed 33 inches in height per Sec.16-20G.006 (9) (d).
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
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: 466 Edgewood Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA2-23-148
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District, Subarea 4 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Southwest corner of Edgewood Avenue SE and Boulevard.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA2-23-148 466 Edgewood Avenue SE

May 24, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant proposes construction of an exterior rear deck. The deck would incorporate into the existing exterior staircase located at the rear of the building and extend up to a maximum height of 26 feet 8 & 3/8 inches in height. The proposed deck would be of steel construction with concrete footings. The Applicant notes that the deck would be separated from the rear façade by a gap of approximately 2 feet to not interfere with existing utility equipment and it would not remove or destroy any of the historic fabric. The new structure would be anchored at the existing staircase landing, not at the building. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams- Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 232 Hamilton E. Holmes
APPLICATION: CA2-23-137
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Across from Douglass High School

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch repair and Deck Repair

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None Known

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

ALTERATIONS

Front Porch Repair

Floor

The Applicant proposes to level the cement floor of the front porch. Photos provided show the cement floor needs leveling. The foundation clearly reflects leveling issues. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Railings and Columns

Photos show rotten iron railings and columns. The railings have decorative details. The railing and the columns are not original to the house; however, the Applicant appears to be proposing replacement in-kind. Staff are not concerned with this recommendation. This entire porch replacement was done before the District designation.

Ceiling

The ceiling on the porch is in terrible shape and needs repair. Under the existing ceiling wood lap siding can be seen. While this clearly shows the original material, the proposal to repair it in-kind is not problematic to Staff since the aluminum was on the house prior to the District regulations.

Door

The iron screen door appears to be in good shape although rustic. Staff recommends the screen door be retained and cleaned. If the door is unrepair, Staff recommends the replacement door match in-kind.

Deck

Photos show the deck needs repair. The Applicant proposes to replace the current deck with another. The current deck extends beyond the side of the house. This is not acceptable. The Applicant shall not build a deck that extends beyond the side of the house. Staff recommends the deck be behind the primary structure and not extend beyond the sides of the house and meet the rear set back.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The deck shall be behind the primary structure and not extend past the sides, per Sec.16-20Q.006(9) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1253 Lucile
APPLICATION: CA2-23-134
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location Corner of Lucile and Atwood

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues Denial without prejudice was issued on CA2-22-409. A Stop Work was issued on the property 7/22/2022.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the June 14 UDC to allow the Applicant time to provide a detailed window schedule and address other matters.

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

PLANS

After a site visit, Staff recognize there are some inconsistencies on the plan that should be addressed. These inconsistencies might be due to drawing issues. The Applicant has indicated their intentions are not to alter any of the listed inconsistencies.

- Front gable roof—The front gable roof is not depicted correctly. On the elevations, the front gable roof is too small. The front gable extends to the middle of the right front window. The Applicant states the pitch is 6:12. Staff recommends the Applicant verify that pitch.
- Gable vents—The gable vents are not drawn correctly. The vents on the elevations are more elongated. That needs to be corrected.
- Trim under the gable roof on the porch—The trim under the front gable that extends to the windows is not depicted correctly. That trim is continuous and sits under the decorative shingle pattern.
- Brackets on the gable roof—the Applicant has not depicted the brackets in the correct location. The brackets should be at the end of the gable roof.
- Columns—the columns top brackets are not correct. The last two brackets are on one continuous platform. The Applicant has depicted two separate platforms. Also, the middle column is not located correctly. The Applicant has it depicted closer to the double windows on the left of the house.

Staff recommends the Applicant correct the listed discrepancies so that no confusion can happen in the field.

ALTERATIONS

Front Porch

Staff have listed the drawing issues above and stand on those recommendations for correction. In addition to those issues. The Applicant proposes the following regarding the porch.

Railings and porch flooring

Currently on the porch there are iron railings that need repairing. These railings are not believed to be original to the house. The Applicant proposes to reinstall these iron railings in-kind. Staff do not recommend this. The railings at this point would be a compatibility issue of the block. District regulations state, “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. In researching the block, the predominate railing construction is vertical wood railings with a top rail construction. Staff recommend the railing be vertical with wood railings with a top rail construction and be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, if needed.

Since the house is on a corner lot, Staff also recommend the same construction for the back deck railings.

Steps and Cheek wall

The steps and cheek wall are needing repair. The Applicant is proposing concrete steps. The concrete steps are not problematic to Staff. The cheek wall currently on the house is brick. Staff recommend the cheek wall be repaired or be replaced in-kind.

Windows

The Applicant has not shown any change to the 9 over one wood windows on the elevations. The Applicant has provided a window schedule and reflect changes on the floor plan. Staff recognize each bedroom has an egress window. Most of those windows are single hung; one fixed and the other double hung. The Applicant has proposed all existing windows 3-inch trim to remain or be replaced if needed and all windows keep the existing dimension and trim style. District regulation states that “architecturally significant windows and doors including details, trimwork and framing shall be retained.” The Applicant has noted this intent on the elevations. However, since the Applicant has provided a window schedule, Staff will need to know which window the Applicant plans to repair/replace. The window schedule is confusing and hard for Staff to follow. Staff recommend the Applicant update the window schedule to reflect which window will be replaced or repaired, note this information on the elevations.

The proposed window is at the rear of the house in the bedroom. District regulations state, “new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors. Staff are confused as to why this window is needed. There are two egress windows in the rear bedroom already. Staff recommend the window not be added. Since this will be an added window that faces a public street because the house is on a corner lot, this will violate the District regulations that state, “new windows or doors added to the existing structure shall be located facades that don’t face a public street.”

Siding

The siding is wood siding and does need some repair. The Applicant proposes to repair and replace the existing siding to match in-kind. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Door

The existing front door is a Craftsman door that appears to be in good shape and original to the house. Staff recommends this door remain and repaired. If it needs replacing, the door should be a wood door with a rectangular light.

Foundation

Photos show the foundation needs repairing. The Applicant has not indicated any work on the foundation. Staff recommends the foundation be repaired in-kind.

Deck

The Applicant has replaced the deck in the rear of the Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Chimney

The chimney appears to be intact. Staff recommends the brick chimney cannot be painted.

SITE WORK

Concrete Pillars and Fence

On the site plan the Applicant has shown concrete pillars, from photos taken, the pillars are significant to the property. The Applicant has noted the chain link fence, that needs repairing. Chain link fences are not permitted. Staff recommends the concrete pillars remain; the chain link fence be removed. A new fence be 4 ft high and be either brick, iron, wood, or metal pickets between the concrete pillars.

Driveway

Photos also show the driveway needs repairing. Staff recommends the driveway be 10 ft wide.

Retaining wall

The Applicant has noted the retaining wall at the front. This retaining wall shall remain and only repaired or replaced in-kind if need be.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall correct the drawing discrepancies: front gable roof over the porch; gable vents; trim under the gable roof on the front porch; brackets under the front gable roof; columns, per Sec.16-20G;
2. The porch railings shall be vertical and wood and be 33 inches above the finish floor except as required by code with a top rail construction, per Sec.16-20G.006(9)(d);
3. The brick cheek walls shall be repaired or replaced in-kind, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(a);
4. The window schedule shall reflect the specifics of which windows will be repaired and which will be replaced and noted on the elevations, per Sec.16-20G.006(3);
5. The front door shall be retained and repaired if needed, if replacement is warranted the new door shall be wood and contain a rectangular light, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
6. The foundation shall be repaired and replaced in kind if needed, per Sec. 16-20G.006(5);
7. The chimney shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20G;
8. The concrete pillars shall be retained and only repaired and replaced in-kind if needed, per Sec. 16-20G.006(16);
9. The chain link fence shall be removed, the new fence shall be 4ft and be of wood, brick, iron or metal pickets, per Sec. 16-20G.006(14)(a)(d)(e);
10. The driveway shall be 10ft wide, per Sec.16-20G.006(12)(c);
11. The retaining wall shall be repaired or replaced in-kind if need be per Sec.16-20G.006(15) and
12. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1037 Metropolitan Parkway SW
APPLICATION: CA3-22-591
MEETING DATE: Mya 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West side of Metropolitan Parkway.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

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

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: 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.

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

Foundation

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

Siding

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

Windows

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

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

Doors

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

Dormer

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

Porch

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

Driveway/ Parking Pad

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

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

STAFF FINDS THAT THE APPLICANT HAS COMPLIED WITH ALL LISTED CONDITIONS.

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

change to the design. The porch roof must be returned to its original design, dimensions, and materials.

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

determine the appropriateness of the proposed replacements. In addition, the Applicant has stated the proposed windows would be wood. The submitted window design appears to be vinyl, which would not meet district regulations. Staff still has not received exact specifications for the proposed windows to be used, but does not that they are listed as wood on the elevations.

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

code. The Applicant has not supplied an updated site plan. The Applicant has not addressed the issue of parking in any application materials.

- 16.) The Applicant will supply a site plan for the property. The site plan has been submitted, but per Condition 15, must be updated to show a compliant parking proposal. The Applicant has not supplied an updated site plan.
- 17.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission. Revised materials have been submitted; however, as annotated above, Staff finds that a significant number of items remain outstanding. Revised materials have been submitted; however, as annotated above, Staff finds that a significant number of items remain outstanding.

OUTSTANDING CONDITIONS:

- 18.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

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 24th 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 Peoples 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

Revisions in Purple

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

Edits to the compatibility analysis:

Sparks 1003, 1005 and 1009 will be comparable.

Height and Pitch

CA3-23-069 for 995 Sparks

May 24, 2023

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

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

Setbacks

It has been determined that the front setback was noncompliant. The range of the setbacks ranged from 8 feet to 14.5 feet. Staff can't determine if the Applicant has met this new requirement and recommend the Applicant clearly note the front set back on the site plan.

Roof form

The proposed roof form for the new construction is a 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.

The Applicant is proposing a gable front porch covering with a hip extension and gable end and a pitch of 6:12. 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.

The Applicant has clearly removed the dormers from the plan and has engaged the second-floor roof line so that it is reflective of continuous hip. 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 width of the house is 27 feet. It complies.

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.

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.

The Applicant has added an extra window at the restroom. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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 are not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant proposes a full width porch that is reflective on the blockface. The porch will have 10x10 columns, 6-inch wood trim on the house and have closed risers and end. In addition to these requirements, Staff recommends the porch ceiling be beadboard. If the porch floors are wood, the porch flooring shall be perpendicular in orientation with a tongue and groove construction. The railings shall be a butt-joint construction and no higher than the front windowsill, any need to meet code will be done with a simple plain extension.

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.

The Applicant clearly has shown the 22 inches crawl space and the brick veneer will only be applied to the foundation.

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-foot 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.

Recommendation still stands.

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. The Applicant shall clear mark the front setback on the plans and comply District regulations, per Sec.16-20M.012;
2. The porch ceiling shall be beadboard, per Sec.16-20M.016(2)(I);
3. If the porch flooring is wood, it shall be perpendicular in orientation with a tongue and groove construction, per Sec.16-20M.016 (2)(I);
4. The porch railing shall be butt-joint construction and no higher than the front windowsill, any need to meet code will be done with a simple plain extension, per Sec.16-20M.016(2)(I);
5. 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
6. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Kevin Bacon
Interim Commissioner

Doug Young
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2536 Godfrey Drive

APPLICATION: CA3-23-138

MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Historic Collier Heights

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: East of Hamilton E. Holmes and West of Hutton Place

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to not allow a deck at the front facade

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferred to the June 14th UDC Meeting.

May 24, 2023

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

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking a variance to allow for a deck to be placed at the front façade.

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

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

Applicant writes: **“I have a small house with no porch. I need a porch to help with my disability. Back yard is too many steps that I am able to do”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“With the delay of the approval for this application, I can’t do the treatments, my doctors recommended, to exercise out on the deck.”**

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

Applicant writes: “It’s in an old house in an historic neighborhood that is in need of remodeling, updated due to my disability.

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

Applicant writes: **“I have been getting compliments from my neighbors, family members and other random people that come by here. I can enjoy the sun when I do my exercises that the doctor recommended.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

The Applicant has not met any of the four requirements to receive a variance. There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions on the property that would allow the deck to be built on the front of the house. Additionally, there appears to be space in the back of the house to accommodate a deck coming directly from inside the house to where the Applicant would not have to climb stairs.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 965 & 971 Boulevard Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-141 & 142
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: West side of Cherokee Avenue SE.

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. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes the construction of two town homes at 965 Boulevard and two town homes on the adjacent parcel 971 Boulevard. As the development is being jointly conceptualized and many of the design elements of the two structures are the same, and both will share a drive, the projects are being reviewed concurrently.

Setbacks

The Applicant proposes side yard setbacks of 7 feet, and a rear yard setback of 7 feet. Staff finds these meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The proposed front yard setback is 30 feet. The only contributing property on the block face has a setback of 19 feet. The existing non-contributing house on the 965 Boulevard property has a setback of 35 feet. As Sec. 16-20K.007 (1)(A) requires, "Front yard setbacks 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," Staff finds that the proposed setback must be reduced to 19 feet to meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant will reduce the front yard setback to 19 feet to comply with Sec. 16-20K.007 (1)(A).

Lot Coverage

The existing lot coverage is 54.97%, only 0.03% less than the maximum permissible lot coverage. While this meets the requirement, Staff would note that any adjustments to the proposed site plan may exceed the allowable lot coverage.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a shared driveway. As shown on the current site plan, the driveway would vary from a width of 10 feet at the street, then widen to 14 feet further back on the property. Staff finds this meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.007 (1)(D)(3).

Parking

The Applicant proposes a double garage on the rear façade of the new construction. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal as it meets the requirements of the zoning code.

Fencing

The Applicant proposes installation of a 6-foot privacy fence on the side and rear of the property. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal as it meets the requirements of the zoning code.

Retaining Walls

The site plan illustrates stone retaining walls. Staff observes that there are existing retaining walls along the 971 Boulevard property, and it appears they continue onto a portion of 965 Boulevard's

frontage. It is noted that the walls will be repaired or replaced as needed. As the determination of scope has not been determined, if it is determined that the walls must be replaced, photographic evidence must be submitted to Staff for final approval. The Applicant will supply photographic evidence if it is determined that the retaining walls must be replaced.

Foundation

The Applicant proposes a brick foundation 36 inches in height. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal as it meets the requirements of the zoning code.

Cladding

The Applicant proposes use of smooth-face cementitious siding with a 6” reveal. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal as it meets the requirements of the zoning code.

Fenestration

Staff finds that the fenestration patterning proposed does match the character which predominates in contributing structures in the neighborhood. The Applicant proposes four-over-four, double-hung windows of an unknown material. The submitted specifications for doors and windows meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will reduce the front yard setback to 19 feet to comply with Sec. 16-20K.007 (1)(A).
- 2.) The Applicant will supply photographic evidence if it is determined that the retaining walls must be replaced.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
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: 790 Lullwater Road NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-144
MEETING DATE: May 26, 2022

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: n/a

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Lullwater Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Mediterranean Revival

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes a screened porch addition to the rear of the structure, reconfiguration of non-original window and doors on the rear elevation where there is an existing addition, reconfiguration of an outdoor terrace, repaving of the existing drive, and addition of a vehicular gate.

Addition

The Applicant proposes a sunroom addition to the center of the rear elevation. This addition would have a tiled roof that matches the existing historic roof on the house. As part of this addition a awning roof would also be constructed to partially cover the terrace. This awning roof would be covered in the same tile. This addition would be located completely behind the existing home. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed addition. Staff does note that there will be a new chimney on this addition and that it will tie into the existing chimney on the rear elevation. It is not clear to Staff is the addition of a new flue would require reconstruction of the chimney (as the chimney is labelled as new on several drawings), widening it, or simply tying into the existing. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work on the rear chimney.

Garage

The plans note that the non-original garage will be refurbished. While this is not a contributing feature, Staff would like additional information regarding the proposed changes. The only one noted is the replacement of the garage door, which does not concern Staff. The Applicant will clarify if additional alterations are proposed to the garage.

Terrace, Walls, and Pathways

The Applicant proposes re-setting of some of the existing terrace and walkways, as well as the addition of walls and built in planters at the rear of the property. As none of the proposed work would remove the historic pathways and circulation, Staff finds that it meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20B.003 (4) (f-g).

Driveway

The Applicant proposes repaving of the existing concrete drive in the same footprint. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Window and Door Replacement

The French doors on the rear elevation are proposed for replacement. Staff noted that the proposed replacement doors would remove the existing transoms above. The application notes that due to a previous addition, many features on the rear elevation are not original. It is noted in the application that the rear doors are not original, but it is not noted if the windows which are to be removed are original or not. The Applicant will clarify if the windows to be removed are original. The Applicant

has also not provided specifications for the proposed replacement windows and doors. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement doors. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement windows.

Fencing and Gate

The Applicant proposes a metal fence, five feet in height in the side yard. They also propose a vehicular gate of an identical style across the existing porte cochere. While Staff is not concerned with the proposal, they would note that installation of the gate should be completed in the least invasive way possible, to ensure that the historic stucco is not damaged and that the alterations may be removed in the future. A gate is also proposed across the pedestrian arch to the right of the porte cochere. Staff is also not concerned with this proposal, as the gate would match the existing wrought iron guards on the structure, Staff is not concerned with the proposal so long as it is installed in the least invasive way possible to avoid damaging the historic stucco. The Applicant will install the proposed gates in the least invasive way possible to avoid damaging the historic stucco and allow that they may be removed at a later date without destroying historic materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work on the rear chimney.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify if additional alterations are proposed to the garage.
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify if the windows to be removed are original.
- 4.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement doors.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement windows.
- 6.) The Applicant will install the proposed gates in the least invasive way possible to avoid damaging the historic stucco and allow that they may be removed at a later date without destroying historic materials.
- 7.) 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
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 930 White Street

APPLICATION: CA3-23-146

MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Westend Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: East of Joseph E. Lowery and West of Azalia Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to not allow unpainted brick to remain painted.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking a variance to from the District requirements that unpainted masonry must remained unpainted. No painting is permitted.

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

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

Applicant writes: **“None, the owner painted the property without knowing such action was prohibited. Variance requested primarily tied to cost-prohibited nature in removing the painted without damaging the original brick.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“Forcing the removal of the paint from the exterior of the home would create financial hardship for the owner. This matter came back up because it led to the denial of a business license application, with further creates hardship for owner by limiting ability to conduct compliant business in the City of Atlanta.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“None. This 1800 sq ft property does not have any peculiar conditions other than already being painted.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The home has been painted since 2019 with no additional follow-up or complaint from neighbors or the Historic Preservation Studio. Further there are several other homes in the area (even the same block) with painted exterior brick. None of these properties result in any substantial detriment to the public good.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

The Applicant has not provided information to support the variance. Not knowing painting unpainted masonry is not permitted isn't a good defense for allowing the variance. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to discover any laws that will affect the property. Nor relying on the argument that others house on the block are painted and they do not cause any detriment to the public good.

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: 104 Randolph Street NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-147
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District, Subarea 2 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 2012

Property Location: West side of Randolph Street SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

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. 16-20C

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

The applicant proposes a rear-addition to the existing non-contributing structure. The existing house has a screened porch on the rear right corner. This porch would be enclosed to create additional conditioned living space, and a new screened porch and deck constructed to the rear. This would require an extension of the roof plane to accommodate the new screened-in porch. The addition would have cementitious siding to match the existing on the house, and the new roof plane extension would be covered with the same material as the existing.

In general Staff does not have any concerns with the proposal but does note that the proposal does not build I the exact footprint but would extend the side elevation out by two feet. No front-facing elevation has been provided with the application. As the proposal would introduce a new portion of the front elevation extending from the addition, Staff must see the visual impact that the addition would have from the street. The Applicant will supply elevations of the street-facing façade illustrating the new proposed addition.

Staff also notes that no lot coverage information has been provided. The Applicant will submit a revised site plan with all lot coverage calculation noted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will supply elevations of the street-facing façade illustrating the new proposed addition.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a revised site plan with all lot coverage calculation noted.
- 3.) 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: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1109 Selwin
APPLICATION: CA3-22-149
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location East of Wilmington and West of Arlington

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

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

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:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to add 476 sf to the existing structure. This heated space will be in the rear of the house. The addition will meet FAR and Lot Coverage. The roofline on the right side will continue and tuck under the hip roof line that is current on the house and end with a gable roof line. Staff are not concerned with the addition.

Siding

The proposed siding will match the existing siding on the house, which is shown as wood bevel siding with a 4-inch exposure. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The proposed windows on both the right and left elevations are wood double hung with wide casing wood trim that will match the existing windows on the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

A brick foundation is proposed for the base. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Porch

The Applicant proposes to retain the existing porch but repair in-kind the corner boards & trim; replace in-kind the 4x4 wood columns; replace the existing porch railing with butt joints; replace porch flooring and joist as required; repair or replace porch roof in-kind with the existing. Photos show the porch ceiling is vinyl. The Applicant has not stated the intention of repair. Staff are not concerned with the porch proposal. Staff do recommend the railing be no higher than the windowsill of the front window and any need for code compliance be done with a simple plain extension. Staff also recommend the porch flooring be perpendicular in orientation and tongue and groove. Regarding the porch ceiling, Staff recommends the Applicant install a bead-board ceiling to be consistent with what would have been built during the construction of the house.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to repair or replace in-kind the wood bevel siding with the 4-inch exposure. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to repair the existing double hung wood windows with wood trim on the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. However, the proposal to change the last window on the existing house on the right side and the last window on the right side to a small window will be problematic. District regulations require all windows to remain the same in size and shape. Staff recommends the proposal for the window change not happen. The windows shall remain the same size and shape.

The remaining windows are on the rear and Staff are not concerned with the rear of the house.

Chimney

The masonry chimney will remain. Photo shows the chimney needs scraping. Staff are not concerned with the repair if the masonry is not painted.

Decorative pattern above the Gable Roof and Vent

The decorative pattern above the front gable roof is distinctive and must remain and repaired precisely. The Applicant has proposed repair and replace shingle and vent. And only have shown shingles on the proposed front elevation. This is problematic. Staff recommend the original distinctive pattern remain and the repair or replacement be done in-kind to the pattern.

The repair and replacement in-kind the vent is no concern to Staff.

Door

The proposed front door is full- wood with light. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The Applicant proposes a deck in the rear that will not exceed the side or rear set back and will not be seen from the public right away. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

SITE WORK

Driveway

The Applicant proposes to repave the 10-ft driveway which extends pass the front elevation. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Walkway

The Applicant proposes a walkway from the front of the house to the existing stone steps that meet the existing sidewalk. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Sidewalk

An existing sidewalk is shown on the site plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The porch railings shall be no higher than the front windowsill and any need to meet code shall be done with a simple extension, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
2. The porch flooring should be perpendicular orientation and be tongue and groove, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
3. The porch ceiling shall be beadboard, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
4. The two windows proposed for size changed; one on the right and one on the left shall remain the original size and not changed as proposed, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o);
5. The chimney shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20M.002(3);
6. The distinctive decorative shingle pattern shall be retained and only repaired or replace to match exactly the distinct pattern, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r) and
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 125 Palisades Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-125
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: South block face of Palisades Rd. between the Woodcrest Ave. and Huntington Rd. intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exhibits characteristics of revival style architecture.

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.

RC-23-125 for 125 Palisades Rd.
May 24, 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 Applicant is proposing a pool, patio, and other related site features to the rear of the property. The proposal would not impact the historic structure, or detract from its character as seen from the public right of way. Additionally, Staff finds that the proposal is situated in an area of the property which will be least visible to the public. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

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

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: 616 Joseph E Boone Blvd (Rodney Cook Park)
APPLICATION: RC-23-133
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923

Property Location: South block face of Joseph E Boone Blvd, east block face of Elm St., north Block face of Thurmond St., west block face of Walnut St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Public Park

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-23-133 for 616 Joseph E Boone Blvd (Rodney Cook Park)

May 24, 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 new sail shades over existing patio areas in the park. In general, Staff finds the proposal to be appropriate for use in a park, and that the materials chosen are durable enough to withstand extended use. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

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: 63 Huntington Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-143
MEETING DATE: May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923

Property Location: North block face of Huntington Rd., east of the Peachtree St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Colonial Revival

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.

RC-23-143 for 63 Huntington Rd.

May 24, 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 Applicant is proposing the replacement of rear windows. Given the location of the windows, the work will not be visible from the public right of way. As no photographs of the work area were provided, Staff is not able to determine whether the windows are original to the structure or later replacements. However, given their lack of visibility, Staff finds that any potential loss of historic materials would not impact the public right of way. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

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

Cc: Applicant
File