



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: 281 Peters Street NW

APPLICATION: CA2-23-177

MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Castleberry Hill Landmark District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** n/a

Date of Construction: 1981

Property Location: West side of Peters Street NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Contemporary

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Retroactive Approval of Alterations and Accessory structures

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20N

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 23CAP-00000417

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 9, 2023, hearing for the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order (23CAP-00000417) on March 22, 2023, for unpermitted construction of a deck and cabanas in the front parking lot of their building. They are proposing retroactive approval of these alterations, as well as interior renovations outside the scope of the Commission's purview. Per Sec. 16-20N.007 (14):

(e) Accessory structures shall be placed behind the principal structure within the buildable area of the lot.

(f) Accessory structures shall not cover more than 25 percent of the rear yard.

(h) Shall be located in the least visible location within the permissible area.

(i) May require screening with the appropriate plant or fence materials.

The proposed work cannot be permitted without a variance to the zoning code. In addition, Staff would note that no site plan has been submitted which establishes lot coverage, so additional materials would be required, at minimum, to see precisely which portions of the code would require a variance to permit the proposed work. No specifications for any of the work have been submitted. Staff recommends that the Applicant defer their application to allow for submittal of outstanding materials and to allow for the legally required advertisement period for a variance application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 9, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to Apply for the Required Variance.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 660 Peachtree Street NE (Fox Theater)
APPLICATION: CA2-23-187
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: LBS

Other Zoning: SPI-16, SA-1

Date of Construction: 1929

Property Location: Northwest corner of the intersection of Peachtree Street NE and Ponce de Leon Avenue NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Moorish Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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 sidewalks surrounding the Landmark Fox Theater Building. The proposal would remove and replace approximately 150 feet of sidewalk, 10 feet in width along the Ponce de Leon Avenue elevation, and two portions directly under the marquee (currently paved with non-historic terrazzo installed in 1993) and a broken section to the south of the marquee measuring. The concrete would all be replaced with broom finished concrete. The Applicant has supplied historic photos showing that the proposal would return the concrete to its historic state. The Applicant has clarified that the damaged existing materials will be removed using sawing, that is less invasive and will not impact the historic building. The addition of a vapor barrier will eliminate the water intrusion that is currently an issue due to the damaged concrete and terrazzo. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1368 Ponce de Leon Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA2-23-194
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2022

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: n/a

Date of Construction: 1915

Property Location: West side of Ponce de Leon Avenue NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Signage

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

CA2-23-194 1368 Ponce de Leon Avenue NE

June 28, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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 installation of new signage for the Paideia School Junior High School. The signage would be installed on the lawn to the right of the drive. Staff finds that the proposed signage meets all the requirements of the zoning code Sec. 16-28A.010 (26) (a-e) and 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: 500 Larchmont Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-23-196
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1966

Property Location: Corner of Larchmont and Kildare Ave

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Driveway and Walkway replacement in-kind

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: SWO for working without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

ALTERATIONS

Driveway

The Applicant proposes to replace in-kind an existing concrete double wide driveway. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. The garage is a double garage, and the original driveway was double wide.

Walkway

The walkway is not of concern to Staff.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval



CITY OF ATLANTA

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: 229 Auburn Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-086
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 4)

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction: 1920 – per the District inventory: A branch office of the Atlanta Life Insurance Company was housed in this building from the 1920's to the 1980's. During WWII, the third floor was used as a dormitory for Atlanta Life workers.

Property Location: Southeast corner of Auburn Ave. and Jesse Hill Dr.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: early 20th Century Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, Additions, and New Construction.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes. Deferred at Applicant's request on April 12, 2023, without discussion.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral.

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

The District regulations contain both quantitative and qualitative requirements for new construction, alterations, and additions. If a project element is not mentioned below, Staff found that it met the related District zoning requirements.

Historic Preservation Tax Credits

Staff understands that the Applicant will be seeking historic preservation tax credits as part of the project's financing. As the review process for these tax credits can often require revisions to projects, Staff recommends that any alterations required for historic preservation tax credits be approved by Staff after documentation of the change has been provided by the Applicant.

Lot consolidation

Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether a consolidation of any lots on the subject block is proposed as part of the development of the site.

Height

In Subarea 4 of the Landmark District, the height of additions and new construction may be 1.5 times the height of the tallest historic building on the block up to a maximum of 68 feet for properties west of I-75/85. Height is measured on the front façade of the building. As the subject property fronts Auburn Ave., Jessie Hill St., and Hill St., the proposed structure would have 3 front façades which would each need to comply with the height requirement independently of one another. The tallest structure on the block is the subject property at 229 Auburn Ave. While the height has not been provided by the Applicant, Staff measures its height at 41' 8". As the 1.5 times modifier for height would allow for a structure taller than the maximum of 68', Staff finds that the height limit for the block is 68'.

In looking at the west, and east façades, Staff finds that the measurements do not appear to be taken from the average point of grade relative to each façade and that several portions of the structure exceed the 68' maximum. For the benefit of the Applicant and the Commission, each street fronting façade is measured from average grade on each frontage, not from the average point of grade across all façades. As such, Staff recommends that the plans be revised to show height of all additions and new construction not exceeding 68 feet as measured from average point of grade on each front façade independently, or, confirm the accuracy of the measurements based on the District regulations.

Alterations to historic structure

Regarding the curtain wall proposed for the partially collapsed portion of the structure, Staff finds that this approach would not meet the District regulations as it creates a false spatial relationship for the west façade of the structure. Staff recommends that the west façade curtain wall be removed from the plans and replaced with a brick wall and fenestration consistent with the historic fenestration on the building.

Design Standards for new construction and additions

Portions of the new construction and additions contain balconies with railing. Staff has no general concerns with the use of balconies, but does recommend that the balcony railing be flush with the front façade, and that the balcony area be "sunken" into the façade of the building to prevent projections from the façade of the building.

The facades of the proposal use brick veneer as the primary façade materials, with accent materials used intermittently. The plans do note “Architectural Panels” being used but the actual material proposed is unclear. As such, Staff recommends all materials be listed on the plans and meet the District regulations.

Regarding the storefront glazing on the north and west elevation, Staff finds that an opportunity exists to bring a more compatible visual pattern to the proposal through the use of embedded color in the façade materials and patterning the storefront openings to match the pattern on the upper stories. By using similar materials to break up the horizontal massing of the entire structure, and by matching the solid and void pattern to the overall building, Staff finds that the proposal would come closer to replicating the pattern of historic buildings in the District. As such, Staff recommends that the materials used on the new construction first floor storefront units match the embedded color and material of the upper story façades. Staff further recommends that the pattern of glazing to solid on the first floor of the new additions be reconfigured to match the building pattern of the upper story units.

Along the east and west façades, two garage entrances are proposed. The District regulations require continuous active use along all street facing facades. As such, Staff recommends that active uses be provided for the entirety of the street facing façades, or, that the Applicant apply for a variance.

Per the District regulations, the exposed portions of parking decks are required to appear like horizontal storied buildings. As such, Staff recommends the parking garage’s eastern façade be revised to have the appearance of a horizontal storied building. Lastly, Staff recommends the plans be updated to show compliance with the District regulations for loading areas, loading dock entrances, and building/mechanical/accessory features.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall clarify whether a consolidation of any lots on the subject block is proposed as part of the development of the site;
2. The plans be revised to show height of all additions and new construction not exceeding 68 feet as measured from average point of grade on each front façade independently or, shall confirm the accuracy of the measurements based on the District regulations, per Sec.16-20C.004(2)€;
3. The west façade curtain wall be removed from the plans and replaced with a brick wall and fenestration consistent with the historic fenestration on the building, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
4. The balcony railing be flush with the front façade, and that the balcony area be “sunken” into the façade of the building to prevent projections from the façade of the building, per Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(a)(ii);
5. All materials shall be listed on the plans and shall meet the District regulations, per Sec 16-20C.008(3)(a)(i);
6. The materials used on the new construction first floor storefront units match the embedded color and material of the upper story façades, per Sec. 16-20C.008(3);
7. The pattern of glazing to solid on the first floor of the new additions be reconfigured to match the building pattern of the upper story units, per Sec. 16-20C.008(3);
8. Active uses be provided for the entirety of the street facing façades, or, that the Applicant apply for a variance, [per Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(b)(i);
9. the parking garage’s eastern façade be revised to have the appearance of a horizontal storied building; per Sec. 16-20C.009(2);
10. The plans shall be updated to show compliance with the District regulations for loading areas, loading dock entrances, and building/mechanical/accessory features, per Sec.16-20C.008(d); and,
11. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

CA3-23-086 for 229 Auburn Ave.
June 28, 2023
Page 4 of 4

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

APPLICATION: CA3-23-127

MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District, Subarea 4 **Other Zoning:** n/a

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of Edgewood Avenue NE and Bell Street NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred May 10, May 26, and June 14 due to lack of sign posting

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 21CAP-00001450

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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 received a stop-work order (21CAP-00001450) on October 7, 2021, for unpermitted construction of an exterior dining area including a fence. This stop-work order remains in place. CA3-23-127 is for a variance to allow a fence between the building and the street, where it would otherwise not be permitted. This is the only portion of the stop-work case addressed in this application.

Variance CA3-23-127

The requested variance is for the retroactive approval of a variance to allow a fence between the building and the street, where it would otherwise be prohibited.

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

The Applicant cites the large homeless population in the vicinity and the presence of a parking lot directly adjacent to the outside dining area. The presence of the fence provides a layer of protection for patrons from vehicles. Staff finds that the subject property in question has an unusual position, being surrounded on the north and west by parking lots not owned by them. To the east in the highway, a condition that did not exist in 1930 when the building was originally constructed. This means that there is no elevation of location for outdoor dining which can be protected from potential hazards without fencing. In addition, this building was not always located on the corner. Originally there was a building between the subject property and Bell Street NE, which was demolished for the parking lot. The creation of this parking lot has created a secondary frontage on Bell Street NE, which did not historically exist.

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

The Applicant cites the lack of an alternative location for outdoor dining and need for patron safety as hardships imposed by the restriction on placement of the fence.

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

The Applicant cites the location of the lot, in a position where it is surrounded by parking lots (owned by a separate entity) on two sides and the highway on the third side as a limitation to outdoor dining space. These conditions create an environment where outdoor diners need to be protected from potential hazards.

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

The Applicant does not directly address how relief would not cause detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta but cites that it is needed for patron safety and continued operation of the business located at this address.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting a variance. The data submitted supports the fact that the environment is such that the outdoor dining area requires a fence to ensure the life safety of patrons. The conditions present on the lot (being surrounded on two sides by parking lots and the third by a highway) did not exist historically and have placed a hardship on this property. The outdoor dining cannot be placed in a location where it does not face risk and challenges from the environment. Though fences are not typically permitted between a structure and the public right-of-way, the removal of the adjacent building for a surface parking lot has now placed the building on a corner, a condition that did not previously exist. Staff finds that the unusual placement of the building limits the placement of outdoor dining, but the conditions present justify the need for a variance to permit a fence in this location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
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 28, 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: Deferral until July 12, 2023

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).

The **highlighted** conditions below are still outstanding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 12, 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. **The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 2.) The Applicant will not remove the historic stoop. **The Applicant has revised the plans to show the retention of the stoop.**
- 3.) The Applicant will update the proposed plans to reflect the removal of this proposed feature. **The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 4.) **The Applicant will install a new wrought iron railing which matches the historic railing which was removed unpermitted. No specifications have been provided for this feature.**
- 5.) The Applicant will submit detailed photographs showing the conditions of all windows on the structure. **The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 6.) 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 has satisfied this condition.**

- 7.) The Applicant will provide a conditions assessment of all windows proposed for replacement, detailing why they need to be replaced. **This has not been provided.**
- 8.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the new windows proposed for the addition. **This has not been provided.**
- 9.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work for the existing doors on the structure. **This has not been provided, the Applicant states the doors will be re-painted. There is still a new door proposed. See condition 9.**
- 10.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the new door proposed for the rear addition. **This has not been provided.**
- 11.) The Applicant will retain the existing siding on the historic structure. **The Applicant states that the siding will be retained and repaired. Staff still needs clarification on exactly where these repairs will occur.**
- 12.) The Applicant will provide specifications for replacement wood, channel set siding which meets the requirement of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (1)(e). **This has not been provided.**
- 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 Commission.
- 14.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKINS
MAYOR

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

Janide Prince
Commissioner

Design Studio
Doug Young
Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 768 Kirkwood
APPLICATION: CA3-23-176
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2017

Property Location Corner of Marcus and Pearl

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None, Known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

SPECIAL EXCEPTION:

Applicant is proposing to build a (swimming pool) directly adjacent to the public right of way and to allow a 6-foot-tall privacy fence/wall in the half-depth front yard where otherwise a 4-foot-tall fence is permitted.

The Applicant must address the following requirements set in the questions below.

- 1. The location will not be objectionable to occupants of neighboring property, or the neighborhood in general, by reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic, and the applicant shall contact the adjoining neighbors about the special exception and provide written letters to the commission from the adjoining neighbors regarding the propriety of the special exception.**

The Applicant writes, "I met with the surrounding and adjacent neighbors, the Cabbagetown historic preservation land use committee and the Cabbagetown CNIA regarding the propriety of this project, presented my site plan and preservation of this project who did not object to this project in general, by reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic as shown in the letters of support submitted d by adjacent and surrounding neighbors, the Cabbagetown HPLU and Cabbagetown CNIA who voted in support and represents the Cabbagetown neighborhood as a whole and wrote a letter of support for this project. The swimming pool is for a private residence only. Therefore, it will create no additional lights, traffic, or noise."

- 2. The area for such activity could not reasonably be located elsewhere on the lot.**

The Applicant writes, "To satisfy the life safety requirement of the city code for building a pool and keeping the pool at the farthest point away from the public right of way, the pool could not be reasonably located elsewhere on the lot. The pool is located on the lot to satisfy the requirements of the Cabbagetown Landmark historic neighborhood guidelines, compatibility rules for setbacks of accessory structures and makes the most sense after reviewing the plans with the HPLU and CNIA who agreed. Because your property sits on a corner, there is virtually no place to locate the pool without it being adjacent to a street."

- 3. The commission may condition any special exception for such facilities based on concerns regarding visibility from public right-of-way, fencing, screening, or other buffering, existence and/or location of lighting, hours of use, and such other matters as are reasonably required to ameliorate any potential negative impacts of the proposed facility on adjoining property owners.**

The Applicant writes, "I understand the above authority of the commission. After meeting with the neighbors, Cabbagetown HPLU, and Cabbagetown CNIA, I took their recommendations and inserted them into the submitted plan. Most notably, to address the concern for parking I included one parking space in the back yard instead of two and will build a 6-foot wood privacy fence from the back of the house to the back fence to satisfy the life safety requirement and limit visibility of the pool from Pearl Street. I planted Leyland Cypress, Italian cypress, limelight hydrangeas, butterfly bushes and chaste trees around the entire perimeter fencing to enhance the aesthetic beauty and provide screening from the street. Pool lights will be added on the sides of the pool and will not be noticeable by neighbors or pedestrians on the street due to the 6-foot, wood privacy fence and privacy trees and bushes surrounding the perimeter of the property. I have to work 9-5

during the weeks and the pool will most likely be used during the hours of 9 am – 5 pm on Saturday or Sunday with my wife.”

STAFF RESPONSE:

The Staff has successfully answered each of the questions. The Applicant has presented his proposal to the neighboring groups. They in return have sent a letter of support for the proposal. The site plan also reflects that there is no place where the pool can go. The 6 feet wood privacy fence also limits visibility of the pool. As well, the Applicant proposes planting varying plants along the perimeter to high the pool.

The Applicant has noted the incorrect zoning information which leads to incorrect lot coverage information, right now Staff doesn't see where this might be an issue, however, Staff recommend the Applicant make the zoning correction on the final plans.

Staff have no concern regarding the proposed Special Exception.

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: 1076 White Oak Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-23-180
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location West of Lee Street and East of Peeples Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

Roof line

On a non-contributing house, the Applicant proposes 618 sf second story addition that will extend to the rear of the house. The second story hip roof, while piers over the original hip roof slightly is deceiving on the plans because the topography drops in the area. Both pitches on the original hip roof and the second story addition are 8:12. Staff are not concerned with the relationship with the two rooflines. Staff are concerned that the pitch on the original roofline appears to be higher than originally built. While this is would be a problem if this was a contributing house, it is not here. Since this is a non-contributing house, the Applicant is proposing a roofline that is reflective of what is seen on the blockface. Staff are not concerned.

The proposed dormers are not problematic for Staff either. They tuck in nicely to the roof line.

Siding

The Applicant proposes cementitious siding for the addition. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. Cementitious siding is permitted. However, the cementitious siding must be smooth-faced and have a reveal between 4 to 6 inches.

Windows

The proposed windows will match the existing double hung windows in style. Staff are not concerned with this proposal; Staff recommends the Applicant identify the material that will be used and not that on the final plans.

Foundation

The proposed foundation is concrete that will match the existing concrete foundation. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend the concrete foundation not be the finishing material.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to repair or replace the double-hung windows. As with the windows for the addition, the Applicant has not indicated the material of the windows. Staff recommends the material be noted on the plans.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a full width covered porch that is reflected of the porches on the blockface. From the drawing the porch will employ a two-part joint system for the porch railing; simple railing that will match the vernacular house style. Staff can't determine the porch floor material. Staff recommends the floor be in align with the style of the house as much as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The cementitious siding shall be smooth faced with a reveal from 4 to 6 inches, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. The window material shall be noted on the elevations, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o);
3. The concrete on the foundation shall not be the finishing material, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(r)(10) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant

CA3-23-180 for 1076 White Oak Ave

June 28, 2023

Page 3 of 3

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 Adam, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 335 Sinclair
APPLICATION: CA3-23-189
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Washita and West of Carmel

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking a variance to allow an addition to the existing structure.

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

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

Applicant writes: **“The block face contains six contributing structures, with lot depths ranging from 84' to 247.5' deep. The lots are generally narrow and deep, and a rear alley runs behind 5 of the 6 lots at an angle, resulting in lots becoming generally smaller moving from north to south. The subject property has less depth than the similar lots at 339, 343, and 347, limiting the area for additions on the lot. Although 331 and 351 have less depth than the subject property, they are slightly wider at the street, and significantly wider at the rear.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“Due to the small size of the lot and an existing detached carport accessed from the rear alley, the lot has very limited buildable area for expansion of the existing house to accommodate the needs of the homeowners as their children grow. The existing house is well below the maximum allowable 0.50 floor area ratio but is near the maximum allowable 55% lot coverage, so any expansion of the house necessitates a two-story addition to provide additional floor area.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The lot has the smallest depth of the other lots on the block face with similar widths and parallel side lot lines and does not have the wider proportions of the other two smaller lots.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The main level of the house sits 7.2' above street level, with a steep rise in the front yard before the lot levels out along the depth of the existing house. Because of this, the proposed additions would not be visible from the street, as the existing side-to-side gable and proximity of the adjacent houses block the view of the proposed addition from the street (see included photographs and line of sight diagrams on the Proposed Right and Left Elevations on sheets A-3 and A-4). Therefore, the purpose and intent of the Inman Park Historic District Regulations are not impaired, as the spatial relationship between the building and street are preserved.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

The Applicant has successfully answered each question to justify a variance. As the Applicant has stated, this lot doesn't have as much depth as 339, 343 and 347 and is not as wide as 331 and 351. Attempting to extend further back would create an issue with the existing carport. Staff believes the Applicant has successfully demonstrated that because of the rise in the front yard above street level, the visibility of the addition is not visible from the street. And Staff agrees the spatial relationship between the building and street is indeed preserved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant

CA3-23-189 for 335 Sinclair

June 28, 2023

pg. 3

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: 879 White St.
APPLICATION: RC-23-159
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North block face of White St., east of the Joseph E Lowery Blvd. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Impact of rezoning request on Commission's ability to apply the requirements of Chapter 20 & Chapter 20G of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

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

The proposed rezoning would change the underlying zoning of the property from R-4A to R-5. Per Sec. 6-4043(e)(6), the Commission is required to “... *review and make written recommendation to the zoning review board... on any proposed action pending before said boards regarding any building, site, or district which has been designated for historic protection pursuant to this article or by chapter 20 part 16 of the Code of Ordinances.*” Given the Commission’s role as defined by this section, Staff finds that the Commission’s recommendations are limited to the proposal’s impact on properties protected by Chapter 20 of the zoning ordinance. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission, Applicant, and interested parties that the Commission’s role is not to determine whether the proposed zoning is appropriate as that task is the purview of the Zoning Review Board and the City Council.

The proposal would change the zoning and allowable uses of the site from single-family zoning to two-family zoning. Staff understands that the Applicant will be applying for a zero-lot-line at some point after the property is rezoned and a new structure is installed. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission, the Applicant, and interested parties that a zero-lot-line application is **not** a subdivision of the lot, but merely a conveyance of land ownership without the creation of new lots, and therefore is not subject to the requirements of the Chapter 20G of the Zoning Ordinance.

Per Chapter 20G, the height, roof form & pitch, architectural details, and many other aspects of the new principal structure would be subject to the Compatibility Rule. Thus, the design of the new structure will be heavily influenced by the predominately Vernacular Victorian and Queen Anne style homes on the block face. As such, Staff finds that the rezoning on its own would not impact the Commission’s review process and therefore has no concerns with the proposal. Staff would, however, strongly urge the Zoning Review Board against any condition regarding the setbacks, height, or architectural characteristics of the future structure(s) on the site. Such conditions would indeed impair the Commission’s ability to apply the detailed architectural and developmental requirements of Chapter 20G and would impede on the Commission’s purview over said regulations.

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

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: 201 Huntington Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-181
MEETING DATE: June 14, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West block face of Huntington Rd. south of the Palisades Rd. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-23-181 for 201 Huntington Rd.

June 28, 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 project proposed by the Applicant involves additions, alterations, and site work. The resulting project would completely remove the historic character of the existing Tudor structure and would transform the property into a modern architectural expression that is not in keeping with the Tudor characteristics of the original home. As such, Staff does not support the project and strongly urges the Applicant to reconsider their project which, as currently proposed, would cause a regrettable and preventable loss of a contributing historic resource within the District. Staff would strongly urge the Applicant to consider alternative designs which would place alterations and additions to the rear of the structure so as to preserve the historic integrity of the building.

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

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2424 Piedmont Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-183
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-15 (Subarea 9)

Date of Construction: mid 1990's

Property Location: Northeast intersection of Piedmont Rd. and Lindbergh Dr.

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: 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-23-183 for 2424 Piedmont Rd.

June 28, 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 mural to be installed on the existing parking deck. In general, Staff finds the proposal to be appropriate for installation on the deck. Staff would suggest that durable materials which require minimal maintenance be used for the artwork installation. Staff further suggests that the Applicant develop a maintenance schedule to ensure that the piece is in good repair for as long as is feasible.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: 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: 384 Woodward Way
APPLICATION: RC-23-190
MEETING DATE: June 28, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Fronts the west block face of Woodward Way, the south block face of Peachtree Battle Ave., the east block face of Howell Mill Rd., the east block face of Wesley Dr, and the east block face of Northside dr.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New trailhead

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-23-190 for 384 Woodward Way
June 28, 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 project proposed by the Applicant involves the installation of a new park trailhead on Howell Mill Rd. In general, Staff finds the design of the proposal, including the site layout and materials, to be appropriate. Staff would recommend that the Applicant develop a maintenance plan to ensure the longevity of the site. Staff would also recommend that the Applicant consult with neighbors via a public engagement process on the proposed design if that has not already been done.

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

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File