



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE

Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS

MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

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

DOUG YOUNG

Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 281 Peters Street NW

**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-177

**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1981

**Property Location:** West side of Peters Street NW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the September 13, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission when the case will be heard concurrently with Variance CA3-23-277

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the September 13, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow for legal advertisement of Variance CA3-23-277.**

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  
Interim Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 500 Hopkins  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-202  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023, deferred since July 12, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1912

**Property Location** East block

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** A BB expired 2/2/23 on renovation of the house which included an approval with conditions (CA2-21-186) was granted from the UDC on 4/6/2021. Prior to this, there were several SWOs on the property.

**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.

## **Revisions are in RED.**

### **STAFF NOTES**

This house was reviewed and approved in 2021. However, this review will stand alone because the work for the 2021 approval never began. There may be similarities that were stated in the 2021 recommendations that will be consistent with the 2023 recommendations.

The 2021 recommendations are as such,

1. The windows have been removed from the structure. Staff recommends all original window openings shall be retained, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(a).
2. The siding shall be replaced with wood siding matching the dimensions and reveal of the original siding, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(d).
3. The gable shake shall be retained, per Sec.16-20.009.
4. Any repairs or replacement to the gable shake shall be permitted only after photographic documentation has been provided to Staff for the review and approval, per Sec.16-20.009.
5. The front door shall be replaced with a new wood door, meeting the District regulations, per Sec.20G.006(3)(c).
6. The transom and side lite divisions shall be removed from the plans, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(a).
7. The existing chimneys shall be retained, per Sec.16-20G.006(16)(a).
8. The Applicant shall detail their plans to retain the chimney in-place after the fireplaces are removed. Per Sec. Sec.16-20G.006(16)(a).
9. The ridgeline of the new addition shall be lowered 6 inches to allow proper interpretation of the original geometry of the structure, per Sec.16-20.009.
10. All rear corner boards shall be retained in place on their respective façades to allow proper differentiation between the existing structure and new addition, per Sec.16-20.009

### **PLANS**

The Applicant has listed the incorrect zoning for this proposal. It is not R-5 but Historic Westend with an underlining zoning of R4-A. Staff recommend the Applicant make this correction. As well, the Applicant has not supplied the lot coverage or floor area ratio that is required for R4-A. Staff recommends the Applicant check the numbers to ensure the proposal meets the FAR and lot coverage of the District.

**The Applicant has changed the zoning to R-4B but should read R-4A**

### **ADDITIONS**

The Applicant proposes to add 986 sqft of livable space in the basement. Staff are not concerned with this proposal **if** the Applicant meets FAR, and lot coverage as stated.

**This recommendation stands.**

### ***Siding***

On the addition, the Applicant proposes cementitious siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. However, Staff recommend the siding be smoothed-faced as required.

**The Applicant has changed the proposal to have 4 ½ reveal wood siding. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.**

### ***Roofline***

On the addition in the rear, the Applicant proposes a small gable roof with a 12/8 pitch that matches, the original roofline. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**This recommendation stands.**

## **ALTERATIONS**

### ***Windows***

The drawn windows are not a true representation of what originally on the house. The inconsistencies are as follows:

- On the front left façade, the original window pattern is a casement style window. The Applicant is proposing three single windows with one double window.
  - **The Applicant is trying to show what is casement style window.**
- On the front right façade, the original window pattern is a double window. The Applicant is proposing two single windows.
  - **The Applicant has made the change. Staff are not concerned.**
- On the left elevation, the front window is now proposed from a single window to a double window.
  - **The Applicant has made the change. Staff are not concerned.**
- The window patterns are one-over-one with a prairie style lite divisions on the top. The new proposal is showing one-over-one only.
  - **The Applicant has made the change. Staff are not concerned.**

Staff recommends all listed inconsistencies be corrected by the Applicant to be consistent with the District regulations which states, all original windows shall be retained. Staff also recommend the Applicant install the single front window on the side elevation and install the previously approved prairie style lite divisions. Previous research indicates the prairie style windows were the original style. Also, Staff recommends if simulated divided lights are used, they be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

**The Applicant is showing the prairie style windows. The recommendations for the divided lights are still recommended.**

### ***Siding***

The Applicant has proposed wood siding on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The Applicant has not specified the dimensions and reveal of the wood siding that must match the original. Staff recommends the wood siding match the original wood in reveal and style.

**The Applicant has specific 4 ½ dimension as the reveal. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.**

***Gable Material***

The Applicant is proposing cedar shake in the gable. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. As before, Staff had recommended the gable shake be retained and only repair or replace in kind after photographic evidence has been provided. Staff still stands on this recommendation.

***Roof Brackets and Exposed Roof Rafters***

The roof brackets are not shown on the plans. The original house had 9 roof brackets. Staff recommend those roof brackets be retained and shown on the plans.

**The Applicant has made these change.**

On the original side elevations, the roof rafters were exposed. The Applicant has not shown this on the plans. Staff recommends the exposed roof rafters be retained and shown on the plans.

**The Applicant has made these change.**

***Front door***

Upon research, the original front door configuration of side lights. The Applicant has removed the side lights that needs to be retained. Staff recommends the side lights are retained and shown on the plans. The Applicant shows a door that appears to have a rectangular light configuration. While this maybe the case, Staff recommends, the Applicant note on the plans the District's requirement that the door be made of wood and contains a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to scale, size and proportion placement, and style to original doors with that block face or that was on the house.

**The Applicant has made the change.**

***Chimneys***

There are no chimneys shown on the plans. This is problematic, there are two chimneys on the original houses and those chimneys must be retained. Staff recommends the Applicant retain both chimneys in their original locations and those chimneys can not be painted.

**The Applicant has made the change.**

***Steps and Cheek wall***

It appears the Applicant is retaining the existing brick cheek walls and steps. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

**SITE WORK**

***Deck***

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall correct the zoning, to R-4A, per Sec.16-20.009:
- 2.

3. Any simulated divided lights shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(d);
4. If the gable material is to be replaced or repaired, photographic evidence shall be provided to Staff before replacement, per Sec. 16-20.009.
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1030 Oakland Drive SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-236  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 2006

**Property Location:** East side of Oakland Drive SW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** n/a

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Retroactive window replacement

**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, 23CAP-00000809

**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 23CAP-00000809, on May 22, 2023, for unpermitted removal of windows on the house. In their application the Applicant indicates that three windows were removed and replaced, the elevations show that the plan is to remove all the existing vinyl windows and replace them with wood windows. The application stated rear windows will be moved to different locations. The scope of work as presented is not entirely clear. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to which windows have already been removed and replaced, and which are proposed for replacement. The Applicant will submit detailed photographs of all windows proposed for replacement.

The application also states all “vinyl cladding” will be removed. It is not clear to Staff where this cladding is located. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to the vinyl cladding removal.

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

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to which windows have already been removed and replaced, and which are proposed for replacement.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit detailed photographs of all windows proposed for replacement.
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to the vinyl cladding removal.
- 4.) 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:** 896 Oakland Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-239  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1945

**Property Location** Corner of Richland and Oakland Drive

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** 5/23/23 a Stop Work was applied for substantial work without permits. The new Applicant is not charged with correcting unpermitted work done by the previous Applicant.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions

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

## **ALTERATIONS**

### **Porch Conversion**

The Applicant proposes to convert porch into 90 sqft livable heat space. The Applicant has not clearly shown FAR as been met. Lot coverage is not a concern here because the house is not moving. Staff recommend the Applicant provide calculations that show FAR and note that information on the plans.

### **Windows**

The Applicant proposes new metal clad windows to match the current windows. the original style windows on the house are showing steel casement windows. More problematic is the current windows are not the same size as the original windows. District regulations requires windows to remain the same size. And any new window must match in-kind. Staff recommends that original size of the windows to installed.

Since this is on a corner lot, so all four sides are visible from the public right away. The Applicant has proposed to add a transom window on the side. This is problematic to Staff. The proposed window isn't meeting District regulations requirements. Since this has two frontages, the windows must be vertical, and the added window should be governed by the compatibility standard. In this case, that would be matching other windows on the house. Staff recommend the Applicant install a window that match the other original windows in size and shape.

### **Siding**

The Applicant proposes removing the siding from the house. Research shows the current siding to be cementitious siding and the existing siding seem to have been asbestos siding, that was removed by the previous Applicant. Since asbestos is not a permitted material, Staff has no problem with removing the asbestos and it appears the cementitious is smoothed-faced. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the current siding.

### **Front Railings**

While the Applicant has not officially noted repair of the front porch railings, Staff has noticed the front stoop railings are not applied correctly. Staff recommend the railing be a two-part head construction and not side constructed as it shown on the plan and photos.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide FAR information and calculation and note them on the plans for the enclosed porch addition, per Sec.16-20M.013;
2. All windows shall match the original windows on the house in size and shape, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c);
3. The siding shall remain on the house which is smooth-face cementitious siding, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
4. The front porch railings shall be a two-part head construction per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i) and

5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKINS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Interim Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 255 Georgia Avenue SE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-051  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

**Other Zoning:** R-5

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** South side of Georgia Avenue SE.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Gabled-Wing Cottage

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Construction

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, deferred 4/12, 4/26, 5/10, 5/24, 6/14, 7/26

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** CA2-22-478, 22CAP-00001867, 22CAP-00001963

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Denial without Prejudice

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

In October of 2022, the Applicant came before the Commission for approval of façade alterations, including re-opening a porch which had been enclosed in the non-historic period, and removal of a non-compliant window also installed within the non-historic period. These alterations were approved with conditions under CA2-22-478 at the Urban Design Commission (UDC) hearing on November 9, 2022. The Applicant never received final approval from Staff, due to remaining outstanding conditions which had not been satisfied. There was additional proposed work to the structure, a rear addition, which was not taller than the existing ridgeline and would not be visible from the public right-of-way. As a result, this addition was not under the purview of the UDC. On December 4, 2022, the Applicant was in the process of constructing this rear addition when the foundation, rear, and side walls collapsed. As a result, 22CAP-00001867 was placed on the property for unsafe conditions, as the collapsed right wall of the structure was resting on the neighboring house. The Applicant then began total reconstruction of the house, without review or approval by the UDC, for which they were issued 22CAP-00001963 on December 28, 2022.

CA3-23-051 has been determined to cover new construction, due to the fact that only the front wall, enclosed porch, and portions of the original roof remain. The Applicant has stated that they intend to reconstruct the house to the exact previous dimensions. Staff has concerns with this proposal based on the submitted plans. Several concerns were raised regarding the accuracy of the plans during the review of CA2-22-478, and in reviewing the photos from code enforcement it appears that all interior load bearing walls, as well as far more of the roof and side structure were removed than was indicated on the plans, most likely a major contributing factor to the collapse. In looking at the plans, there are two rooflines, the front is a pyramidal roof, the rear is a hipped roof. On the elevations the front roof is not correctly depicted. The coversheet shows a roofline that appears to be sloppily hand-drawn in and does not have accurate or even slope on each side, while the actual elevations have not been corrected. Given the deficiencies that occurred using previously incorrect plans, Staff must insist on plans that are accurate in all aspects. The Applicant will submit plans accurately depicting all features proposed for the new construction. The Applicant will correct the roof form and include roof pitch on all roof planes on all elevations. The Applicant will annotate the elevations to show proposed materials, including dimensions of siding and trim.

The Applicant has not submitted any proposed materials to be utilized for the reconstruction. The proposed window to be utilized on the front elevation also is a remaining outstanding conditions of CA2-22-478. Given the massive material loss that resulted from the collapse of the historic home, Staff must have specification provided to determine if they meet district regulations. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials, siding, trim, windows, and doors which will be used for the new construction.

The submitted site plan also does not note any features other than the house. Staff wants to ensure that the site is accurately depicted, so that no additional historic features are lost during construction. The site plan should include all impervious surfaces, structures, and lot features. The Applicant will update the site plan to include all applicable site features.

**No new materials have been received or communication has been received from the property owner or their representatives in regards to this case, as such, Staff has recommended denial of the application without prejudice.**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice**

- 1.) The Applicant will submit plans accurately depicting all features proposed for the new construction. **The Applicant has submitted new updated plans.**
- 2.) The Applicant will correct the roof form and include roof pitch on all roof planes on all elevations. **The Applicant has submitted new updated plans.**
- 3.) The Applicant will annotate the elevations to show proposed materials, including dimensions of siding and trim. **The Applicant has submitted new updated plans.**
- 4.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed foundation materials. **The Applicant has noted that no new foundation materials will be installed.**
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed siding and trim. **The Applicant has provided specifications.**
- 6.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed windows and doors which will be used for the new construction. **The Applicant has provided specifications.**
- 7.) The Applicant will update the site plan to include all applicable site features. **The Applicant has provided specifications.**
- 8.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.



# 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:** August 9, 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)?:** Yes.

**07/26/2023 - Updated text in Bolded Arial 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. 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.*

**The updated plans show the total existing and proposed impervious surfaces would be 3,583 sf. Staff would note that there is a typo on the chart which states the "Total Impervious" incorrectly as 3777 sf. Staff recommends the lot coverage chart be updated to reflect the correct lot coverage totals.**

*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.*

**The updated plans show a slight reduction in floor area to roughly 2320sf.**

#### 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 updated plans show the use of metal columns, handrails, and steps. It is unclear whether this will be a retention of the original materials or a replacement with new materials. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify through a notation on the proposed elevations whether the existing handrails, columns, steps, and roof of the front porch will be retained and repaired, or replaced in-kind.**

*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.*

**Staff finds this recommendation has been met.**

*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 updated plans show the structure with 4 over 4 windows. Staff retains the recommendation regarding the lite division construction. Regarding the horizontal slider window on the front façade, Staff notes that while this window matches the others on the structure in terms of the style, it does not meet the intent of the recommendation. The intent is for the horizontal slider to have the appearance of a 4 over 4 double hung window similar to the historic window on the directly adjacent property. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.**

*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 updated plans show compliance with this recommendation.**

*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.*

**The Applicant has provided photographs of the extant historic siding underneath the currently installed aluminum siding. These photographs show “wood grained” cement shake siding tiles consistent with materials used during the time period of construction. While Staff would note that the siding shown in the sample section appears in good condition, this type of siding is brittle which makes repairs of any potential damaged sections difficult if not impossible. Staff would also note that this material very often included asbestos fibers, and the removal of this siding would likely trigger a review by the State of Georgia for compliance with EPA standards. If the siding were to break during repairs, as Staff finds it often does, the asbestos fibers would be released as well. As such, Staff finds that repair of the siding is possible though not likely.**

**In this District, the regulations would require any siding alteration to “be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure” in addition to complying with “the applicable regulations set forth in subsection 16-20M.013(2)”. Staff notes this as the requirements for new construction would not permit replacement of the shake siding tiles such as the ones still extant on the structure. In practice, this would mean that if the shake tiles are removed wholesale from the structure,**

**August 9, 2023**

Page 5 of 5

they could not be replaced with an identical material without needing a variance from the Commission. Staff notes this as the District regulations would not require the preservation of original or historic materials when using the first of the two criteria for alterations and additions to contributing structures.

The existing aluminum siding appears to be from roughly the late 1980's or early 1990's. As such, Staff finds that the horizontal lap siding appearance of the structure has been in place for approximately half of its existence. As such, Staff finds that the requirements of Sec. 16-20.009(3) would apply: "Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected." With this in mind Staff finds that the use of smooth faced cement fiber lap siding, a material permitted by the District regulations, would be permitted.

As such, Staff finds that while the regulations would permit the repair of the original siding, they would also permit the replacement of the existing siding with a cement fiber horizontal lap siding product. Given this analysis, Staff finds the proposal to use cement fiber horizontal lap siding meets the District regulations.

**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 lot coverage chart be updated to reflect the correct lot coverage totals;**
4. **The Applicant shall clarify through a notation on the proposed elevations whether the existing handrails, columns, steps, and roof of the front porch will be retained and repaired, or replaced in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);**
5. *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);*
6. *Any simulated lite divisions shall be dimensional and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n)(2);*
7. *Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.*

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1175 Montreat Avenue SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-234  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** North side of Montreat Avenue SW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional/American Small House

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Retroactive approval of an unpermitted addition and 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, 23CAP-00000912, CA2S-22-560

**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.

In fall of 2022 the Applicant files an administrative review (CA2S-22-560) for replacement of extremely deteriorated materials on the rear of the principal structure, including three windows and wooden siding and trim. While in the process of obtaining approval for the proposed work, the Applicant began and unpermitted reconstruction of a side porch. This porch appears to have deteriorated and collapsed sometime between 2020 and 2022. A stop-work order was issued for this addition on June 13, 2023. CA3-23-234 covers both the original work proposed under CA2S-22-560 and the unpermitted addition.

### **Rear Replacement Work**

The rear wall of the structure has completely deteriorated to the point that it is in partial collapse and needs to be completely re-framed. As part of this reconstruction, three windows which have fallen out would also be reframed and replaced in-kind on the rear elevation, and two windows (one on the right elevation and one on the left) which have also completely deteriorated due to the deterioration are also proposed for replacement. The majority of the house is covered in non-original vinyl siding, which is not permitted, and the Applicant proposes restoration to the original wooden siding. The Applicant has supplied specifications for wooden siding and trim which matches the original (still visible in small portions on the rear elevation), as well as wood-framed, six-over-six windows. Given the submitted photographs, which show that the features are deteriorated beyond restoration, Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed restoration and replacements.

### **Side Addition**

The side utility room addition has been reconstructed to the same proportions as the previously existing room, including the shed roof. Staff does not have concerns with this addition with the exception of the fenestration and cladding. The addition is currently framed-out but remains unclad. As noted above, the majority of the house is clad in non-original vinyl siding. 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 exterior on the side utility room addition must be clad utilizing the same wooden siding proposed for the rear repair and restoration work. The Applicant will clad the utility room addition using the submitted wooden siding.

There have been two windows installed on the utility room addition. There has been a square vinyl, sliding window installed on the street facing façade of the utility room. Sec. 16-20M.013 (2) (n)(1) states, "Windows in the front façade shall be predominantly vertical in proportion." Staff has reviewed the historic photography of this utility room addition. It appears that this room was most likely a side porch which was enclosed at an unknown point in the past. There was a retrofitted, non-original jalousie window placed on this enclosure. As this was a non-original feature, Staff recommends use of a six-over-six window that is vertical in proportion to match the remaining

windows. A six-over-six vinyl window has been installed on the side elevation of the addition. While the material is not of concern, Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(2)(2) requires, "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 must install windows which meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant will install windows on the utility room addition which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(n)(1-2).

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

- 1.) The Applicant will clad the utility room addition using the submitted wooden siding.
- 2.) The Applicant will install windows on the utility room addition which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(n)(1-2).
- 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:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 715 Ponce De Leon Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-237  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A                      **Other Zoning:** Poncey Highland Historic District (Subarea 5)

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** South block face of Ponce De Leon Ave., west of the Somerset Ter. Intersection.

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

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

**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. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20V

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Commission previously reviewed and approved CA3-23-122 to allow variances from the transitional height plane and to increase the allowable height for this property at the May 10, 2023, public hearing.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** Deferral.



CA3-23-237 for 715 Ponce De Leon Ave.

August 9, 2023

Page 2 of 3

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

#### Building Type Standards

The District regulations contain building type standards that detail the allowable building types and forms within each subarea. Staff finds the proposal matches the Tower building type described in Sec. 16-20V.015(16) which is an allowable building type within subarea 5. Tower buildings are described as "...a stacked unit or commercial block building of eight or more stories in height, which may include portions less than eight stories in height."

The building standards contain several requirements for Tower buildings as it relates to overall building form and placement. Staff would note that many of these requirements involve portions of the building that are directly adjacent to the street. Given that this is an interior lot and would not have public street frontage, and given that the proposal would function partially as a companion to the non-contributing commercial building located at 737 Ponce De Leon Ave., Staff finds that these regulations would not apply. However, several of the regulations detail design requirements for portions of the structure which face the street. Staff finds that these regulations would still apply given that a portion of the proposal does face Ponce De Leon Ave.

Per the regulations, Staff finds the proposal would face Ponce De Leon Ave. regarding the parking location, Staff recommends that the Applicant confirm that any interior above ground parking is at least 20 feet from the street facing front façade. Staff further recommends that the Applicant provide documentation showing that 70% of the street facing ground floor façade contains fenestration. Staff further recommends that the Applicant provide documentation showing that the street facing upper floor facades contain at least 20% fenestration per floor and contain no more than 20ft maximum of blank wall space per floor. Staff would note that the street facing upper floor facades appear to meet these requirements, but finds that the documentation must be provided to show compliance with the District regulations.

#### Development Controls

Per the District regulations, this property is permitted a maximum FAR of 8.2. While the Applicant's narrative notes an approximate floor area of 250,000 sf, Staff finds that the District regulations would require an exact calculation. As the Floor Area is not noted on the plans, Staff recommends that the Applicant detail the proposed Floor Area of the property and confirm that it meets the FAR requirements.

Per the District regulations, the proposal does not encroach on the minimum front and rear yard of 5 feet.

The District regulations place a lot coverage maximum of 85% on properties in subarea 5. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation of the proposed lot coverage and confirm that it meets the requirements.

The District regulations contain minimum open space requirements for residential and non-residential uses. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation showing that the proposal meets the Open Space Requirements.

Per the District regulations, the structure meets the requirements for maximum height as the proposal is 175 feet 6 inches and the maximum allowed height is 185 feet. Staff would note that the Commission's approval of the variances contained in CA3-23-122 remove the transitional height plane requirement and the 52 foot height restriction for portions of buildings within 60 feet of subareas 1, 2, or 6.

CA3-23-237 for 715 Ponce De Leon Ave.

August 9, 2023

Page 3 of 3

Site Design Standards

Staff recommends the Applicant detail that the proposal would meet the loading and mechanical features requirements.

Parking Requirements

For non-residential uses and residential uses that are not single family, two family, and townhouse building types, there is a maximum of 1 parking space for each residential unit and a maximum of 2.5 spaces for all other non-residential uses. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation detailing the parking that will be provided and confirm that it meets the maximum parking requirements.

Overall Design

The District regulations have specific requirements for new construction regarding the materials used on the exterior façades of the building. In general, Staff finds that the proposal meets those requirements and has no general concerns with the overall design.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral.**

1. The Applicant shall confirm that any interior above ground parking is at least 20 feet from the street facing front façade, Per Sec. 16-20V.015(16)(f);
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation showing that 70% of the street facing ground floor façade contains fenestration, Per Sec. 16-20V.015(16)(e);
3. The Applicant shall provide documentation showing that the street facing upper floor facades contain at least 20% fenestration per floor and contain no more than 20ft maximum of blank wall space per floor, Per Sec. 16-20V.015(16)(e);
4. The Applicant shall detail the proposed Floor Area of the property and shall confirm that it meets the FAR requirements, Per Sec. 16-20V.014 Table 2;
5. The Applicant shall provide documentation of the proposed lot coverage and confirm that it meets the requirements, Per Sec. 16-20V.014 Table 3;
6. The Applicant shall provide documentation showing that the proposal meets the Open Space Requirements, Per Sec. 16-20V.014(2);
7. The Applicant shall detail that the proposal would meet the loading and mechanical features requirements, Per Sec. 16-20V.018(2);
8. The Applicant shall provide documentation detailing the parking that will be provided and shall confirm that it meets the maximum parking requirements, Per Sec. 16-20V.016(2) Table 6; and,
9. All updated plans and documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](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:** 1118 St. Louis Place  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-241  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Atkins Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West of Briarcliff and East of North Highland.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Enclosed back porch

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-200.

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None Known

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

**COMPATIBILITY RULE:**

In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. Synthetic materials may be used if visually indistinguishable from the original materials. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face."

Those elements to which the rule applies are noted in the regulations by a reference to the "compatibility rule."

**ADDITION**

**Enclosed Back Deck**

The Applicant proposes to enclose an existing back deck which will require the Applicant to meet FAR. The .39 percent does meet FAR..50 that is required for the underlying R-4 zoning.

The proposed roof is an ending gable roof that will sit below the principal structure roofline. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 316 Sunset Avenue NW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-244  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Sunset Avenue Historic District

**Other Zoning:** SPI 19, SA8

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** West side of Sunset Avenue NW.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Four Square

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** n/a

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes renovation and an addition to the principal structure. The addition would be to the rear elevation, a full-width addition that is a continuation of the existing hipped roof. The proposed addition would be clad in wooden siding with a brick foundation to match the existing present on the structure. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding to be used on the addition. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed brick to be used on the addition,

There are no fully extant windows or doors on the structure. As a result, full replacement of the existing windows and doors is proposed. On the upper level there is what appears to have been a window which was infilled at an unknown date. This would be restored to its original state. The Applicant also proposes the addition of two doors to the second story of the street-facing façade, to allow porch access for both of the proposed dwelling units, two doors to the lower level of the addition portion of the rear elevation, and nine windows to the left and right elevations.

Staff is not concerned with the proposal for full windows replacement. Staff is also not concerned with the addition of the four proposed doors, which are placed to mirror the existing conditions on the lower story. Staff is concerned with the proposed addition of two horizontal sliding windows in the center of the left and right elevations. These proposed bathroom windows do not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20P.006 (3)(b)(2-3) which requires, "Replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Replacement windows and doors shall match the original in design, materials, shape, and size with no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size," and "(3)New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and design to existing windows and doors." The Applicant will revise the proposed windows on the side elevations to be vertical in orientation and compatible in size to the remainder of the windows on the structure. The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement and new windows.

In regard to the proposed four new doors, Sec. 16-20P.006 (3)(b) (7), "New exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame." The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed new and replacement doors.

The proposed elevations show railing only on the upper level of the porch. Staff understands that the current, non-original balustrade is deteriorated and must be replaced; however, it must be replaced on both levels. The Applicant will install a balustrade of two-part, butt-jointed construction, on both levels of the front façade porch. Staff further notes that the current porch flooring is likewise deteriorated. The Applicant will replace the porch flooring with tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the façade.

The site plan does not show the existing steps and walkway being retained. The Applicant will clarify if the steps and walkways are proposed for removal. In terms of the proposed site plans, Staff is also concerned with the proposed rear yard setback of 7 feet. Per Sec. 16-20P.006 (3)(a)(4),

“There shall be a rear yard of not less than ten feet.” The Applicant will revise the proposed rear yard setback to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20P.006 (3)(a)(4).

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

- 1.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding to be used on the addition.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed brick to be used on the addition,
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed windows on the side elevations to be vertical in orientation and compatible in size to the remainder of the windows on the structure.
- 4.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed replacement and new windows.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide specifications for the proposed new and replacement doors.
- 6.) The Applicant will install a balustrade of two-part, butt-jointed construction, on both levels of the front façade porch.
- 7.) The Applicant will replace the porch flooring with tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the façade.
- 8.) The Applicant will clarify if the steps and walkways are proposed for removal.
- 9.) The Applicant will revise the proposed rear yard setback to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20P.006 (3)(a)(4).
- 10.) 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:** 1076 White Oak Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-180  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9<sup>th</sup> Deferred since July 12, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1955

**Property Location** West of Lee Street and East of Peoples Street

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No,    **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Non-descript  
post War World II

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None Known

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions

\*\* This house non-contributing so the review will lean on the District regulations which states,  
**Alterations and additions to non-contributing structures requiring a certificate of**



**appropriateness, shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction set forth in subsection 16-20M.013(2)”**

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

**EDIT in RED for AUGUST 9th**

### **ADDITION**

#### ***Roof line***

On a non-contributing house, the Applicant proposes 618 sf second story addition that will extend to the rear of the house. The second story hip roof, while piers over the original hip roof slightly is deceiving on the plans because the topography drops in the area. Both pitches on the original hip roof and the second story addition are 8:12. Staff are not concerned with the relationship with the two rooflines. Staff are concerned that the pitch on the original roofline appears to be higher than originally built. While this is would be a problem if this was a contributing house, it is not here. Since this is a non-contributing house, the Applicant is proposing a roofline that is reflective of what is seen on the blockface. The Applicant pitch range from 3:12 to 9:12. The Applicant roof pitches are 8:12 Staff are not concerned.

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

**The Applicant has revised addition to not pier over the main roofline. In fact, the addition steps down into the slope of the house. Staff is not concerned with this addition.**

#### **Basement Built Out**

**The Applicant is now proposing a basement built out that will be 618 sf heated space. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. This meets FAR.**

#### **Siding**

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

**The Applicant has changed the proposal for cementitious siding but instead is propoingbrick to match in-kind with the existing bring on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.**

#### **Windows**

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

**Recommendation remains the same.**

### **Foundation**

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

**Recommendation remains the same.**

### **ALTERATIONS**

#### **Windows**

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

**Recommendation remains the same.**

#### **Porch**

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

**Staff recommends remains, this is a non-contributing, no style post-war house. Staff deem The added porch will not take away a style that doesn't exist.**

#### **Side Landings**

There are two existing side landings on the left and right side of the house. These landings are not decks. These landing cannot be in closed and would be considered door to nowhere. Due to safety and code regulations, the Applicant is proposing railings. Staff are not concerned about the landings. Staff further would recommend that the landing coming from the living room could possibly connect to the full porch to further ensure safety. However, this is not a proposal from the Applicant only a suggestion that Staff hope the Commission may consider.

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

1. The window material shall be noted on the elevations, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o);
2. The concrete on the foundation shall not be the finishing material, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(r)(10) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](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:** 1330 Bolton Rd (English Park)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-232  
**MEETING DATE:** August 9, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Southwest intersection of Bolton Rd. and Fulton Industrial Blvd.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New construction

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 6-4043

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

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

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

RC-23-232 for 1330 Bolton Rd (English Park)

August 9, 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 several alterations to the existing site. In general, Staff is supportive of removing the fence and the other improvements proposed. However, Staff finds that the overview document that has been provided omits key information that Staff would expect to be submitted for review such as a site plan, detailed plans of the parking and entrance area, and a plan showing the existing conditions of the site. Staff would suggest that the Applicant provide these documents as they will be required for permitting the proposal and must first be stamped by the HP Studio Staff to confirm that the project has been commented on by the Commission.

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

Cc: Applicant  
File