



# 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](http://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:** 445 Atwood  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-220  
**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location** East of Lucile and West of Greenwich.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alteration and Site work

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20G.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Stop Work order was issued on March 25, 2023

**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.

## **PROPOSAL**

The Applicant proposes the following alterations and site work to the property: front door replacement, fence installation, walkway update and driveway installation.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### ***Front Door Replacement***

The current door is a solid wood door. The Applicant is proposing a 3 lite-panel wood mahogany door. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. It meets the District's regulations.

## **SITE WORK**

### ***Fence installation***

The Applicant proposes a 6ft vertical privacy fence with a gate. Staff are not concerned with this proposal; however, it appears the gate is showing as 7ft. The gate can only be 6ft. Staff recommends the gate only be 6ft and the Applicant clearly identify it as such.

### ***Walkway***

The Applicant proposes to removal a non-compliant gravel walkway and replace the material with concrete. Staff have no problem with the replacement material. While the width of the walkway appears to be excessive, making the walkway appear more as a parking pad from research it appears this maybe the original width because other houses appear the same. To be certain, Staff recommends the Applicant comply with the District regulations which states, "The original layout, patterns and paving materials of sidewalks, driveways, alleyways, curbs and streets shall be retained to comply with the District regulation. If this is the original walkway

### ***Driveway***

The Applicant proposes a driveway on the side of the house. Staff recommend the driveway only be 10-ft wide and 20 feet past the front of the house, to comply to the District regulations.

**Since turning in the plans, the Applicant has decided to remove the driveway proposal. Therefore, Staff is removing the recommendation.**

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The gate on the fence shall only be up to 6ft in height and the Applicant must clarify that on the site plans or where else it is noted, per Sec.16-20.006 (14)(c);
2. The walkway shall retain its original layout pattern, per Sec.16-20G.006(12)(a) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE

Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS

MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

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

DOUG YOUNG

Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1089 Arlington Avenue SW

**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-226

**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 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:** Bungalow

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20M

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Yes, 21CAP-00001784, CA2-22-542 (denial without prejudice)

**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 received stop-work order 21CAP-00001784 on December 9, 2021, for unpermitted construction of a side landing and painting of previously unpainted brick and stone masonry surfaces. The Applicant submitted an application for these violations in October of 2022, CA2-22-542. That application was denied without prejudice on January 25, 2023, due to lack of response from the Applicant. Though the current application only addresses the side landing, the additional violations have still not been addressed and must be brought into compliance.

### **Side Landing**

The Applicant removed an existing non-conforming rear deck due to deterioration. The previous deck wrapped around the house to the right elevation, where there is a side door. The Applicant reconstructed a landing and stairs to access this door. The site plan illustrates that this stair and landing is four feet in width, and that the setback between this feature and the property line is 4 feet 6 inches. The Applicant has not provided data supporting this setback. Per Sec. 16-20M.012 (2), "Side yards shall either: i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; ii) conform to the setback of the existing building; iii) conform to any existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks previously established by a majority of the contributing buildings of like use on that side of the block; or iv) be of a width of not less than seven feet."

The first criteria does not apply, as there is an existing structure. The proposed setback does not meet the requirements of ii) as the setback of the building is 8 feet 6 inches on the right elevation and this feature is a projection outside that footprint. The feature also does not meet iv) as it is less than 7 feet. To permit the retention of this feature under this criterion, a variance to reduce the side yard setback would be required.

No data has been submitted for iii). The Applicant will supply compatibility data for contributing properties on the block face, establishing that the proposed right yard setback meets the compatibility rule for existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks.

### **Painted Brick and Stone**

The Applicant has painted all brick and stone surfaces present on the structure. Per Sec. 16-20M.017 (1) (b), "Alterations and additions shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property." Painting of unpainted brick and stone is damaging to the historic material and in direct violation of the zoning code. The Applicant will remove the paint from all masonry surfaces using the gentlest methods available to restore the historic materials.

CA2-23-226 1089 Arlington Avenue SW

July 26, 2023

Page 3 of 3

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant will supply compatibility data for contributing properties on the block face, establishing that the proposed right yard setback meets the compatibility rule for existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks.
- 2.) The Applicant will remove the paint from all masonry surfaces using the gentlest methods available to restore the historic materials.
- 3.) 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

JAHNEE PRINCE  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
DIRECTOR  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 333 Nelson  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-227  
**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Caslteberry Hill Landmark District (Subarea 1)

**Other Zoning:** None

**Date of Construction:** 2008

**Property Location:** Corner of Centennial Olympic Park Drive and Nelson with Chapel Street and Nelson Street corner.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Signage

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20N

**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 Chapter 20 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance and Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code.

**SIGNAGE**

*Nelson Street—Residential Condo Signage*

The Nelson Street proposal is 144 inches to 95 inches in width and 8 inches to 14 inches in length. It will perpendicularly project downwards on a slant from the canopy at its edge. Staff is not concerned if this proposal.

*Chapel Street—Parking Garage Signage*

The proposed signage on the parking garage will be placed in the transom area below the second floor above the first floor entrance as required. The directional signages will hang 10 inches below the building title. Two directional signages will be 120 inches in width one will be 80 inches in width and one will be 52 inches in width. Staff is not concerned with this 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

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 26, 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 September 9, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow for proper advertisement of a variance application.



**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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

DOUG YOUNG

Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1176 Avon Avenue SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-157

**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** South side of Avon Avenue SW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Bungalow

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20M

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, Deferred June 14, June 28

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Yes, 21CAP-00001459

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The building permit submitted in January did not have an application with an estimate or cost of work attached. Given that the stop-work order was preventing that work from taking place, the

CA3-23-157 1176 Avon Avenue SW

July 26, 2023

Page 3 of 3

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

The Applicant has submitted two estimates for the proposed work but has informed Staff they are waiting for additional estimates. As such, Staff recommends deferral of the project to allow time for the Applicant to obtain the additional estimates.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until August 9, 2023 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](http://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 26, 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 scope 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. [The Applicant has submitted brick to repair the material which was removed.](#)
- 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). The Applicant has noted that there are different existing window styles (for example a fixed window with a transom above). Staff would still request that these depictions be accurate, but understands there was more than one style present.

- 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

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 26, 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

CA3-23-201 262 Edgewood Avenue NE

July 26, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant 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 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](http://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 26, 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. *Updated text in Italic font.*

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** *Approval with conditions.*

**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.

*The Applicant has submitted revised plans which show a rear addition that is no taller than the existing structure, and a re-worked front stoop. Staff finds that the new proposal would meet the first of the two criteria for reviewing alterations and additions to a historic structure in the District.*

Development Controls

*The subject property is a corner lot with frontages along both Oakland Dr. and Richland Rd. The proposal would meet the District regulation requirements for side and rear yard setbacks.*

*The site contains an existing 29' wide driveway off Richland Rd. While the site plan does not note repairs or replacement of the driveway, Staff finds that the condition of the area is such that replacement is likely. As the District regulations place a 10 foot width maximum on any driveway, the existing feature could not be replaced in kind without a variance. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant detail their plans for the existing driveway. Staff further recommends that any replacement driveway meet the District regulation 10 foot maximum width.*

*Per the site plan, the total lot coverage would be 3,762 sf which is stated as being 50% of the lot area. In measuring the lot, Staff finds that the lot measures to 7,435 sf, which means that the allowable lot coverage would be a total of 3717.5 sf. As such, Staff finds that the proposal is currently over the allowable lot coverage by 44.5 sf. While this metric is not subject to a review by the Commission, Staff would note that the overage would result in issues in the zoning review for the project's building permit. As such, Staff recommends the proposed lot coverage be reduced to meet the underlying R-4 requirements.*

*Per the plans, the total heated space of the new structure will be 2365 sf, or 31% of the lot area. Staff finds that this meets the District regulations.*

#### Architectural Standards

*The Applicant is proposing Replacement of the front porch columns, hand rail, steps, and roof. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission and the Applicant, that the existing elevations incorrectly show wood columns, railing, and wood stairs. Based on the condition of the porch ceiling, Staff finds there is likely to be structural damage to the porch roof that will need to be addressed. As such, Staff has no concerns with its replacement. However, in looking at the photographs of the property, Staff finds that the decorative metal columns and handrails are likely original to the structure. Staff finds that replacing these features with wood would not be consistent with the existing architectural character. As such, Staff recommends that any replacement columns and railing be period appropriate decorative metal similar to the existing railing and columns. Likewise, Staff does not support the replacement of the existing masonry porch steps with wood steps. Staff recommends that the existing porch steps be retained or replaced in-kind with regards to material and overall design.*

*The windows on the structure are non-original vinyl replacements. Several of the windows on the sides, and one window on the front, have been replaced with horizontal slider windows. As such, Staff has no concerns with their replacement with new vinyl windows. Staff would note that the existing elevations do not accurately reflect the placement of the windows on the structure, particularly on the front façade where both window unit groupings are shown as horizontal slider windows.*

*The District regulations would require new windows to match the size and shape of the original window opening. Given the remaining evidence on this structure, and that of neighboring structures on the block face, Staff finds that the original windows were likely to be either horizontal slider windows or smaller double hung windows. As such, Staff recommends that any existing slider window be replaced with a new slider window or a smaller double hung window matching the size of the existing opening except where otherwise required for egress requirements.*

*Regarding the window style, only one house on the block face (882 Oakland Dr) contains what appear to be historic windows. These windows have a 4 over 4 lite pattern that is repeated on the smaller slider or double hung windows. As such, Staff recommends all double hung windows contain a 4 over 4 lite pattern. Staff further recommends that any slider window contain lite divisions that simulate a 4 over 4 double hung lite pattern. Lastly, Staff recommends that any simulated lite divisions be dimensional and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.*

*The left side façade of the structure contains several horizontal transom style windows. Staff recommends that these windows be replaced on the plans with new windows that match the size and style of the other new windows proposed on the home.*

*The structure is currently clad in aluminum siding. No information on whether original siding is in place on the structure has been provided. As such, Staff recommends that photographic evidence of any original siding under the aluminum siding be sent to staff for review. Staff further recommends that any original*

*wood siding be retained and repaired or replaced in-kind. Staff further recommends that if no original siding is present after the aluminum siding is removed, that any replacement cement fiber siding be smooth faced.*

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. *The Applicant shall detail their plans for the existing driveway;*
2. *Any replacement driveway shall meet the District regulation 10 foot maximum width, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4)(c);*
3. *The proposed lot coverage shall be reduced to meet the underlying R-4 requirements;*
4. *any replacement columns and railing be period appropriate decorative metal similar to the existing railing and columns, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);*
5. *The existing porch steps shall be retained or replaced in-kind with regards to material and overall design, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);*
6. *Any existing slider window be replaced with a new slider window or a smaller double hung window matching the size of the existing opening except where otherwise required for egress requirements, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o)(2)(a);*
7. *All double hung windows shall contain a 4 over 4 lite pattern, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(0)(2)(c);*
8. *Any slider window shall contain lite divisions that simulate a 4 over 4 double hung lite pattern, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n)(2);*
9. *Any simulated lite divisions shall be dimensional and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n)(2);*
10. *The horizontal or transom style windows shall be replaced on the plans with new windows that match the style and size of the other new windows proposed on the home, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);*
11. *Photographic evidence of any original siding under the aluminum siding be sent to staff for review, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);*
12. *Any original wood siding be retained and repaired or replaced in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);*
13. *If no original siding is present after the aluminum siding is removed, that any replacement cement fiber siding be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q); and,*
14. *Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.*

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

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 26, 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 simply 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

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](http://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 26, 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 two 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 existing steps are not original to the home. They have been altered and do not meet current code. The Applicant proposes to restore the steps to the original dimensions, eliminating the post-construction alterations to improve safety. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

### **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. The Applicant has noted and provided evidence that these windows proposed for replacement are not original to the structure, and many have been retrofitted with infill to make them fit in larger openings. The Applicant notes that a manufacturer has not yet been identified for the windows. Staff will need to see specification for these windows prior to final approval of the plans. The Applicant will clarify the specifications of the proposed replacement windows.

### **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. The Applicant has provided documentation regarding where and the degree of grading which would need to occur. The Applicant has also noted that all work will be undertaken within the existing City of Atlanta guidelines for site development and the municipal tree ordinance.

### **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 specifications of the proposed replacement windows.
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the proposed fence design to remove the granite posts.
- 5.) 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.
- 6.) 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

CA3-23-212 & 213 923 Springdale Road NE

July 26, 2023

Page 6 of 6

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

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:** 1075 White Oak Avenue SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-223

**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** North side of White Oak Avenue SW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Tudor Revival

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations & addition

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20M

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Yes, 20CAP-00000439

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

The Applicant proposes a rear addition, deck, stoop alterations, a new front door, re-roof, complete siding replacement, complete window replacement, and site work. Some of these alterations have already been completed, unpermitted, including reconfiguration and enclosure of a portion of the front stoop, removal of a window and moving the front door, partial repaving of the driveway, and reconstruction of a retaining wall.

### **Addition and Deck**

The Applicant proposes a 474.7 square foot addition to the rear of the primary structure and a 130 square foot deck. The addition would have a CMU foundation with cementitious siding above. Per Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(r)(10), “Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete, or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.” The Applicant will revise the proposed foundation to be finished with a parge coat of stucco to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(r)(10). The Applicant proposes use of cementitious siding on the addition. As discussed below Staff has determined that the appropriate replacement siding material for the building should be wood siding. The Applicant will utilize wood siding, consistent with that to be used on the historic structure as exterior cladding on the addition.

Staff notes that the only proposed windows on the addition are on the rear elevation. The lack of fenestration patterning on the side elevations is not in keeping with the historic patterning present on the original house. The Applicant will add windows to the side elevations for consistency of fenestration to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(o)(2)(b).

### **Stoop Reconfiguration & Front Door**

The existing stoop has been enclosed without a permit. The original design of the house had a covered stoop to the left of the chimney at the base of the gabled portion of the façade. This stoop has a roofline that was a continuation of the curved gable (which is still extant) and was supported by a square wooden post. The front door, originally beneath the stoop was removed, and a window, to the right of the chimney was removed and the front door placed in this location. The proposed design keeps these unpermitted alterations. Per Sec. 16-20.009 (2), “The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.” The Applicant will revise the proposed design to remediate the unpermitted alterations to the front façade. The Applicant will not enclose the historic stoop and return the features which were removed to their historic specifications. The Applicant will return the front door to its original location. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement front door. The Applicant will restore the original window opening to the right of the chimney to its original dimensions.

### **Window Reconfiguration and Replacement**

The Applicant has noted that there are no windows extant on the structure. Though no photos have been provided showing this (the window openings are all boarded over), it appears the windows were removed unpermitted. The Applicant proposes full window replacement with vinyl one-over-one windows, with the exception of the left elevation where two new windows are proposed. One window would replace an existing door. The other window would be a new transom window. Staff has significant concerns with the proposals. The historic windows present on the house were not one-over-one windows. Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o) states, “(1) Replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.(2) The compatibility rule shall apply to the following aspects of fenestration: (a).The size and shape of individual window openings.(b).The overall pattern of fenestration as it relates to the building façade.(c).The style of the individual window.

The proposed window style does not match the historic style, which was predominantly six-over-six double hung, with a four-over-four window of the gable of the front elevation. The Applicant will revise the proposed window style to match what was historically present on the house with muntins that are permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement windows. The proposed door replacement on the side elevation is also not permitted by code. The Applicant will remove the proposed window from the left elevation and retain the historic door. The proposed transom window is not vertical in orientation and does not meet the compatibility rule or match the size and shape of original window openings. The Applicant will remove the proposed transom window from the left elevation.

### **Siding Replacement**

The Applicant proposes full replacement of the existing non-compliant vinyl siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal as the siding is badly deteriorated and does not meet district regulations. Staff is concerned with the proposed replacement material. The Applicant proposes uses of cementitious siding on the structure. Per Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(q), “Subject to the compatibility rule, wood or smooth-finish cementitious lap siding, wood shingles, brick, stone, and true stucco are permissible building materials for the façades of the principal structure. Corrugated metal, aluminum siding, and vinyl siding are not permitted.” The Applicant has submitted some photos for compatibility data for the following addresses:

- 1050 White Oak Avenue SW
- 1058 White Oak Avenue SW
- 1070 White Oak Avenue SW
- 1071 White Oak Avenue SW
- 1085 White Oak Avenue SW
- 1089 White Oak Avenue SW
- 1101 White Oak Avenue SW

All these structures utilize cementitious siding. 1050, 1058, and 1070 White Oak all cannot be used for compatibility data because they are not on the same block face. 1089 and 1101 White Oak



cannot be used for compatibility data because they are non-contributing to the district, constructed in 2002 and 1971, respectively.

Of the remaining properties, 1071 White Oak and 1085 White Oak, both are contributing, but only 1085 was permitted to have cementitious siding per UDC approval.

Staff has supplied a chart detailing the contributing/non-contributing status of the structures on the block face, and details regarding the siding materials. Wood siding is the material which predominates, as it is present on 5 of the 10 contributing structures. Further, Staff notes that the wood siding universally has a narrow reveal of 4 inches. As such, the use of cementitious siding is not appropriate because it is not supported by compatibility data. The Applicant will not utilize cementitious siding. The Applicant will utilize wood siding with a 4-inch reveal.

Address	Contributing/Non-Contributing	Siding Material
1033 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Wood
1039 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Wood
1041 White Oak Avenue SW	Vacant	n/a
1047 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Brick & Stucco
1053 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Wood
1057 White Oak Avenue SW	Non-Contributing	n/a
1063 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Cementitious siding (not UDC approved)
1067 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Wood
1071 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Cementitious siding (not UDC approved)
1075 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Vinyl (not permitted)
1079 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Aluminum (not permitted)
1083 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Wood
1085 White Oak Avenue SW	Contributing	Cementitious siding (approved)
1089 White Oak Avenue SW	Non-Contributing	n/a
1091 White Oak Avenue SW	Vacant	n/a
1095 White Oak Avenue SW	Non-Contributing	n/a
1101 White Oak Avenue SW	Non-Contributing	n/a

### Site Work

The Appears to have been unpermitted partial repaving of the shared drive and reconstruction of a retaining wall, including new stairs, as part of the unpermitted work. Staff notes that the new portion of the retaining wall is marked on the site plan, but not the existing front portion. The Applicant will add and label the existing retaining wall to the site plan. The new retaining wall also does not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20.013 (2)(m) which states, “The compatibility rule shall apply to the design and height of portions of retaining walls located in a front yard or half-depth front yard that are visible from a public street. Such retaining walls shall be faced with

stone, brick, or smooth stucco. The compatibility rule notwithstanding, at no point of such retaining wall shall exceed four feet in height.” The retaining wall is unfinished CMU. The Applicant will cover the new retaining wall with a parge coat of stucco to bring the feature into compliance with Sec. 16-20.013 (2)(m). Staff would note that no additional work can be approved on the drive without a separate application by the adjoining property owner. The application notes that a rear parking pad will be removed for the construction of the addition. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 23, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:**

- 1.) The Applicant will revise the proposed foundation to be finished with a parge coat of stucco to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(r)(10).
- 2.) The Applicant will utilize wood siding, consistent with that to be used on the historic structure as exterior cladding on the addition.
- 3.) The Applicant will add windows to the side elevations for consistency of fenestration to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(o)(2)(b).
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to remediate the unpermitted alterations to the front façade.
- 5.) The Applicant will not enclose the historic stoop and return the features which were removed to their historic specifications.
- 6.) The Applicant will return the front door to its original location.
- 7.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement front door.
- 8.) The Applicant will restore the original window opening to the right of the chimney to its original dimensions and design.
- 9.) The Applicant will revise the proposed window style to match what was historically present on the house with muntins that are permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.
- 10.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement windows. The proposed door replacement on the side elevation is also not permitted by code.
- 11.) The Applicant will remove the proposed window from the left elevation and retain the historic door.
- 12.) The Applicant will remove the proposed transom window from the left elevation.
- 13.) The Applicant will not utilize cementitious siding.
- 14.) The Applicant will utilize wood siding with a 4-inch reveal.
- 15.) The Applicant will add and label the existing retaining wall to the site plan.
- 16.) The Applicant will cover the new retaining wall with a parge coat of stucco to bring the feature into compliance with Sec. 16-20.013 (2)(m).
- 17.) 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 225 Hamilton E Holmes (Frederick Douglass High School)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-224  
**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1968

**Property Location:** East block face of Hamilton E Holmes Dr.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** N/A

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Institutional / School

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Site work

**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-23-224 for 225 Hamilton E Holmes Dr (Frederick Douglass High School)

July 26, 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 the addition of new infrastructure at an existing baseball/athletic field on the site, including new dug-outs, batting cages, and warm up areas. While the site will be visible from the public right-of-way, Staff has no concerns with the location of the proposed changes as they are directly adjacent to the existing athletic field infrastructure. Additionally, Staff has no concerns with the materials, design, or layout of the proposal

**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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 601 Beckwith St. (Oglethorpe Elementary School)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-257  
**MEETING DATE:** July 26, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1958

**Property Location:** West block face of Beckwith St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** N/A

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Institutional / School

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Addition

**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-23-257 for 601 Beckwith St. (Oglethorpe Elementary School)

July 26, 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 the addition of a new secure entrance vestibule along with various ADA and mechanical improvements. In general Staff has no concerns with the ADA or mechanical changes. Regarding the addition, Staff has not been provided with elevations of the proposed structure for review. As such, Staff would suggest that the addition utilize brick as the primary façade material with fenestration matching the design of the fenestration on the existing building. Alternatively, Staff would support a design that is heavily fenestrated, while still including some brick, to indicate the addition is contemporary.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Confirm the Delivery of Comments at the meeting.**

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File