



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: CA2-23-251

MEETING DATE: August 23, 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: 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: Yes, 23CAP-00000417, CA2-23-177

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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 installation of acrylic lettering to the street-facing façade of the building. The proposed lettering would measure 2.5 feet x 7.5 feet in dimensions. Per Sec. 16-28A.010 (49), (8), “The combined area of these permitted building signs shall not exceed ten percent of the total area of the front wall of each said business establishment, and in no case shall any individual sign exceed 200 square feet. Notwithstanding these provisions, every business establishment shall be entitled to at least 60 square feet total combined sign area.” There is an existing sign already located on the building above the central portion of the façade. The existing sign is identical in design to the proposed signage. This would create a total signage of 37.5 square feet. There is also existing address signage below, which is taller than the commercial door frame, making it at least 10 feet in height and 3 in width, and combined with an additional smaller address signage panel, adding at least 40 square footage of signage. There is a fourth sign located on the glass storefront, which fills almost the full panel of the commercial door. Even without the proposed signage, the Applicant is already at capacity of approaching the maximum permissible square footage of signage. As the proposed signage would cause the establishment to exceed the permissible signage square footage, Staff recommends denial of the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 159 Hale Street NE

APPLICATION: CA2-23-255

MEETING DATE: August 23, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** R-5/ Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Hale Street NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck, Site work, Fence

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations not visible from the public right-of-way

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00000970

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

On June 30, 2023, the Applicant received a stop work order (23CAP-00000970) for unpermitted work at 158 Hale Street NE.

Deck

The Applicant has reconstructed a deteriorated deck in a smaller footprint on the rear of the house. A new concrete pad has been poured for the footings. Staff finds the deck meets the requirements of Sec.16-20L.006 (1)(j).

Side Landing

The Applicant has replaced a deteriorated side landing in-kind. This feature is located behind the rear yard fence and is not visible from the public right-of-way. It does not fall under the purview of the Urban Design Commission.

Balcony Railing

The Applicant has replaced a deteriorated balcony railing in-kind. This feature is not visible from the public right-of-way. It does not fall under the purview of the Urban Design Commission.

Front Steps

The Applicant has replaced the steps on the left and right sides of the front porch. Photographs submitted by the Applicant show a severe level of deterioration on the steps that required their replacement. The steps meet the requirements of Sec.16-20L.006 (1)(I).

Fencing

The Applicant had installed an 8-foot fence in gap created by tree removal. The Applicant has since removed this fence, which would not meet the requirements of 16-20L.006 (1)(L)(ii.). Staff notes this removal to illustrate that the Applicant has come into compliance on this issue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 229 Auburn Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-086
MEETING DATE: August 23, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Other Zoning: N/A

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

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes.

- Deferred at Applicant's request on April 12, 2023, without discussion.
- **June 28, 2023 – Updated text in bold.**

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. 16-20C of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

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

Historic Preservation Tax Credits

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

Updated Plans

The updated plans provided by the Applicant show the first-floor elevation of the Auburn Ave. façade of the new construction portions of the proposal being raised to comply with floodplain requirements from Site Development. Staff finds that the floodplain requirements would supersede any related requirements of the zoning ordinance, and as such, has no concerns with this proposal.

Lot consolidation

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

The Applicant has indicated that they will be applying for consolidation of the parcels associated with the project at a future date.

Height

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

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

The updated plans show compliance with this recommendation.

Alterations to historic structure

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

Staff withdraws the previous recommendations based on the Commission’s findings regarding the curtain wall at the June 28, 2023, hearing.

Design Standards for new construction and additions

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

The Applicant has stated their intent to comply with this recommendation, though the elevations have not yet been updated to reflect this change. Staff will retain this recommendation.

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

The updated plans show compliance with these recommendations.

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

The updated plans show compliance with these recommendations.

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

In their updated materials, the Applicant has provided documentation in support of a variance request, though Staff has not received a variance application at the present time. As such, Staff retains this recommendation as it appears that the Applicant will be submitting for a variance in the future.

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

CA3-23-086 for 229 Auburn Ave.

August 23, 2023

Page 4 of 4

The Applicant has updated the plans to include the use of metal panel fins on the parking garage area. While Staff finds that this approach comes closer to compliance than the original proposal, Staff would retain the recommendation. For the benefit of the Commission and the Applicant, Staff would note that compliance with this regulation would require the openings in the upper stories to mimic the fenestration pattern of the related façade.

Regarding the conditions for loading area, loading dock entrances, and building/mechanical/accessory features, Staff finds the revised drawings comply with the recommendations.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Any alterations required for historic preservation tax credits be approved by Staff after documentation of the change has been provided by the Applicant
2. The balcony railing be flush with the front façade, and that the balcony area be “sunken” into the façade of the building to prevent projections from the façade of the building, per Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(a)(ii);
3. Active uses be provided for the entirety of the street facing façades, or, that the Applicant apply for a variance, [per Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(b)(i);
4. the parking garage’s eastern façade be revised to have the appearance of a horizontal storied building; per Sec. 16-20C.009(2); and,
5. Staff shall review, and if appropriate, approve the final plans and supporting documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1176 Avon Avenue SW

APPLICATION: CA3-23-157

MEETING DATE: August 23, 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: Denial

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

The Applicant has explained that the proposed porch would not be constructed. There are no other building permits or certificate of appropriateness applications pending.

The Applicant has submitted two estimates for the proposed work and documentation of their income. One estimate (Entry Point) gives a total estimate of \$11,564 for the proposed work. This estimate does not provide an itemized total for the work versus materials. The second estimate (Pella) gives a total of \$50,533. Given the wide discrepancy in the cost estimates, Staff has spoken with Pella regarding the total for the second estimate, and the company states that they do not stock any wood doors and must hire a contractor to handmake the proposed doors, at a cost of approximately \$22,000 each. The Applicant stated that they have requested additional estimates, but no other estimates have been provided.

The documentation provided by the Applicant is for one job, with an income of roughly \$30,600. It is not clear if this is the Applicant's only source of income, as it appears that this job is part time/per diem, with hours worked ranging widely from as little as 0.5 hours in a pay period to as much as 38 hours in another. The Applicant has stated that they have additional sources of income, but no supporting documentation has been provided. While Staff does not feel that the estimate provided for custom wood doors is a feasible proposal, the lower estimate provides a reasonable proposal for correcting the violations. As such, Staff recommends denial of the financial hardship exemption.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

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: August 23, 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: 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 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.

The Applicant has submitted new plans as of August 16, 2023. The Applicant has addressed the majority of Staff’s concerns. The highlighted conditions listed below remain outstanding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 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. No specifications for the front door have been submitted. Staff would note that the door on the plans would meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(r)(5), which requires, “Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.” It appears that the Applicant has tried to match what was previously present on the house, a mid-20th century wood door with a geometric diamond-shaped lite. Staff feels strongly that this door was not original to the property, and when specifications are submitted the non-original door style does not need to be matched. A door more in keeping with the construction era of the house and the Tudor Revival style would be more appropriate.
- 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. No specifications for the proposed windows have been submitted.
- 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. This is noted on the plans; however, no specifications have been provided for the proposed material.
- 15.)** The Applicant will add and label the existing retaining wall to the site plan. No site plan has been included in the revised submission.
- 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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 941 Austin Avenue

APPLICATION: CA3-23-235

MEETING DATE: August 23, 2023, deferred since August 9, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5/Beltline/Subarea 1

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: East of Haralson and West of Moreland Ave.

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

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. 16-20L.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work was issued for unauthorized work. Also, the Applicant came to the Commission for a variance that was denied. This is a new application.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

RED FOR NEW COMMENTS

COMPATIBILITY RULE:

The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Inman Park Historic District is to ensure that alterations to existing structures, and new construction, in Subarea 1 and alterations to existing contributing structures in Subarea 2 and Subarea 3 are compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district as it existed in 1945, of the contributing structures in each subarea, and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face; and further, to ensure that lot platting in Subarea 1 is compatible with the historic platting pattern of Subarea 1 and of a particular block face as it existed in 1945.

To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows:

Where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) it shall be compatible with that which predominates in contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.

BASEMENT BUILDOUT

The Applicant is proposing a basement build out on the principal structure. The only issue Staff has with this is it appears FAR is not being met by the Applicant. The Applicant has mistakenly taken the .65 FAR requirement of R-5, while the District regulations requires FAR to be .50 for any addition. Staff recommends the Applicant meet the District regulation for FAR.

The Applicant has identified the correct underlining zoning with dictates the lot coverage and FAR. The max lot coverage is 55% is 2,836, sf. The 2, 5785 sf meets the max coverage. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The FAR is also being met with a .5 of 5,156. The house is 1,828 and the ADU is 750 totaling 2, 578. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ADDITION and EXISTING

The Applicant is proposing a lower-level addition that will attach to the existing approved accessory dwelling at the rear of the property. However, on this proposal, it appears the Applicant is also attempting to move the accessory dwelling to meet the addition. This movement of the accessory structure will cause that structure to be reviewed per the regulations. Staff finds the accessory structure to meet the setbacks, however, the height of the structure is too high. As it stands it piers over the existing house. District regulations states, "The height of additions shall not be subject to the compatibility rule but **shall be no higher than the existing structure.**" Staff recommends the Applicant adjust the height on the addition, so it aligns with the existing structure height.

The Applicant has pivoted from the original proposal of moving the ADU and making it apart of the main structure. Instead, the Applicant is utilizing the allowable setback that can be used by matching which will increase the livable space. District regulations states, “The compatibility rule shall not apply to the front and side setbacks of any addition to an existing structure; however, the front and side yard setbacks of the addition shall not be less than the respective setback, at its closest point, of the existing structure.” In doing this, the Applicant is leaving the already existing ADU in the place it was approved originally. It is not the purview of Staff to review the ADU application CA2s-21-038. Staff are not concerned about the addition proposal.

Roofline

The Applicant has proposed removing the existing roof line to create a new roofline. While the proposed new roofline will tuck under the existing roof with a 4feet and 12-inch pitch, with the garage now being apart of the review, Staff recommend the Applicant employee a roofline that engage cohesively with the overall the principal structure, to allow for a continuous flow. The pitch should be compatible with the existing roofline. This would comply with the District regulations which states, “The compatibility rule shall apply to the form and pitch of the primary roof of the principal structure.”

It should be noted, the roofline was removed, and Staff recommend the Applicant to reinstall the roofline back to its original type, style, shape, and dimensions and note that on the plans.

New elevations show the addition will sit below the existing roofline employing a 5/12 pitch. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

As with the roofline, the Applicant had removed several windows on the existing structured with out approval. Staff recommends, those windows be installed to the original type, style, shape, and dimensions.

The proposed windows must be compatible to the existing windows, which could include the side windows because they are visible to the public. The existing windows were six over one with lite divides and vertical in orientation. Staff recommend the proposed window be six over one with lite divides and vertical in orientation, if muntins and/or mullions are used, such muntins and/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.

This recommendation stands, the window on the south elevation should match which is already shown on the house. No transom window will can be permitted.

Fenestration

Staff also note on the south elevation, the fenestration pattern is off, there is too much solid space to opening. Staff recommends the Applicant install one more window on the addition that copies the existing windows. This should eliminate that problem.

This recommendation stands.

Front Porch Columns and Railing and Roof

The Applicant had or is proposing the existing shed roof and railing. The roof is proposed be added as a shed roof to copy the removed roof. Staff is not concerned with this. The railings are not proposed to be added back to the existing structure. The iron railings were not original to the house, so removing them is not of concern to the Staff. However, railings would be essential for safety. Porch elements are subject to the compatibility rule for the blockface. Staff recommend the Applicant install railings that are compatible with the predominate railings on the blockface or install in-kind railings originally was on the porch if they know that information.

This recommendation stands.

Siding

The siding on the addition is proposed to match the siding on the existing house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

Siding

The Applicant has proposed to install new siding on sections of the existing house and to retain the existing siding on other sections repairing in-kind if needed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff also recommend the new siding be in-kind to match the existing exactly.

ADU ALTERATIONS

While the Applicant is not proposing the removal of the ADU, the Applicant is updating and repairing sections of the ADU.

New Roof

The Applicant proposes a new roof that will match the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal if the roof is not causing the ADU to be higher than the existing house. Right now, the ADU is showing at max height to be 20ft.

Siding

The Applicant proposes new siding to match the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

New Garage Door

Staff is not concerned with the new garage door.

SITE WORK

The Applicant propose a 3ft driveway access utilizing the alley for access into the garage. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The window on the addition on the south elevation shall match in-kind windows that were establish on the existing house, no transom windows are permitted, per Sec.16-20L.006(n)(3)(ii);
2. The Applicant shall add an additional window on the south elevation to balance the solid to window that is currently shown on the existing house, per Sec16-20L.006(n)(3)(iii);

CA3-23-235 for 941 Austin Ave.

August 23, 2023

pg. 3

3. The porch shall have columns and railings that are compatible with what predominates on the blockface, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(i);
4. New siding shall match in-kind the existing exactly, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(q) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 715 Ponce De Leon Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-23-237
MEETING DATE: August 23, 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)?: Yes. Updated text for August 23, 2023 meeting in Bold font.

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: Approval with conditions.

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.

After discussions with the Applicant regarding the site geometry, particularly the existence of an intervening parcel between the north façade of the subject property and Ponce De Leon Ave.. Further, while there is a driveway directly adjacent to the proposal, there is not a public street that would connect the subject property to Ponce De Leon Ave. As such, Staff would revise their previous findings to state that the property would not contain a street facing front façade, and the related requirements for street facing front façades would not apply to the current proposal. Staff would also withdraw the recommendations relating to the street facing front façade.

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.

The Applicant has provided documentation on the revised drawings which meets this recommendation. The subject property as a lot area of 45,505 sf. The District regulations allow a floor area maximum of 8.2 for this property, or 373,141 sf. Per the information provided by the Applicant, the proposal would include 258,507 sf, equating to a FAR of 5.7. As such, Staff finds the proposal meets the District's FAR requirements.

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

August 23, 2023

Page 3 of 4

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 Applicant has provided documentation on the revised drawings which meets this recommendation. The District regulations would allow a lot coverage of 85%, or 38,697.3 sf rounded up to the nearest tenth. The proposed lot coverage is 31,715 sf, or 70% of the net lot area rounded up to the nearest tenth. As such, Staff finds the proposal meets the District regulations for lot coverage.

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.

The Applicant has provided documentation on the revised drawings which meets this recommendation. The District regulations require any new development on the property to contain 10% open space, or 4,505.5 sf. The Applicant is proposing 7,232 sf of open space, or 16% rounded to the nearest tenth. As such, Staff finds the proposal meets the District regulations for open space.

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.

Site Design Standards

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

The Applicant has provided documentation on the revised drawings which meets this recommendation. Further, Staff finds that the proposed loading, mechanical equipment, and dumpster locations shown on the site plan stamped as received by the Office of Design on August 15, 2023, would meet the District regulations.

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.

The Applicant has provided documentation on the revised drawings which meets this recommendation. Staff further finds that the proposed parking would be less than the maximum parking permitted by the District regulations..

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.

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

August 23, 2023

Page 4 of 4

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1. Staff shall review, and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.**

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Northyards Blvd.
APPLICATION: RC-23-240
MEETING DATE: August 9, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** Various

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Entirety of Northyards Blvd. from Northside Dr. to Cameron Alexander Blvd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Street Renaming.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 138-8

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter with the Commission's Comments to the Applicant, the Chair of the Zoning Committee, and the appropriate City agencies.

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. 138-8 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

Staff would note that the Applicant's proposal includes both the naming of private streets and the renaming of one public street: Northyards Blvd. The Commission's purview is limited only to public streets, so this analysis will not include discussion of the private streets included in the proposal.

Per Section 138-8 of the Atlanta City Code:

(e) Urban Design Commission review and comment. All street renaming and dedications located in the City of Atlanta must be reviewed by the urban design commission and be the subject of a regularly scheduled commission meeting. In advance of such a meeting, neighborhood associations, historical groups, historic preservation groups, and other interested parties will be notified that the street renaming or dedication has been placed on the commission's agenda. After the meeting, written findings regarding the street renaming or dedication must be forwarded to the city's commissioner of its department of public works and must be received by the commissioner before the commissioner is authorized to submit to the city council legislation authorizing the street renaming or dedication.

The naming or renaming of a street (or any other City-related facility) is a significant undertaking by the City as it is one of the few ways for a person or event to be honored by the City by giving it a potentially permanent place in the City's future and thus its history. When streets and facilities (whether from the City's founding or more recently) are considered for renaming, the Staff finds that it is not appropriate to compare the significance of the existing name to the proposed name (and by extension the people, events, or locations memorialized in those names). It is more appropriate to consider the respective honorees in relation to the era in which their significance is associated and how that significance is related to the City of Atlanta.

When taking this approach into account, Staff finds that Mr. Ronald Yancey is a significant figure in the City's history, specifically that of the area immediately adjacent to the proposal, for several reasons. The information provided documents Mr. Yancey's, educational career and his distinction as the first Black graduate from Georgia Tech. The information also details the discrimination and significant hurdles that Mr. Yancey had to overcome to graduate from Georgia Tech.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with the Commission's Comments to the Applicant, the Chair of the Zoning Committee, and the appropriate City agencies.

Cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams-Interim, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 171 Huntington
APPLICATION: RC-23-249
MEETING DATE: August 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills

Other Zoning: Conservation

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: West of Woodcrest Avenue and East of Palisades Road

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20(B)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.

ADDITION and ALTERATION OF HOUSE

The Applicant is proposing an additional 65sft to the existing house. In doing this addition, the Applicant proposes the following:

2nd Story Addition/Roof

A new second story is proposed which will change the existing roof line from a double gable to a double flat roof with the side of the house projecting over the first floor.

Entry

The new proposed second story with the new roofline will create a new elongated entryway. A cantilevered stoop roof is proposed over the entryway.

Windows

The proposed windows are proposed to remain aluminum clad wood windows; however, the window sizes will be enlarged to accommodate the proposed 2nd story.

Foundation

The existing painted CMU foundation is proposed to have applied a thin coat of stucco.

Staff Comments

While it appears, the house has recently had some renovations allowing for a modern addition to the rear, the new proposal is totally changing the house from a traditional house in the front to a new modern house. Staff reasons while these changes are consisted with the previous rear addition, Staff would not support a wholesale of the removal of all the traditional house, which this new proposal would do. The 1955 house would now be consumed by this new modern type of house, losing the original house all together. Additionally, the type of houses in the community are traditional house of some sort nicely conveying a story of time and period. If modern houses are continuously allowed to wipe out the traditional houses that created this community, this community will cease to exist.