



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1178 Greenwich Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-128
MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Greenwich Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred May 10, May 24, June 14, and June 28

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 23, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

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

Massing

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

Overall Height

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

Roof Form

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

Roof Pitch

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

Foundation Height

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

Foundation Materials

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

Cladding

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

Windows

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

Doors

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

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

Front Yard Setbacks

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

Side and Rear Yard Setbacks

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

New materials were submitted to Staff, including a variance application to reduce the required side yard setback from 7 feet to 5 feet. This change is proposed to widen the front façade to bring the design into compliance, given the unusual condition present on the lot. While Staff is in favor of deferral to allow for this variance, Staff would not that the design as is still is not compatible with the historic housing stock in terms of design and massing. While the Applicant is moving towards meeting the compatibility rule, Staff cannot support the present two-story design and recommends that the design be revised to a cross-gabled, one-and-a-half story design to meet the compatibility rule per Sec. 16-20G.006.

Accessory Dwelling Unit

As part of the redesigned plans the Applicant has removed the L-shaped portion of the house, and added an ADU. Staff finds that the proposed ADU meets the requirements of the zoning code; however, Staff would note that given the unusually wide driveway that the ADU will be visible from the public right of way, because it cannot be placed on a less visible portion of the lot. Per Sec. 16-20G.006 (10), “Screening with appropriate plant or fence materials is required if said structure is visible from the public right-of-way.” The Applicant will appropriately screen the proposed ADU.

Staff finds that in addition to the variance application, the conditions **highlighted** below are still outstanding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant to address the following and apply for a variance:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit evidence of the legal easement agreement regarding the driveway. **The Applicant has satisfied this condition.**
- 2.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to meet the compatibility rule in terms of design and massing per Sec. 16-20G.006. **Staff notes that the proposed design has come into compliance substantially. However, based on the existing housing stock present on the block face, Staff still feels that a house design that is visibly two stories in height is not**

compatible. While Staff understands that the Applicant wishes to apply for a variance to increase the width, which Staff agrees will help to make the proposed massing more compatible with the historic housing stock, Staff cannot support the present two-story design and recommends that the design be revised to a cross-gabled, one-and-a-half story design to meet the compatibility rule per Sec. 16-20G.006.

- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed height to meet the compatibility rule per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(g). [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the roof design to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(d) in terms of form and pitch. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(d). [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 6.) The Applicant will install three-over-one, wood-framed, double-hung windows which comply with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i). [The Applicant has supplied an 82-page informational booklet, not specifications for the specific windows which will be used. The Applicant will clarify and provide exact specifications for the proposed window size, model, and materials to be used.](#)
- 7.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i). [The Applicant has supplied an 82-page informational booklet, not specifications for the specific windows which will be used. The Applicant will clarify and provide exact specifications for the proposed window size, model, and materials to be used.](#)
- 8.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed front door to ensure compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(k). [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 9.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE

Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS

MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
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: July 12, 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)?: Yes, June 14 & 28

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 22CAP-00001213 and 23CAP-00000394

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant 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.

The Applicant has submitted revised materials. Staff finds that all conditions have been satisfied with the exception of the highlighted items indicated below.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with 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. The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.
- 3.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement beadwork. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.

- 4.) The Applicant will update the elevations to accurately depict the replacement gable vent. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 5.) The Applicant will provide a detail drawing showing how the feature will be reconstructed. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 6.) The Applicant will clad the porch foundation utilizing the extant historic brick still present on the site. [It appears that the historic brick has not been retained, based on the Applicant's submittal of new proposed brick to be utilized. Staff has concerns with this proposal as the brick veneer does not match the appearance of the historic material which was removed. Staff requires submittal of brick which is specifically sourced to replicate that which was removed in appearance.](#)
- 7.) The Applicant will submit specifications for proposed replacement materials to supplement the porch reconstruction. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 8.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted decking. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 9.) The Applicant will install wood tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the face. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 10.) The Applicant will install porch supports which match the historic materials which were removed. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 11.) The Applicant will restore the supports to the locations where they were originally placed. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 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. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 14.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted balustrades. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 15.) The Applicant will install butt-jointed balustrades no taller than the bottom of the windows sills on the house. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 16.) The Applicant will restore all window and door trim with replacement wooden trim which matches the original in dimensions, reveal, and style. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 17.) The Applicant will install corner boards, which match the originals which were removed. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 18.) The Applicant will replicate the fascia and soffit which were removed with materials that match the existing that were removed. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 19.) The Applicant will submit updated plans showing the correct design of all trim and decorative features. [The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.](#)
- 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. Staff is concerned that not all windows appear to match the historic style. 1101 Arlington Avenue SW is a double-frontage lot, and all windows must be in compliance, matching the historic two-over-two vertical pattern. The Applicant will remove the proposed one-over-one windows. In addition, the proposed specifications for the windows indicate that the muntins will be flat. Sec. 16-20M.013 (n)(2), "If muntins or mullions are used, such muntins or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass." The Applicant will update the plans to show the correct window style on all windows/elevations. The Applicant will submit specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (n)(2).

- 22.) The Applicant will not remove the casement windows which remain on the elevation projection. The Applicant has illustrated that this feature will be restored on the plans.
- 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: July 12, 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)?: Yes, deferred 6/14, 6/28

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).

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 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. **The Applicant has supplied specifications for this feature which meet the requirements of the zoning code.**
- 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. The Applicant has supplied more photos. Staff is still not comfortable approving the window replacement without a contractor who specializes in window repair assessing the structure of the windows, which appear to have damage (broken glass, missing weights, etc) but are not beyond repair. Staff still needs to see a detailed assessment of the need for replacement.
- 8.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the new windows proposed for the addition. The Applicant has submitted general specifications for wood windows, which appear to meet the requirements of the code; however, Staff will require an itemized estimate ensuring that the proposed windows exactly replicate the size, dimensions, and lite pattern present on the house. The Applicant will provide a detailed estimate for all replacement windows which are approved, and for the new windows proposed for the addition.
- 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. The proposed door which has been submitted still does not meet the requirements of the code. Fiberglass doors are not permitted per the zoning code. Staff would also note that the proposed door is of a Craftsman design which is not compatible with the historic character of the house or the time of construction. The Applicant must propose a door which meets the requirements of the code and is compatible with the historic character of the structure.
- 11.) The Applicant will retain the existing siding on the historic structure. The Applicant states that the siding will be retained and repaired.
- 12.) The Applicant will provide specifications for replacement wood, channel set siding which meets the requirement of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (1)(e). The Applicant has supplied specifications for 4-inch cementitious channel set siding. Chapter 16-20Q.006 (1)(g-h) states, "(g)The compatibility rule shall apply to all building façade materials on all façades, and in addition to all other applicable regulations, as follows:(h)The presence and dimensions of the exposed face of lap siding and wood shingles." The existing home has wooden channel set siding. The proposed material does not meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant will submit specification for wooden siding which meets the requirements of Chapter 16-20Q.006 (1)(g-h).
- 13.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1076 White Oak Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-23-180
MEETING DATE: July 12, 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. The Applicant pitch range from 3:12 to 9:12. The Applicant roof pitches are 8:12 Staff are not concerned.

The proposed dormers are not problematic for Staff either. They tuck in nicely to the roof line and will sit to the rear of the house.

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.

CA3-23-180 for 1076 White Oak Ave

June 28, 2023

Page 3 of 3

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: CA3-23-201

MEETING DATE: July 12, 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: Deck

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order (21CAP-00001450) on October 7, 2021, for unpermitted construction of an exterior dining area including a deck and a fence. This stop-work order remains in place. CA3-23-127, a variance to allow a fence between the building and the street, where it would otherwise not be permitted was heard by the Urban Design Commission and approved on June 28, 2023. The fence was the only portion of the unpermitted work addressed in that application.

The Applicant has erected a wooden deck 50' 10 ½" wide by 30' 11" deep to the rear of the existing principal structure. A temporary structure sits on top of the deck to provide a covered outdoor dining area. In general Staff finds that the deck meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20 C.005 (4)(a) governing accessory structures. Staff is concerned that a site plan has not been submitted with the application materials. The Applicant has submitted plans showing the principal structure and the deck addition; however, they do not show the full lot. The requirements of Sec. 16-20C.005 (4)(b)(ii)(4-7) cannot be established without a full site plan, drawn to scale to illustrate how the requirements of the zoning code, including rear and side yard setback, and lot coverage have been met. The Applicant will submit site plan showing the full lot, all features, including the new unpermitted deck, drawn to scale.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit site plan showing the full lot, all features, including the new unpermitted deck, drawn to scale.
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the 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: 888 Oakland Dr.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-203
MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Northeast corner of Oakland Dr. and Richland Rd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional Side Gabled Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and an addition.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial.

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

Interpretation of District Regulations and their application on the current proposal

The District regulations allows for two options for reviewing alterations and additions to a contributing structure in the Oakland City Historic District. The first option requires the alterations and additions to be consistent with, and reinforce, the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and comply with the general architectural requirements of the District. Secondly, if no historic materials which characterize the property are being destroyed, the new work may be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment.

Regarding the first criteria, the proposal involves a full second story addition to the structure. Staff finds that the structure currently is, and has historically been, a Minimal Traditional style home. As such, Staff finds that the inclusion of a second story would not be consistent with, and would not reinforce, the historic architectural character of the existing contributing structure. As such, Staff finds that the proposal would not meet the first criteria.

Regarding the second criteria Staff finds that historic materials will certainly be destroyed, in this case the roof structure. Further, Staff finds that the addition would not be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the existing property, Staff finds that the proposal would not meet the second criteria.

In looking at the materials provided, Staff also finds that the application is missing several key documents and metrics which are required by the District regulations including, but not limited to, a completed compatibility study based on the 4 contributing structures on the block face (874, 878, 882, & 888 Oakland Drive), and those documents which have been submitted are incomplete and missing information. In addition to these concerns, Staff finds that the project as currently proposed would require at least two variances from the District regulations, one for the height and one for the board and batten siding.

Given the issues and concerns raised above, Staff cannot support the project in its current form. As the proposal will require an almost complete redesign to meet the requirements of the Historic District zoning overlay, Staff recommends that the Commission deny the application to allow the Applicant the time required to fully redesign the project to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 619 Cherokee
APPLICATION: CA3-23-204
MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1987

Property Location: Corner of Cherokee Place and Cherokee Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work/Special Exception

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

SPECIAL EXCEPTION:

On the corner lot, the Applicant is proposing to install a pool, pool pavilion and carport. The Applicant is seeking the special exception to all the 6ft fence on a half-depth lot, so that pavilion pool can sit behind the rear of the house without being seen from the public right away.

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

- 1. Such wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining and is not incompatible with the character of the neighborhood.**

The Applicant writes, "Because of desired security and privacy for the proposed pool area, the 6'ht. fence is needed. Since this a corner lot, there are no adjacent properties impacted. The fence will be custom built on site and will be of an attractive, simple design compatible with the architecture of the home and of other similar fences found in the neighborhood."

- 2. Such greater height is justified by requirements for security of persons or property in the area.**

The Applicant writes, "The proposed 6'ht. fence will provide added security for the proposed pool area due to its proximity to the adjacent public sidewalk."

- 3. Such greater height is justified for topographic reasons:**

The Applicant write, "Because the adjacent public sidewalk is at the same elevation of the proposed pool, 6'ht. is needed to screen eye level views into the property from sidewalk.

- 4. Such greater height, in the yard or yards involved, is not incompatible with character of the surrounding neighborhood.**

The Applicant, writes, "Since this fence is at the rear of the existing home it is not out of character with other existing fences in neighborhood."

STAFF RESPONSE:

The Applicant has successfully answered the four criteria set for a Special Exception. Staff agrees with the Applicant that the pool especially on a corner lot will need security and the most logical way of providing this is with a fence. A four ft face would not be sufficient. The fence will not prevent passage of light or air with neighboring properties. The fence design is aligning with other fences in area.

Staff have no concern regarding the proposed Special Exception.

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 229 Peters Street NW

APPLICATION: CA3-23-206

MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1952, 1989

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Peters and Fair Streets NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Commercial Warehouse

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 9, 2023, hearing of 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 proposes total renovation of the existing non-contributing structure on the property. The existing structure is a prefabricated, industrial warehouse, constructed of corrugated metal. The proposed renovations would construct a brick façade, which would create a parapet enclosure extending 6 feet 6 inches from the existing eave of the gabled roof, giving the building the appearance of a flat roof. This parapet wall would have an elaborate Mission-style detailing. Inset into the façade would be two storefronts facing Peters Street and six storefronts all facing the Fair Street entrance off the street. Specifications have not been provided for the form of the storefronts, though they appear to be standard commercial storefronts.

Staff has several concerns regarding the proposal. First, though a document was submitted labeled “site plan” it does not depict the full lot and all features. It is identical to the submission of elevations. The Applicant will submit an existing and proposed site plan, drawn to scale, illustrating the existing lot coverage, and the proposed alterations including all features present on the lot.

Secondly, no compatibility data has been submitted for the proposal. A number of featured elements including façade organization, proportions, scale, roof form and pitch, materials, fenestration patterning, style, and materials are all subject to the compatibility rule. The Applicant will submit compatibility data for all elements which are subject to the compatibility rule and establish how the proposed design meets the compatibility standards of the zoning code.

Staff has significant concerns with the elaborate Mission-style parapet ornamentation. This element does not exist anywhere within the landmark district, particularly not on the block of the subject property. It is far too elaborate and an inappropriate style for the district. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to simplify the proposed parapet in a design which meets the compatibility rule. Staff also has concerns regarding the proposed mixture of stone and brick veneer. The design appears to largely be based on suburban strip-mall style design and is not tailored to the landmark district and surrounding historic architecture. The Applicant will utilize materials which meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to simplify the proposed parapet in a design which meets the compatibility rule.

The Applicant has also not submitted specifications for any of the proposed materials to be utilized in the design. Staff needs specifications on the proposed brick and stone veneers, proposed windows, doors, sidewalk materials, and roofing alterations to ensure compliance with the zoning code. The Applicant will provide specifications for all new materials to be used on the façade renovations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 9, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to Address the Following:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit an existing and proposed site plan, drawn to scale, illustrating the existing lot coverage, and the proposed alterations including all features present on the lot.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit compatibility data for all elements which are subject to the compatibility rule and establish how the proposed design meets the compatibility standards of the zoning code.
- 3.) The Applicant will utilize materials which meet the compatibility rule.
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to simplify the proposed parapet in a design which meets the compatibility rule.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for all new materials to be used on the façade renovations.
- 6.) The Applicant will supply all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior (Tuesday, August 1, 2023) to their next hearing.
- 7.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the project.

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: 923 Springdale Rd.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-211
MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1918

Property Location: East side of Springdale Rd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Spanish Colonial Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Correction of the Contributing/Non-Contributing Property Determination List.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

CA3-23-211 for 923 Springdale Rd.

July 12, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The District regulations allow the Director of the Commission to make actions to correct the Contributing/Non-Contributing Property Determination List which was adopted when the District was designated. At the time of designation, the City Staff included as contributing the accessory structure of every property with a contributing principal structure rather than attempt to survey all properties individually. For some properties, such as the subject property, the site may contain historic accessory structures that have been altered to the point where they no longer convey their original architectural character and would not meet the threshold for inclusion as a contributing structure in a Landmark District.

The subject property contains an accessory structure that first appears in the Sanborn Maps in 1924. Since that time, several incompatible alterations and additions have removed the historic spatial relationships, materials, and features that defined the structure. From the information provided, it appears that these changes occurred outside of the period of significance for the district. As such, Staff finds that the alterations would not in themselves qualify for listing as contributing, even though all of the and there is no indication that Leila Ross Wilburn, the architect who designed the principal structure, was involved in the design of the accessory structure.

Given the information above, Staff finds that the accessory structure in question should not be considered a contributing structure under the Contributing/Non-Contributing Property Determination List for the Druid Hills Landmark District.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: 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: 923 Springdale Road NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-212 & 213
MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: n/a

Date of Construction: 1918

Property Location: East side of Springdale Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Spanish Colonial Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition of an accessory structure, deck, driveway, window replacement, construction of a new accessory structure, active recreation, deck, and site work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions (CA3-23-212), Approval with Conditions (CA3-23-213)

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

CA3-23-212

The Applicant proposes extensive site work, as well as the demolition of the existing driveway, front steps, deck, and garage. The proposal would include construction of a new detached garage, deck, swimming pool, driveway, vehicular and pedestrian gates, and front porch steps. In the process of adding the new attached garage, the Applicant also proposes replacement of non-original windows in the impacted area.

Demolition of Accessory Structure

The Applicant proposes demolition of the existing garage. This building was original to the site but has been significantly enlarged and altered over time introducing non-compatible materials, changing the roof form, cladding, eave style, and other character defining features as well as more than doubling the square footage. A separate application (CA3-23-211) has been submitted to change the contributing status of this structure. Staff finds that the garage has been altered to such a degree that it is no longer representative of the original 1918 design conceived by architect Leila Ross Wilburn. At present however, the zoning code does not permit for the demolition of the structure without a change in the contributing status of the accessory structure. Staff would support the demolition of the heavily altered accessory structure, so long as CA3-23-211 is approved, and the structure determined to no longer be contributing to the Druid Hills Landmark District. The Applicant will only demolish the existing garage if approval of CA3-23-211, changing the contributing status of the accessory structure, is approved by the Urban Design Commission (UDC).

New Construction of Attached Garage

The Applicant proposes construction of a two-car detached garage. The proposed structure would have a barrel tiled roof, which matches the existing roof on the primary structure and an exterior of board and batten siding, with windows, which match those on the primary structure. Staff does not have concerns with the proposed design of the accessory structure. The proposed placement of the garage (8.5 feet from the lot line) would not meet the requirements of the zoning code. CA3-23-213 is a variance application to allow a reduction in the left and right yard setbacks to accommodate the proposed garage (from 25 feet to 8.5 feet) and swimming pool (from 25 feet to 10 feet). As Staff's recommendation is approval of the proposed variance (CA3-23-213), Staff does not have concerns with the placement of the proposed garage.

Deck Demolition

There is an existing non-historic deck located to the rear of the primary structure. This feature is clearly non-historic, and Staff has no concerns with its removal. Staff would also note that based on the submitted photographs the existing deck was installed in such a way that its removal would not damage the historic fabric of the house.

Deck Re-construction

The proposed reconstruction of the deck would greatly increase the size, creating three separate levels stepping down to the proposed swimming pool. While the size of the deck would increase, given the size of the lot this would not have a detrimental impact on overall lot coverage. The deck, as designed, also meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20B. Staff would note that the new deck, as with the existing should be incorporated into the primary residence in the least invasive methods possible to ensure that the historic fabric is not damaged. The Applicant shall incorporate the proposed deck into the primary residence in the least invasive methods possible to ensure that the historic fabric is not damaged. The Applicant will install the deck using the least invasive methods possible to ensure that the historic fabric of the primary residence is not damaged.

Swimming Pool Installation

The Applicant proposes construction of a new swimming pool directly to the rear of the primary residence. The swimming pool would be accessed by the new proposed decking. Sec. 16-20B.006 (2)(b) states, "Swimming pool and accessory buildings, tennis courts and the like [permitted] not less than 25 feet from side or rear lot line." The proposed placement of the swimming pool (10 feet from the lot line) would not meet the requirements of the zoning code. CA3-23-213 is a variance application to allow a reduction in the left and right yard setbacks to accommodate the proposed garage and swimming pool. As Staff's recommendation is approval of the proposed variance (CA3-23-213), Staff does not have concerns with the design of the proposed swimming pool. In addition, Staff would note that the addition of the proposed vehicular and pedestrian gate, as well as the granite wall surrounding the pool, provide a double layer of protection from a life safety perspective.

Front Steps

The scope of work regarding the front steps is not entirely clear. On the application the work is proposed as full replacement, but on the plans it is noted that they will be repaired. The existing steps are concrete, and it is not clear to Staff if they are original. Staff notes in the photos provided that there are minor cracks in the steps, but there does not appear to be major deterioration or a need for full replacement of the steps. Based on the submitted photos, it appears that repair and sealing of the steps would suffice based on the apparent deterioration. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the steps.

Window Replacement

In addition to new windows to be installed on the proposed garage, the Applicant proposes replacement of 24 windows on the primary residence. While their locations are noted in the windows schedule on the plans, these locations are not keyed on the submitted elevations, so Staff is unclear as to precisely where these windows would be installed or the reason for replacement. It is also not clear if all these windows are being custom built or if they are being procured from a particular supplier. The Applicant will clarify the specifications of the proposed replacement windows. The Applicant will supply a keyed window schedule on either the elevations or photos of the existing house, clearly illustrating which windows will be replaced.

Fencing & Gates

The Applicant proposes installation of 5-foot vertical picket metal fencing with granite posts to enclose the rear yard, including vehicular and pedestrian gates. The vehicular gate would be positioned across the existing original porte cochere. The pedestrian gate would be installed on the right elevation. Staff finds that the proposed fencing meets the requirements of the zoning code; however, the proposed granite posts do not. Sec. 16-20B.003 (7)(c) states, “Fences and walls shall be constructed of vertical iron pickets, brick, stucco, vertical wood pickets, or coated chain link.” The proposed fence design must be altered to use entirely metal, or the posts changed to brick, to meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant will revise the proposed fence design to remove the granite posts. Staff would also note that the installation of the vehicular gate should be undertaken in the least invasive method to minimize impact to the original porte cochere. The Applicant will install the vehicular gate using the least invasive methods possible to ensure that the historic fabric of the porte cochere is not damaged.

Site Work

The Applicant proposes removal of the existing retaining walls which cascade from the rear of the primary residence towards the back of the property. There are currently four of these walls and a connecting walkway present on the property. Based on the proposed site plan, one larger stone gravity wall, with access stairs, would be the only replacement, located at the top of the sloped rear yard. Staff is not clear if the proposed changes would be sufficient to prevent problematic erosion if the additional walls are removed, given the grade change on the property. It is not clear if additional grading of the land would occur to prevent this. The Applicant will clarify the degree of grading and if erosion control has been considered in the proposed design. Further, there are numerous mature trees present in the area where this site work is proposed. The Applicant will undertake all proposed site work in such a way that does not damage critical root zones.

Driveway

The existing driveway is non-historic. In 2017 the property was subdivided to create 929 Springdale Road NE. At that time the original drive was removed (because it crossed the property boundaries, now subdivided) and the current drive, which circles the house was installed. The proposal would shorten the drive, removing the entire portion behind the primary residence and on the right elevation, in favor of a shorter drive that enters on the left elevation, goes under the porte cochere, directly to a turning court in front of the proposed new garage. Staff is fully in support of this proposal, as the circular drive has been altered significantly from original circulation pattern. The proposed alterations, which not exactly replicating the original drive pattern, due to the subdivision of the lot, will increase conformity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will only demolish the existing garage if approval of CA3-23-211, changing the contributing status of the accessory structure, is approved by the Urban Design Commission (UDC).

- 2.) The Applicant will install the deck using the least invasive methods possible to ensure that the historic fabric of the primary residence is not damaged.
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the steps.
- 4.) The Applicant will clarify the specifications of the proposed replacement windows.
- 5.) The Applicant will supply a keyed window schedule on either the elevations or photos of the existing house, clearly illustrating which windows will be replaced.
- 6.) The Applicant will revise the proposed fence design to remove the granite posts.
- 7.) The Applicant will install the vehicular gate using the least invasive methods possible to ensure that the historic fabric of the porte cochere is not damaged.
- 8.) The Applicant will clarify the degree of grading and if erosion control has been considered in the proposed design.
- 9.) The Applicant will undertake all proposed site work in such a way that does not damage critical root zones.
- 10.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

Variance CA3-23-213

The requested variance is to reduce the left side yard setback from 25' (required) to 8.5' (proposed) and the right yard setback from 25' (required) to 10' (proposed).

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 shape of the lot and the split jurisdiction of the lot, which was annexed into the City of Atlanta on January 1, 2023. The unusual dimensions of the lot, which limit the buildable area are due to the subdivision of the original parcel in 2017. This subdivision left 923 Springdale Road NE, with all features now non-conforming, per the zoning code for the City of Atlanta. Because the property was originally in Dekalb County, outside city limits, where this zoning code did not apply the subdivision had not previously created a hardship as the zoning code for Dekalb County applied.

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 inability to make improvements based on the application of the zoning code as applied to the now subdivided, and considerable reduced lot dimensions as well as unusual shape which cuts in. The Applicant additionally cites the presence of mature trees which are protected by the City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance. To relocate the proposed improvements to the rear of the lot, within the 40-foot buildable area imposed by the zoning code would require the removal of these trees.

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

The Applicant cites the dimensions of the lot, annexation into the city, and presence of protected mature trees.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the

purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that the project will not negatively impact the public good or impair the purposes or intent of the zoning ordinance, and that in reduction in the side yard setback would not cause a visual impact, due to the presence of the port cochere and lack of visibility from the public right of way, and that the placement of the proposed swimming pool and garage both replicate the existing non-conforming setback of the historic garage.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting a variance. Staff is satisfied by the responses given in which an unnecessary hardship was created by the subdivision of the lot, annexation in the City of Atlanta, and application of the Tree Ordinance. Staff finds that the application of the setback requirements of the Druid Hills Landmark District, would create an unnecessary hardship and as such, Staff supports the requested variance. Staff would note that the construction of both the proposed garage and swimming pool (Ca3-23-212) and the variance to reduce the proposed side yard setbacks (CA3-23-213) is contingent on the approval of CA3-23-211, and application to change the contributing status of the existing original garage located on the property. As such, Staff places a conditional approval of the variance to reduce the left side yard setback from 25' (required) to 8.5' (proposed) and the right yard setback from 25' (required) to 10' (proposed) on approval of application CA3-32-211.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions (CA3-23-213):

1.) Staff places a conditional approval of the variance to reduce the left side yard setback from 25' (required) to 8.5' (proposed) and the right yard setback from 25' (required) to 10' (proposed) on approval of application CA3-32-211.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Janide Prince
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

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Doug Young
Director of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 920 King Grant

APPLICATION: CA4PH-23-207

MEETING DATE: July 12, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1963

Property Location Corner of Kings Grant and Eleanor

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No, none known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

Type IV and In-Rem process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a threat to public health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the Application. In this case, the property has gone through the In-Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta's Office of Code Compliance.

Notices were sent via registered mail to the owner on record on March 28, 2022, regarding the public hearing that was held on April 28, 2022. At the November 5, 2020, hearing, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. In looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, no one interested in the property was presented at the meeting.

The Applicant is not the owner of the property, and the In-Rem process does not allow for the City or a third-party to repair, renovate, or sell the property. Staff finds that the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values do not apply in In-Rem cases where the City is the Applicant but can be useful for informational purposes. Staff finds that the most relevant questions in In-Rem cases are as follows:

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists; and,

The Applicant did not specifically answer this question, they have provided documentation regarding their analysis of the property. The inspection of the property noted that the cost to repair structure would be \$25,444.42 and the value of the home based on Tax records was \$534.98(2021) and \$251.42 (2022). Photographs of the property which were taken before the In-Rem board meeting have been provided and show that the carport area is missing, the roof framing is severely damaged.

Staff finds that an imminent threat to public health and safety has been established.

2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.

The Applicant has not provided a response to this question. The materials submitted with the Application appear to show that the property owner was not responsive to the notices. Further, as noted above, the In-Rem process does not allow the City or another third-party to repair, renovate, or sell the property.

Staff reasons that because the owner has not replied to the notices and the City hands are tied with seeking a third-party to repair, renovate or is prohibited in selling the property no other alternatives can be sought to rectify this situation.

July 12, 2023

pg. 3

Photographs and documentation

Photos provided of the house, do show a severely damaged carport with the roof that is collapsing and could be very dangerous the public if accessed.

The Office of Code Compliance estimates that the structure is 408% deteriorated based on the value of the property verses the cost of repairs.

Staff findings

Staff leans on the fact that the City cannot repair, renovate, the property is not up for sale and the owner has not responded to any of the notices possibly to help mitigate this issue, the most reasonable way is to demolish the existing house. Staff is torn with the demolition of a historic property that is so sufficient to City of Atlanta. It appears from the photographs provided by the Applicant and the internet, that the house appears to be in good conditions. However, without any interior photos, it is difficult for Staff to determine if there are structural problems along with the exterior listed with the house even though the outside looks stable.

Staff finds that demolishing an historic house, is never easy but in this case the threat to the public good outweighs retaining a house that probably is going to further decline because there is no foreseeable alternative to getting it repaired, especially since the owner has not responded.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File