



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: June 14, 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

CA2-23-131 898 Beecher Street SW

June 14, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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 balustrade without a permit. Staff finds the new balustrade meets the requirements of Sec.16-20G.006 (9).

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Janide Prince
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Doug Young
Interim-Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 801 Lullwater Road
APPLICATION: CA2-23-163
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2018

Property Location: West of North Dekalb and East of Lullwater Place

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Solar Panels installation

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: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA2-23-163 for 801 Lullwater Road

June 14, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

SOLAR PANELS

Solar panels are proposed for the side elevations near the rear of the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. The panel is not very visible from the public right-away.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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: 996 Dimmock
APPLICATION: CA2-23-170
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location West of Lee Street and East of Peeples

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: 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: Stop work placed December 7, 2023: Chimney removed, porch flooring incompatible, parking pad installed, wood pattern cementitious siding installed instead of the smooth -faced signing.

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.

ALTERATIONS

Siding

A site visit shows the current siding on the house is smooth-faced cementitious siding. The Applicant has corrected the siding error. Staff are not concerned with this matter.

Porch railings and flooring.

Porch railings

The Applicant has employed a two-part joint system for the porch railing. The height of the railing is a bit high. The preferred method is having the railing no higher than the front windowsill and any need to meet code be done with a simple extension. However, the front windowsill is very low, and the height of the front porch is steep. Staff are not concerned with the porch railings.

Porch flooring

Upon inspection, the porch flooring is perpendicular in orientation. Staff could not discern if the construction method was tongue and groove. Staff recommend the Applicant verify the floor is tongue and groove.

Chimney

The chimney has been added back to the house and not painted. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

SITE WORK

Driveway

The Applicant has shown on the site plan and has built a driveway that appears to be in compliance with the District regulations which states the driveway shall be no wider than 10ft and 20ft passed the front façade. Staff are not concerned about the driveway. Staff does recommend the Applicant note on the final site plan the measurement of the driveway to clearly show the driveway complies.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The porch flooring should be perpendicular orientation and be tongue and groove, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
2. The Applicant shall verify and note the porch flooring is tongue and groove, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
3. The Applicant shall note the driveway measurements on the final site plan. District requirements are notes above in the Staff Report, per Sec.16-20M.012(4)(c)and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 976 Gress Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-23-154
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2006

Property Location: Corner of Gress and Mead

Contributing (Y/N)? No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Traditional inspired.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

DECK ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to remove the current deck and build a new 12x 15 deck that will nestle into the house and not overextend the sides of the houses or go past the rear setback. Since this property sits on a corner lot, it will be visible to the public, Staff recommends the railing have a joint butt construction system.

Roof

The proposed roof is gabled on the enclosed porch; The roof proposal isn't problematic. Staff suggests changing the roof to a hip roof or shed roof, that is a suggestion.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to install four vertical track windows on the enclosed deck. The vertical windows glass windows are not problematic. The windows are consistent with the overall architectural style of the house and can be changed if needed in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

1. The railing shall have a joint butt system, per Sec.20-16K.007(2)(D)(1) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
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: 1176 Avon Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-157
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: South side of Avon Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Financial Hardship Exemption

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: Yes, 21CAP-00001459

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

A stop-work order was placed on the property on October 8, 2021. The stop-work order was for an unpermitted roof replacement, deck addition, and removal of two doors on the left and right elevations, infilling the openings with windows and siding. The roofing and deck were found to meet the requirements of the code. The door removal did not. Then owner, Jamir Figueroa came before the Commission in January 2022 for CA2-21-609, requesting to retain two windows which had replaced doors on the left and right elevations. The application was denied.

The house has been sold to a new owner since that time. The new homeowner, Berline Desir, applied for a building permit (BB-202107688) in January 2023. The permit was not issued because of the existing stop-work order on the property, Staff did coordinate with code enforcement to allow minor interior repairs, which did not meet the threshold for a building permit.

Since that time, the Applicant has submitted for a financial hardship exemption so that the doors do not need to be returned to their original state.

The Applicant has provided an estimated income of \$60,000 a year. No supporting documentation for this income has been provided. Two quotes have been submitted (Visionaire and Entry Point), along with a third email (Window World) detailing that the company was not able to complete the work, but could sell the Applicant a door, and she would have to use her own labor to install. Unfortunately, none of the submitted estimates would meet the requirements of the zoning code. All the estimates are for fiberglass doors, which do not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(r)(5). Per the code, "exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame." No details have been supplied regarding the style of trim and how it would match what was historically present.

The Applicant has also stated that companies were not responding to her inquiries after the initial quotes. Staff has reached out to all the companies (Visonaire, Entry Point, and Window World) who provided quotes and has discussed them in detail with the staff at these companies, to ensure that an understanding of scope was consistent. Staff would note that none of the companies has experience or expertise in working with historic buildings, and none sells wood doors. None could provide information regarding how their work would integrate into the historic fabric of the house, all the quotes were for door units that were installed as-is, with no trim work, just a set unit. Given that the quotes are all priced based on items which cannot be used per the zoning code, Staff cannot establish that there is a financial hardship based on this information.

The Applicant has stated that due to their existing debt to income ratio they do not qualify for loans. They have stated that no grants or tax abatements are available to them. No supporting evidence has been provided for these statements.

The building permit submitted in January did not have an application with an estimate or cost of work attached. Given that the stop-work order was preventing that work from taking place, the Applicant has applied for a financial hardship exemption to not have to correct the unpermitted

CA3-23-157 1176 Avon Avenue SW

June 14, 2023

Page 3 of 3

work. The fact that the Applicant is applying to put a full porch addition onto the house, does not support a claim of financial hardship. Unpermitted work must be corrected before new work has been undertaken. Too little information has been provided to support the Applicant's income, lack of alternative funding sources, cost of the required repairs, and to support an inability to correct the unpermitted work. As such, Staff recommends denial of the financial hardship exemption.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
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: 1101 Arlington Avenue SW

APPLICATION: CA3-23-161

MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East side of Arlington Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Retroactive approval of unpermitted alterations

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: Yes, 22CAP-00001213 and 23CAP-00000394

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the July 12, 2023 hearing

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 came before the Urban Design Commission in October of 2022 (CA2-22-443) for retroactive approval of an unpermitted addition (22CAP-00001213). The plans were approved with conditions on November 15, 2022.

Once the Applicant was granted their building permit for the project (BB-202208070) a second stop work order was issued for exceeding the permitted scope of work (23CAP-00000394). The following items were out of scop with the initial approval for CA2-22-443):

1. Full removal of the siding was not approved, per the approved plans “The Applicant may replace the first four rows of wooden siding above the foundation in-kind, as needed, and up to 10% of the remaining siding for small spot repairs.”
2. Removal of the decorative beadwork was not approved. “The Applicant will retain the historic beadboard on the street-facing gable.”
3. Removal of the distinctive diamond gable vent was not approved.
4. Removal of the historic brick foundation of the porch was not approved.
5. Reconstruction of the porch with CMU was not approved.
6. Per the approved replacement of the flooring, “The Applicant will replace the porch flooring with wooden flooring installed perpendicular to the house with historically appropriate tongue-in-groove construction.” The flooring which was installed is horizontal decking, which does not match the approved specifications.
7. Raising the height of the porch was not approved.
8. Replacement of porch supports was not approved.
9. Replacement of the balustrade in this style was not approved, “The Applicant will repair the existing railing using historically appropriate butt-jointed construction of a height no higher than the bottom of the windows on the street facing façade. “ The railing is too high and is not butt-joint construction.
10. Re-framing of any exterior features was not approved.
11. Changing trim or other decorative details was not approved.
12. The only windows approved for removal were windows O & P on the right-side elevation (flanking the chimney). It appears all windows and doors have been removed, some replaced, and possibly reframed.

The Applicant has applied for retroactive approval of all their outstanding violations.

Siding

1. Full removal of the siding was not approved, per the approved plans “The Applicant may replace the first four rows of wooden siding above the foundation in-kind, as needed, and up to 10% of the remaining siding for small spot repairs.”

All historic siding has been removed and discarded with the exception of the upper gable on the east elevation. The Applicant will not remove the remaining historic siding. The Applicant will clad the remainder of the exterior in wooden siding which matches the existing remaining historic siding in style and reveal.

Decorative Beadwork

2. Removal of the decorative beadwork was not approved. “The Applicant will retain the historic beadboard on the street-facing gable.”

The Applicant proposes to replace the decorative beadwork which was removed but no specifications have been provided. The beadwork is shown on the plans, but Staff needs to know exactly what materials are proposed for the replacement. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement beadwork.

Gable Vent

3. Removal of the distinctive diamond gable vent was not approved.

The Applicant proposes replacement of the distinctive gable vent which was removed. Staff has concerns as the proposal shown on the elevations does not appear to match the historic specifications for the feature which was removed. The Applicant will update the elevations to accurately depict the replacement gable vent. The Applicant will provide a detail drawing showing how the feature will be reconstructed.

Porch

4. Removal of the historic brick foundation of the porch was not approved.

5. Reconstruction of the porch with CMU was not approved.

6. Per the approved replacement of the flooring, “The Applicant will replace the porch flooring with wooden flooring installed perpendicular to the house with historically appropriate tongue-in-groove construction.” The flooring which was installed is horizontal decking, which does not match the approved specifications.

7. Raising the height of the porch was not approved.

8. Replacement of porch supports was not approved.

9. Replacement of the balustrade in this style was not approved, “The Applicant will repair the existing railing using historically appropriate butt-jointed construction of a height no higher than the bottom of the windows on the street facing façade. “ The railing is too high and is not butt-joint construction.

The brick porch foundation was removed and completely rebuilt with CMU, raising the height by almost a full riser. It appears that much of the historic brick remains on the property. The porch must be reclad to match its historic appearance using as much intact historic brick as possible to recreate the original foundation. Staff recommends that the street-facing elevation be clad first and any historic brick which must be added to supplement bricks which were lost or destroyed placed on the sides. The Applicant will clad the porch foundation utilizing the extant historic brick still present on the site. The Applicant will submit specifications for proposed replacement materials to supplement the porch reconstruction.

The Applicant will remove the unpermitted decking. The Applicant will install wood tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the face.

There were originally four porch supports, with a corner board pilaster where the porch meets the el-projection on the front façade. The replacement porch supports do not match the existing, which were removed. The porch supports installed do not replicate what was removed, lacking a base and capital. The Applicant will install porch supports which match the historic materials which were removed. The Applicant will restore the supports to the locations where they were originally placed. The Applicant will add the corner board pilaster at the corner of the front projection which was removed.

The Applicant has installed front-nailed balustrades which do not meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant has also removed the portion of the balustrade which was on the right-hand side of the entrance beside the el-projection. The Applicant will restore the balustrade to its former proportions and location. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted balustrades. The Applicant will install butt-jointed balustrades no taller than the bottom of the windows sills on the house.

Trim

10. Re-framing of any exterior features was not approved.

11. Changing trim or other decorative details was not approved.

The Applicant removed all existing trim and siding. In doing so many architectural details were removed. The trim installed features none of the decorative detailing and is a flat style, not representative of the dimensions or style of the original workmanship, featuring neither caps nor sills. In fact the siding was installed over window openings, so the framing is not even evident from the materials submitted by the Applicant. The Applicant will restore all window and door trim with replacement wooden trim which matches the original in dimensions, reveal, and style. The Applicant will install corner boards, which match the originals which were removed. The Applicant will replicate the fascia and soffit which were removed with materials that match the

existing that were removed. The Applicant will submit updated plans showing the correct design of all trim and decorative features.

Windows

12. The only windows approved for removal were windows O & P on the right-side elevation (flanking the chimney). It appears all windows and doors have been removed, some replaced, and possibly reframed.

As previously noted, window openings are not currently visible on the house with the exception of a portion of the street-facing façade and the left elevation (where one window has been installed). On the el-projection, the casement windows remain. The Applicant proposes full replacement of the windows with vinyl, one-over one windows. Staff cannot support this proposal. The windows which were removed were two-over-two, vertical, double-hung windows. The proposed replicas must replicate the size and shape of individual window openings and the style of the individual window per Sec. 16-20M.003 (o)(2)(a-c). The exception to this is the window on the front-façade. This was a fixed window with a transom window above. This window must be replaced with a style identical to the window which was removed in style and design. The casement windows on the el-projection must be retained. On the rear elevation, as this is a double frontage lot, the windows must be returned to the original window pattern which was destroyed by the unpermitted work under the first stop-work order. The proposed picture window (labelled as windows R) in particular must be returned to the previously approved design. window in particular must be removed. The Applicant will update the plans to show the correct window style, dimensions, and arrangement. The Applicant will replace the windows which were removed with replacements which match the original in design, shape, and size with muntins which are permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass. The Applicant will not remove the casement windows which remain on the el-projection. The Applicant will supply specifications for all proposed replacement windows.

Doors

The Applicant has also provided specifications for the proposed doors to be used. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant to Address the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will not remove the remaining historic siding.
- 2.) The Applicant will clad the remainder of the exterior in wooden siding which matches the existing remaining historic siding in style and reveal.
- 3.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement beadwork.
- 4.) The Applicant will update the elevations to accurately depict the replacement gable vent.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide a detail drawing showing how the feature will be reconstructed.

- 6.) The Applicant will clad the porch foundation utilizing the extant historic brick still present on the site.
- 7.) The Applicant will submit specifications for proposed replacement materials to supplement the porch reconstruction.
- 8.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted decking.
- 9.) The Applicant will install wood tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the face.
- 10.) The Applicant will install porch supports which match the historic materials which were removed.
- 11.) The Applicant will restore the supports to the locations where they were originally placed.
- 12.) The Applicant will add the corner board pilaster at the corner of the front projection which was removed.
- 13.) The Applicant will restore the balustrade to its former proportions and location.
- 14.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted balustrades.
- 15.) The Applicant will install butt-jointed balustrades no taller than the bottom of the windows sills on the house.
- 16.) The Applicant will restore all window and door trim with replacement wooden trim which matches the original in dimensions, reveal, and style.
- 17.) The Applicant will install corner boards, which match the originals which were removed.
- 18.) The Applicant will replicate the fascia and soffit which were removed with materials that match the existing that were removed.
- 19.) The Applicant will submit updated plans showing the correct design of all trim and decorative features.
- 20.) The Applicant will update the plans to show the correct window style, dimensions, and arrangement.
- 21.) The Applicant will replace the windows which were removed with replacements which match the original in design, shape, and size with muntins which are permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.
- 22.) The Applicant will not remove the casement windows which remain on the e-projection.
- 23.) The Applicant will supply specifications for all proposed replacement windows.
- 24.) 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: 2739 Oldknow Drive NW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-168
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20Q Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: North side of Oldknow Drive NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Compact Ranch

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes extensive exterior alterations to the existing historic home, including two additions, a front porch addition and a rear, master-suite addition, full window replacement, full siding replacement, and a deck. Staff has significant concerns with the plans as submitted. The plans are not detailed, showing no features or finishes present on the existing structure. The Applicant will submit detailed architectural elevations showing all features currently present on the historic structure.

Porch Addition

The Applicant proposes removal of the existing concrete block stoop and replacement with a new wood front porch with a front-gable. Staff cannot support this proposal. Per Sec. 16-20Q.006 (10)(a), “Original or historic porches or stoops, including their component features shall be retained.” Staff would further note that the original wrought railing appears to have been removed, unpermitted. The Applicant will not remove the historic stoop. The Applicant will update the proposed plans to reflect the removal of this proposed feature. The Applicant will install a new wrought iron railing which matches the historic railing which was removed unpermitted.

Rear Addition

The Applicant proposes an addition which sites entirely behind the existing structure. There is a projection on the right elevation, which appears to be a previously enclosed side porch. The addition would extend back from this portion of the street-facing façade, with a new hipped roof that ties into the existing and sitting below the current roofline. A deck would be incorporated into the side of the addition, and also sits fully behind the existing house. While Staff does not have concerns with the proposed addition in terms of height, scale, placement or lot coverage, there are concerns regarding the proposed materials to be used of the addition, which are noted below.

Window Replacement

It appears based on the submitted elevations that full window replacement is proposed on the structure. No window schedule has been submitted, the submitted photographs do not show the condition of any of the current windows, nor have specifications been provided for the proposed replacement windows. The style shown on the plans appears to be one-over-one, double-hung, vinyl windows. Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(a-d) states, “(a)Original or historic windows and exterior doors shall be retained.(b)Replacement windows or exterior doors shall be permitted only when the original or historic windows and exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated.(c)If original or historic windows or exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated, replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size.(d)Replacement windows and doors for non-original or non-historic windows and doors shall be compatible with the architectural style of the structure or shall be subject to the compatibility rule.” Staff finds that the submitted materials do not meet any of the requirements of the code regarding window

replacement. The existing original windows are two-over-two horizontal, wood-framed windows. Any replacement or new windows proposed on the structure would need to match the existing. The Applicant will submit detailed photographs showing the conditions of all windows on the structure. The Applicant will submit a window schedule, keyed to the submitted photographs, detailing the location and specifications of all windows proposed for replacement. The Applicant will provide a conditions assessment of all windows proposed for replacement, detailing why they need to be replaced. The Applicant will provide specifications for the new windows proposed for the addition. The Applicant has not indicated if doors will also be replaced. Staff notes that a new door is proposed for the addition. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work for the existing doors on the structure. The Applicant will provide specifications for the new door proposed for the rear addition.

Siding Replacement

No specifications have been provided for the proposed cladding material on the new addition; however, the elevations note that cementitious siding is proposed for the entirety of the structure. Sec. 16-20Q.006 (1)(e) states, “The compatibility rule shall apply to the overall design, size, scale, massing and width of new principal structures and additions.” This includes, (h) the presence and dimensions of the exposed face of lap siding and wood shingles.” The submitted photographs, which while limited in their scope, do not indicate the need for replacement of the existing channel set siding. The code also requires that the addition be internally consistent and match the existing siding present on the structure. The Applicant will retain the existing siding on the historic structure. The Applicant will provide specifications for replacement wood, channel set siding which meets the requirement of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (1)(e).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 28, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit detailed architectural elevations showing all features currently present on the historic structure.
- 2.) The Applicant will not remove the historic stoop.
- 3.) The Applicant will update the proposed plans to reflect the removal of this proposed feature.
- 4.) The Applicant will install a new wrought iron railing which matches the historic railing which was removed unpermitted.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit detailed photographs showing the conditions of all windows on the structure.
- 6.) The Applicant will submit a window schedule, keyed to the submitted photographs, detailing the location and specifications of all windows proposed for replacement.
- 7.) The Applicant will provide a conditions assessment of all windows proposed for replacement, detailing why they need to be replaced.
- 8.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the new windows proposed for the addition.
- 9.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work for the existing doors on the structure.

- 10.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the new door proposed for the rear addition.
- 11.) The Applicant will retain the existing siding on the historic structure.
- 12.) The Applicant will provide specifications for replacement wood, channel set siding which meets the requirement of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (1)(e).
- 13.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commisison.
- 14.) 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: 722 Gaskill Street SE

APPLICATION: CA3-23-169

MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20A, SA3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1911

Property Location: North side of Gaskill Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Shotgun

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes an addition to the rear of the structure, as well as the addition of four skylights to the left elevation, and conversion of an existing vent on the street-facing façade to a window.

The proposed addition would sit entirely behind the existing structure, and not exceed the height of the existing structure. The Applicant proposes use of new windows which match the existing two-over-two vertical lite pattern, which exists in the original windows on the house. Staff is not concerned with this; however, no specification have been provided for these windows. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows to be utilized on the addition.

The addition would utilize smooth-face cementitious siding, which matches the original in style and reveal and trim and corner boards to also match the existing on the house. No detail has been given on the proposed foundation materials. It appears based on the elevations that the original home has a brick foundation and that there is an existing addition with a concrete block foundation. No material is noted on the proposed elevations. The Applicant will clarify the proposed foundation material for the addition.

The four proposed skylights would be located on the left elevation, with three skylights installed on the historic portion of the roof, and the fourth on the existing addition. Sec. 16-20A.006 (13) (c)(2) states, “The placement and design of flat profile skylights and/or solar panels, where permitted, shall minimize their ability to be seen from public rights-of-way and is subject to approval by the commission.” Though the three skylights proposed for the historic portion of the roof are set closer to the street, given the pitch of the roof and profile, their placement would meet the requirements of the zoning code. Staff does not have any concerns with this proposal.

Staff cannot support the proposed conversion of the front vent into a window. Sec. 16-20A.006 (14)(c) states, “Alterations shall not introduce materials or building elements that do not reinforce the architectural character of the building and shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.” The lancet vent is a character defining feature of the street-facing façade, one of the few Carpenter Gothic elements used to distinguish the simplicity of the shotgun house form. Its replacement with a square window would remove a character defining feature. While Staff could support installation of a window behind the vent for minimal light, this historic element would need to remain in situ and the window would not be operable or an egress. The Applicant will not remove the historic lancet vent on the street-facing face and replace it with a window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows to be utilized on the addition.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed foundation material for the addition.
- 3.) The Applicant will not remove the historic lancet vent on the street-facing face and replace it with a window per Sec. 16-20A.006 (14)(c).
- 4.) 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
Interim-Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 85 Waddell
APPLICATION: CA3-23-171
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Edgewood and East of Dixie

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations; enclosure of back 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.

BACK PORCH ENCLOSURE

The Applicant proposes to add an additional 34 sf to the house by enclosing the back porch. Staff are not concerned about this proposal; the added heated space will meet FAR and lot coverage not setbacks are a concern.

ALTERATIONS

Siding

At the rear of the house, the Applicant proposes new siding to match the existing on the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Window

At the rear of the house, the Applicant proposes a new window. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

Staff are not concerned with the proposed deck at the rear of the property. The deck will not extend beyond the existing house.

Shingles

Staff are not concerned with the new shingle that will match the existing.

Foundation

Staff are not concerned with the new foundation that will match the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA3-23-171 for 85 Waddell

June 14, 2023

pg. 3

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: 941 Austin

APPLICATION: CA3-23-164

MEETING DATE: June 14, 2033

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Historic Iman Park **Other Zoning:**

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: West of Sinclair Avenue and East of Elizabeth Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to allow for second story to a roof that can't support it.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None Known

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: **“This piece of property is confined within a skinny, irregular shaped lot, which makes a rear extension problematic because it would create ill-proportionately shaped spaces that wouldn’t be functional. This is due to the need for a means of ingress and egress out of the back of the house and because it is not possible to do it on the side given that the existing house is already very close to the property lines.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“It creates a monetary hardship because the current zoning requirements restricts the property to only being able to be 3 bedrooms including the garage/ADU, and the cost of construction for this project along with the purchase price is greater than the resale value of the house upon completion. Although this is intended to be my long-term home, this same hardship affects the ability to get construction financing and potentially future refinancing opportunities. (It could also make more sense for me to demo the house completely and build back a two-story house”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The historical zoning restrictions don’t allow an addition taller than the original structure’s roof height of 18 feet. This restriction doesn’t allow for an appropriate societal evolution to extend the longevity of the home. Given the lower sloped roof pitch, it wouldn’t make sense to squeeze the additional living space into the existing attic and beyond. In addition to this, this house already had an addition built onto it before it was bought, and had a new roof put on due to tree damage.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The proposed plans fit into all other neighborhood regulations and would be very similar to most of the other houses on the street. See the 2 story examples of similar homes on Austin Ave below. Another proposal we would be willing to make is that this property sits up on a steep elevation and the back part of the house isn’t visible from the sidewalk or street. If we were able to build a second story on the back half of the house so long as it isn’t visible from the sidewalk or the street. This would both hold up the integrity of the historical intentions of the neighborhood by maintaining its original front façade and also allowing to get more use out of the house and jus3fy the renova3on expense, and beZering the neighborhood.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

The Applicant has not successful answered each question to justify a variance. The Staff do agree the lot does narrow somewhat as it continues back, and house is close to the other house. However, from the site plan the lot isn’t so narrow to where an addition could not be constructed in the rear. The Applicant has not shown there is an unnecessary hardship. The house can be constructed at the rear of the house. If the construction can only support a 3-bedroom house, that is what needs to build. Staff reason this does not cause any economic hardship, if priced out

CA3-22-164 for 941 Austin
June 14, 2023

accordingly. Likewise, the notion that the regulations do not permit the longevity of the house, is the opposite understanding of what in fact the regulations do. Not permitting the addition to remove significant historical value like a roof increases the historical value of the house which increases the longevity if retained properly. In fact, it seems as if the Applicant doesn't consider if this proposal will destroy the historic roofline. District regulation clearly states, "new additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment." Also, the current roofline will not permit the addition to happen in a manner that would not supersede the existing roofline. While many neighborhoods may support a two-story house that reflects this proposal, Staff cannot support the proposal in this area for the listed reasons stated above.

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 without Prejudice at the Applicant's Request

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.

The Applicant has stated that given the need for estimates to restore the property, they want to withdraw the Application to prepare a separate application for an addition and alterations to the existing structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

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: 1331 Metropolitan Parkway SW (Capitol View Masonic Lodge)

APPLICATION: CA2-23-165

MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: n/a

Other Zoning: NC-9, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: Northwest corner of the intersection of Metropolitan Parkway and Dill Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Neoclassical Revival, Chicago School-skyscraper

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

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

The Applicant proposes alterations to the Landmark Capitol View Lodge Masonic Building including installation of new storefront windows in three of the arches on the Dill Avenue elevation which are currently (and historically were) enclosed with brick, installation of new metal canopy over the entrance on the Dill Avenue Elevation, enclosure of the original corner entrance into interior space, new signage on the Dill Avenue and Metropolitan Parkway elevations.

Store Front Installation

The Applicant proposes removal of the existing three brick bays on the Dill Avenue elevation. There are a total of seven bays on this elevation. From left to right along the Dill Avenue elevation; the first bay is currently windows, the second bay is currently a door (the proposed new canopy would be installed over this entrance), the third is windows, the fourth, fifth, and sixth bays are brick with small semi-circular windows, the fourth bay has a single door beneath the window. These bays have always been enclosed, from the time of construction, with brickwork designed to accommodate these windows. The seventh bay on the corner of the building is open, allowing access to the original angled entrance on the corner of Metropolitan and Dill.

Staff cannot support the proposal. Sec. 16-20.009 (2) requires, “The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.” The original design of the building enclosed this portion of the building to provide a variety of specialized spaces. Not all bays were intended to be street front display windows. The proposed alteration would not only remove a distinctive original design feature, but also create a false sense of history. The Applicant will not remove the brick bays located on the Dill Avenue Entrance.

The proposal would remove the original corner entrance, enclosing it with windows to make additional internal space. Staff cannot support this proposal. The corner entry is a character defining feature, meant draw in patrons from both street frontages, and cannot be enclosed. The Applicant will not enclose the original corner entrance.

Likewise, the proposal would remove the configuration on the Metropolitan Parkway elevation, replacing the central door and flattening the configuration. Staff has the same concerns with changing the historic use of portions of the building as voiced above. Staff would note that not all doors need to be operable, but the proposal to make the windows flush on this portion cannot be supported. The Applicant will retain the existing configuration of the Metropolitan Parkway elevation.

Staff does not have concerns with the design of the proposed commercial glass window replacement on the ground floor. Over time these storefronts have been altered for multiple different clients, and as a result the glass elements on the ground floor elevation are a hodgepodge of different styles and materials. The Applicant will replace the windows in the first and sixth bays on the Dill Avenue elevation and the second and fourth bays on the Metropolitan Parkway elevation. The Applicant will replace the window and door units on the second bay of the Dill

Avenue elevation, the corner bay, and the third bay on the Metropolitan Parkway entrance with a configuration that matches the existing using the proposed contemporary metal and glass window and door configuration. The application does not include a door proposal for the Dill Avenue fourth bay. Given that Staff is not supporting the proposed removal of the brick bays, an alternative replacement door must be submitted. The Applicant will submit a proposed replacement door for the fourth bay on the Dill Avenue elevation. The Applicant will update the proposed elevations to reflect the retention of the original design configurations.

Canopy

The Applicant proposes installation of a flat metal canopy over the Dill Avenue entrance. Staff does not have concerns with this proposal, so long as its installation is completed in such a way that it is beneath the existing marble surround and is completed in a manner that it the least invasive possible, so that if removed in the future the historic fabric remains undamaged. The Applicant will install the proposed contemporary metal canopy beneath the marble framing of the bay using the least invasive methods possible.

Signage

The Applicant proposes new blade signage for both the Dill Avenue and Metropolitan Parkway elevations. These signs would be 48 square feet in size and attached via two metal posts to the side of the building. Staff finds that the proposed signage meets the requirements of Sec. 16-28A.007 (p).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will not remove the brick bays located on the Dill Avenue Entrance.
- 2.) The Applicant will not enclose the original corner entrance.
- 3.) The Applicant will retain the existing configuration of the Metropolitan Parkway elevation.
- 4.) The Applicant will replace the window and door units on the second bay of the Avenue elevation, the corner bay, and the third bay on the Metropolitan Parkway entrance with a configuration that matches the existing using the proposed contemporary metal and glass window and door configuration.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit a proposed replacement door for the fourth bay on the Dill Avenue elevation.
- 6.) The Applicant will update the proposed elevations to reflect the retention of the original design configurations.
- 7.) The Applicant will install the proposed contemporary metal canopy beneath the marble framing of the bay using the least invasive methods possible.
- 8.) 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: 364 Auburn Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-23-166 & CA3-23-167
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Buildings included in this application: Haugabrooks Funeral Home – 1938.
Commercial Structures - 1925

Property Location: North block face of Auburn Ave, between the Hilliard St. and Jackson St. intersections.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Financial Hardship Exemption (CA3-23-167) and revisions to previously approved plans (CA3-23-166).

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The subject property has received numerous reviews including alterations, new construction, variances, and consolidations.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA2-23-166 (Revision to Previously Approved Plans): Deferral.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA3-23-167 (Financial Hardship Exemption): Deferral.

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

CA3-23-167 – Financial Hardship Exemption

The Applicant is applying for a financial hardship exemption to allow an increase in the Old Wheat St. front façade from 46 feet 4 inches to 47 feet 7 & 1/2 inches.

To qualify for a financial hardship exemption, the Applicant must first show that the relief requested is required to continue using the structure(s) for their intended use. Staff finds that this requirement refers directly to existing contributing buildings, and not to new construction or additions to existing contributing structures. After this burden of proof has been established, the Commission must consider the following criteria:

1. The present and future income of the property owner(s) and those occupying the property;
2. The availability, at present or in the future, of other sources of income revenue, including loans, grants, and tax abatements;
3. The costs associated with adherence to the District regulations in comparison to the costs associated with achieving the same proposal without the District regulations;
4. The degree of existing architectural importance and integrity of the structure; and,
5. The purpose and intent of this chapter.

While the Applicant has submitted documentation that presents a compelling argument to allow an increase in the allowable height, Staff finds that this documentation does not show how the increase in height is required to continue using the existing structures for their intended use as retail and . As such, Staff finds that the criteria for considering a Financial Hardship Request has not been met. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation showing that the requested financial hardship exemption is required to continue using the existing contributing structures for their intended retail use.

Regarding the remaining criteria, Staff does find that the Applicant presents a compelling argument for hardship based on the proposed use of the structure as affordable housing. Further, the proposal would add more affordable housing than would otherwise be required at the site, which provides a potential mitigating consideration should the Commission choose to grant a financial hardship exemption.

CA2-22-166 Revisions to Previously Approved Plans:

The Applicant is proposing revisions consisting of an additional vertical story added to the previously approved designs. In general, Staff has no concerns with the overall style, materials, or fenestration pattern of the proposal. The only issue Staff can identify is the height of the new proposed structure would exceed the height allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. Given Staffs findings on the financial hardship exemption, and given that said exemption is required in order to approve the proposed design, Staff cannot recommend approval of the proposed revisions at this time.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA2-23-166 (Revision to Previously Approved Plans): Deferral.

CA2-23-166 & CA3-23-167 for 364 Auburn Ave.

June 14, 2023

Page 3 of 3

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA3-23-167 (Financial Hardship Exemption): Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide documentation showing that the requested financial hardship exemption is required to continue using the existing contributing structures for their intended retail use, per Sec.
2. All updated plans and documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

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: 2805 Metropolitan Pkwy (Oak Hill Child, Family, and Adolescent Center)
APPLICATION: RC-23-215
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: mid 1990's

Property Location: West block face of Metropolitan Pkwy, south of the Cleveland Avenue intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Institutional

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. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-23-215 for 2805 Metropolitan Pkwy
June 14, 2023
Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing a new structure in the existing courtyard area of the facility. An existing single story “U” shaped building is on site which would partially envelop the proposed structure and screen it from the public right of way. Given that the Commission is primarily concerned with impacts that would affect the public right of way, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA3-23-167 (Financial Hardship Exemption): Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File