



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: 1253 Lucile
APPLICATION: CA2-23-134
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023, deferred since May 24, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location Corner of Lucile and Atwood

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: 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 Denial without prejudice was issued on CA2-22-409. A Stop Work was issued on the property 7/22/2022.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Defer to October 11, 2023, UDC meeting so the Applicant to address some development issues.

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

THE COMPATIBILITY RULE

The compatibility rule is a method of ensuring that alterations to existing structures and the design of proposed new construction are sensitive to and sympathetic toward existing elements of design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The elements 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.), shall be 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 compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

EDITS in RED-The Applicant is now proposing an addition.

Property on a corner lot, all four sides will be reviewed.

PLANS

After a site visit, Staff recognize there are some inconsistencies on the plan that should be addressed. These inconsistencies might be due to drawing issues. The Applicant has indicated their intentions are not to alter any of the listed inconsistencies.

- Front gable roof—The front gable roof is not depicted correctly. On the elevations, the front gable roof is too small. The front gable extends to the middle of the right front window. The Applicant states the pitch is 6:12. Staff recommends the Applicant verify that pitch. **The Applicant has verified the pitch and corrected the inconsistency.**
- Gable vents—The gable vent is not drawn correctly. The vents on the elevations are more elongated. That needs to be corrected. **The Applicant has corrected the gable vent.**
- Trim under the gable roof on the porch—The trim under the front gable that extends to the windows is not depicted correctly. That trim is continuous and sits under the decorative shingle pattern. **The Applicant has corrected the trim.**
- Brackets on the gable roof—the Applicant has not depicted the brackets in the correct location. The brackets should be at the end of the gable roof. **The Applicant has shown this and corrected the drawings.**
- Columns—the columns top brackets are not correct. The last two brackets are on one continues platform. The Applicant has depicted two separate platforms. Also, the middle column is not located correctly. The Applicant has it depicted closer to the double windows on the left of the house. **This has been corrected.**

Staff recommends the Applicant correct the listed discrepancies so that no confusion can happen in the field. **Staff are not concerned with any of the discrepancies listed.**

Site Data

The Applicant has erroneously listed R-5 as the underlying zoning. Historic Westend's underlying zoning is R4-A. It is important for accurate development.

- **Setbacks**—The Applicant rear yard setback does not comply to the R4-A requirement of not less than 15 feet. The Applicant propose as set back of 7 feet which is reflective of R-5.
- **Lot Coverage**—The lot coverage is not accurate. The Applicant has failed to account for the proposed rain garden. Staff recommends the rain garden be accounted for in the lot coverage calculation.
- **Floor Area Ratio**—The Applicant has not provided the floor area ratio. Staff recommend they supply this information.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes a 1000 square foot addition to the existing house. The roofline is beneath the existing roof line with a 6:12 pitch that extends back to the rear with asphalt shingle. Staff is not concerned with this design.

Windows and Trim

The proposed windows and trim are wood to match the existing windows in style and material except for the last three windows on the left elevation in the rear. The light divide on these windows is 4 over 1, the original vast majority windows on the house are 9 over 1. While this is the case, Staff is not concerned with the different lite divides, the Applicant is complying to the District regulations which states, “new doors and windows, when permitted shall, be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement and style to existing windows and doors.” This compatible while not exact.

Siding

The proposed siding is cementitious siding. Cementitious is permitted.

Side Stoop

The proposed side stoop is not problematic to Staff. It does not valid any direct District regulation, nor does is it subjected to the compatibility test.

Foundation

The Applicant indicate brick surround on the proposed foundation. This is problematic because brick surround is veneer and not full solid masonry. District regulations requires, new foundation be solid masonry or concrete. Staff recommends the proposed foundation either be solid masonry or concrete to comply with the District Regulations.

ALTERATIONS

Front Porch

Staff have listed the drawing issues above and stand on those recommendations for correction. In addition to those issues. The Applicant proposes the following regarding the porch.

All the discrepancies have been addressed. Staff are not concerned.

Railings and porch flooring

Currently on the porch there are iron railings that need repairing. These railings are not believed to be original to the house. The Applicant proposes to reinstall these iron railings in-kind. Staff do not recommend this. The railings at this point would be a compatibility issue of the block. District regulations state, “new or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code.” In researching the block, the predominate railing construction is vertical wood railings with a top rail construction. Staff recommend the railing be vertical with wood railings with a top rail construction and be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, if needed.

Since the house is on a corner lot, Staff also recommend the same construction for the back deck railings.

The Applicant has complied and constructed wood railings meeting the recommendations.

Steps and Cheek wall

The steps and cheek wall are needing repair. The Applicant is proposing concrete steps. The concrete steps are not problematic to Staff. The cheek wall currently on the house is brick. Staff recommend the cheek wall be repaired or be replaced in-kind.

The Applicant has complied and show brick surround which includes the steps and cheekwalls.

Windows

The Applicant has not shown any change to the 9 over one wood windows on the elevations. The Applicant has provided a window schedule and reflect changes on the floor plan. Staff recognize each bedroom has an egress window. Most of those windows are single hung; one fixed and the other double hung. The Applicant has proposed all existing windows 3-inch trim to remain or be replaced if needed and all windows keep the existing dimension and trim style. District regulation states that “architecturally significant windows and doors including details, trimwork and framing shall be retained.” The Applicant has noted this intent on the elevations. However, since the Applicant has provided a window schedule, Staff will need to know which window the Applicant plans to repair/replace. The window schedule is confusing and hard for Staff to follow. Staff recommend the Applicant update the window schedule to reflect which window will be replaced or repaired, note this information on the elevations.

The Applicant has now indicated a wholesale window replacement in-kind to match the original wood windows in style, placement, and material.

The proposed window is at the rear of the house in the bedroom. District regulations state, “new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors. Staff are confused as to why this window is needed. There are two egress windows in the rear bedroom already. Staff recommend the window not be added. Since this will be an added window that faces a public street because the house is on a

corner lot, this will violate the District regulations that state, “new windows or doors added to the existing structure shall be located facades that don’t face a public street.”

The Applicant has adjusted the plan. Staff are longer concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The siding is wood siding and does need some repair. The Applicant proposes to repair and replace the existing siding to match in-kind. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Door

The existing front door is a Craftsman door that appears to be in good shape and original to the house. Staff recommends this door remain and repaired. If it needs replacing, the door should be a wood door with a rectangular light.

The recommendation stands.

Screen door

Apparently, the screen doors (2) appear to be original to the house while there is no definitive information to confirm the originally. Screen doors are not typically an element on the house that is required to be retained. Since there is no direct evidence that the screen doors are original the removal of the screen doors is solely up to the Applicant.

Foundation

Photos show the foundation needs repairing. The Applicant has not indicated any work on the foundation. Staff recommends the foundation be repaired in-kind.

The recommendation stands.

Deck

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

Chimney

The chimney appears to be intact. Staff recommends the brick chimney cannot be painted.

This recommendation stands.

SITE WORK

Concrete Pillars and Fence

On the site plan the Applicant has shown concrete pillars, from photos taken, the pillars are significant to the property. The Applicant has noted the chain link fence, that needs repairing. Chain link fences are not permitted. Staff recommends the concrete pillars remain; the chain link fence be removed. A new fence be 4 ft high and be either brick, iron, wood, or metal pickets between the concrete pillars.

The recommendation stands.

Driveway

Photos also show the driveway needs repairing. Staff recommends the driveway be 10 ft wide and repaired or replaced in-kind.

Recommendation Stands.

Retaining wall

The Applicant has noted the retaining wall at the front. This retaining wall shall remain and only repaired or replaced in-kind if need be.

Recommendation Stands.

Sidewalk

The Applicant proposes 5 feet 6-inch sidewalk. Staff recommends the material of the sidewalk complies with what is on the blockface which are hexagonal pavers.

Rain Garden

A 170 square foot rain garden is proposed at the front of the house. As mentioned, Staff are concerned with this proposal because the Applicant has not accounted for it in the lot coverage calculation. Additionally, a rain garden would be considered an accessory structure which can not be placed in the front of the property. District regulations states, accessory structures, “shall be located to the side or rear of the main structure within the buildable area of the lot and shall not project beyond the front of the main structures.” Staff recommends the rain ground be placed on the side or rear of the main structures and not project the front of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the October 11th.

1. The Applicant shall correct the underlying zoning to reflect R4-A and not R-5, per Sec.16-06A.;
2. The Applicant shall correct the 7 feet setback to show the rear must be no less than 15 feet as required by R4-A, per Sec.16-06A.008(3);
3. The Applicant shall account for the raingarden in the lot coverage calculation, per Sec.160-06A.008(6);
4. The Applicant shall indicate the FAR for R4-A and make sure the addition meets the FAR requirement, per Sec.16-06A.008(5)(b)(2);
5. The front door shall be retained and repaired if needed, if replacement is warranted the new door shall be wood and contain a rectangular light, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
6. The proposed foundation shall be either solid masonry or concrete, per Sec.16-20G.006(5)(b)
7. The existing foundation shall be repaired and replaced in kind if needed, per Sec. 16-20G.006(5)(a);
8. The chimney shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20G;
9. The concrete pillars shall be retained and only repaired and replaced in-kind if needed, per Sec. 16-20G.006(16);
10. The chain link fence shall be removed, the new fence shall be 4ft and be of wood, brick, iron or metal pickets, per Sec. 16-20G.006(14)(a)(d)(e);
11. The driveway shall be 10ft wide repaired or replaced in-kind, per Sec.16-20G.006(12)(c);
12. The retaining wall shall be repaired or replaced in-kind if need be per Sec.16-20G.006(15);
13. The sidewalk shall have hexagonal pavers to match what was there prior, Sec.16-20G.006(12)(a);
14. The raingarden shall not be placed in the front of the house. It can shall be placed on side or in the rear of the house, not projecting beyond the main structure, per Sec.16-20G.006(10) and
15. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA3-23-134 for 1253 Lucile
September 27, 2023
Page 7 of 7

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: 540 Grant Street SE
APPLICATION: CA2-23-296
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: 1905

Property Location: Southeastern corner of the intersection of Grant and Orleans Streets SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Greek Revival

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00001133

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA2-23-297 540 Grant Street SE

September 27, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant received a stop work order 23CAP-00001133 on July 26, 2023, for unpermitted replacement of front porch steps. Staff finds that the replacement of the steps meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.007 (2)(D)(1). Staff notes in the submitted photographs that there is no handrail installed, no is one included in the scope of work. In the photographs the porch flooring is extremely splintered from deterioration. This work is also not included in the scope of the project.

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: 135 Pearl Street SE
APPLICATION: CA2-23-301
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20A, SA3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Pearl Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Retroactive Approval of Accessory Structures & Fence

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 21CAP-00000169, CA2S-22-243, 23CAP-00001185

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant received a stop work order (21CAP-00000169) on March 26, 2022, for unpermitted construction of a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU). A certificate of appropriateness (CA2S-22-243) was issued for the ADU. There was additional site work which occurred; construction of a new fence, carport, and deck, which was not included on the application and not approved by Staff. A second stop work order 23CAP-00001185 was issued on August 3, 2023, for the remainder of the unpermitted work. This application addresses the remainder of the un-permitted work.

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)

The ADU was permitted under CA2S-22-243; however, the actual dimensions of the structure were incorrect on the original plan and the accessory structure is taller than shown on the plans. Staff finds that the accessory structure, at a height of 16 feet does not exceed the height of the primary structure (21 feet) and meets the requirements of the zoning code.

Carport

The Applicant seeks retroactive approval for construction of a double width carport, which opens to the rear of the property to driveway access off of the alley way. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed design.

Deck

The Applicant has stated that the portion of the deck surrounding two temporary inflatable pools and hot tubs will be removed, leaving the portion closest to the house. Staff would not that while the existing deck does meet the zoning code in terms of placement, that if the proposed portion were to be removed the Applicant would still be exceeding their allowable lot coverage. The maximum allowable lot coverage is 7,296 square feet. The current coverage is 4,105 square feet, or 56%. Per section 16-20A.009 (8) the maximum allowable lot coverage in the Cabbagetown Landmark District, Subarea 3 cannot exceed 50%. The Applicant must reduce lot coverage by 457 square feet to bring the project into compliance. The removal of the swimming pool and hot tub will decrease lot coverage by 177 square feet, leaving the property at 280 square feet over allowable lot coverage. The existing deck is 368 square feet. The Applicant will submit a revised site plan showing how the deck will be brought into compliance to ensure that maximum allowable lot coverage is not exceeded.

Fence

The Applicant seeks retroactive approval of construction of a new six-foot wooden fence. Staff finds that the fence meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

CA2-23-301 135 Pearl Street SE

September 27, 2023

Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit a revised site plan showing how the deck will be brought into compliance to ensure that maximum allowable lot coverage is not exceeded.
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams- Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2592 Hightower CT.
APPLICATION: CA2-23-304
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1957

Property Location: East of Hamilton E. Holmes

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order placed on 7/26/23 for no permit and painted brick.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant has done a series of work that includes painted brick, rebuilding the rear deck, removal of plastic shutters, removal of storm doors, replacement of front door and removal of the storm windows.

Windows

Research indicates, the Applicant has not altered the original windows. If fact, Staff summarize removing the storm windows have showcased the original windows clearly. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant has removed the plastic shutters, Staff is not concerned with this proposal either. The shutters are not a defining character of this style of house. Additionally, the original shutters would have been wood if anything. These plastic shutters were not original to the house.

Door

Staff is not concerned with the removal of the screen door. From research it doesn't appear the house had a decorative screen door that was reflective of this style house during the period of built. The current screen door is a standard protective screen door. Staff is concerned that the proposed door is a Craftsman door not suitable for this style house. Staff recommends the Applicant install a front door that is reflective of the house built during the period for this style house.

Rear Deck

Staff is not concerned with the rebuilt rear deck.

Fence

The SWO indicates, an unauthorized fence was constructed. However, Staff find no evidence of this fence.

Painted Brick

The Applicant has painted the unpainted masonry which is prohibited in the district. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the paint from the brick in a manner that will not damage the brick. No sandblasting is permitted.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install a front door that is reflective of the house built during that period for this style house, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c);
2. The Applicant shall remove the paint on the brick in a manner that will not damage the brick. Sandblasting is not permitted, per Sec.16-20Q.005(1)(b)(i) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



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: 1062 Peeples St.
APPLICATION: CA2-23-306
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Southwest corner of Peeples St. and White Oak Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revision to previously approved plans.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 26-20 & 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission has reviewed and approved plans for new construction, and a previous plan for revisions to the approved plans.

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.

Previous approvals

The Commission has previously reviewed this project under two separate applications. Conditions were placed on those approvals, and the current proposal has not shown compliance with all of these conditions of approval. For the benefit of the Commission and the Applicant, the conditions of approval are as follows:

CA3-22-342:

1. All outstanding conditions in Application # CA3-22-342 shall remain in effect unless this approval alters the original element or condition.
2. The applicant shall provide the proof of calculations on the site plan for floor area ratio (FAR) per Sec. 16-20M.012(5).
3. The applicant shall revise the elevation to include corner board and provide product information for all trim, and corner board per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q). (Staff)
4. The applicant shall provide an updated Window and Door Schedule per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).
5. The applicant shall provide a detailed customer proposal (proposed order form) prior to ordering Windows and Doors, such information shall be indexed to the updated Window and Door schedule and comply with all applicable conditions per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o).
6. The applicant shall provide revised final plans and documentation in one (1) PDF. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.
7. Condition for stamped sidewalk be removed.
8. All conditions shall be consolidated.

CA2-22-581:

1. The applicant shall repair or replace in-kind all sidewalk and planting strips. The applicant shall make all efforts to complete the sidewalk along the property frontages. All repairs, replacements, and new installations must be completed before Certificate of Occupancy is issued. Per Sec. 16-20M.013(2) (c).
2. The applicant shall work with staff to minimize and ensure that all grading and accessibility is within the provisions and intent of the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Atlanta.
3. All paired and ribbon windows shall feature a mullion with a reveal. The mullion may be added after market with a plank made of pressured treated wood, aluminum, or vinyl. The mullion shall be approximately 1.5 inches to 2.5 inches in width and project from the window framing a minimum of one-half inch. The applicant shall provide a project specific window sections (horizontal, top-down) to indicate installation and specifications. Per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n) and (o).
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.
5. Roof slopes be coordinated with the roofing materials to ensure that the materials called out for will support that slope of the roof form.
6. That the front porch including steps and brick piers be coordinated with the compatibility rule, confirming materiality, heights, extents, everything with the front porch needs to be reviewed with the compatibility rule and revised, as necessary.

7. All setbacks to be confirmed and respected.
8. Sidewalks be stamped concrete.
9. The height of the house be identified on the plans and confirm that the house is from the existing grade and not the proposed grade.
10. That Commission get confirmation of the exact windows and doors proposed to be used. Cut sheets or doors and windows.

Given that several of these conditions still apply, Staff recommends that all previous conditions of approval for CA3-22-342 & CA2-22-581 remain in effect unless they are rendered unnecessary by the current proposed revisions.

Revisions to previous revised approval

The plans have been revised to show a structure with a hipped roof and an accent gable on the right side of the front roof plane. On the front façade, the windows on the front façade have also changed from double grouped windows to single windows. On the right-side façade, the windows have changed but are generally consistent with the District regulations. The one exception is the small casement window on the second floor of the rear of the right-side façade. Staff recommends that the small casement window on the right-side facade be removed or be changed to a double hung window that is proportional in size to the other double hung windows on the right-side façade.

On the left side façade, the windows have also changed and now include a double grouped smaller casement window, similar to the small window on the right-side façade. Staff would recommend that the small double grouped casement window on the left-side façade be changed to be a double grouped double hung window set that is proportional in size to the other double hung windows on the left side façade of the structure. Staff would note that the plans still lack of corner-boards. Staff recommends that corner boards be added to all corners of the structure, and to delineate the front portion of the right-side façade from the rear portions of the structure.

Lastly, Staff would note that the site plan is still missing floor area ratio calculations. As the Oakland City Historic District regulations govern floor area, the project will not be allowed to move forward to permitting until this is listed on the site plan and floor-plans have been provided for Staff to confirm the calculations. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide floor area calculations which confirm that the total floor area of the structure is less than 50% of the lot area, and provide floor-plans for Staff to confirm these calculations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. All previous conditions of approval for CA3-22-342 & CA2-22-581 shall remain in effect unless they are rendered unnecessary by the current proposed revisions;
2. The small casement window on the right-side facade shall be removed or shall be changed to a double hung window that is proportional in size to the other double hung windows on the right-side façade, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o);
3. The small double grouped casement window on the left-side façade shall be changed to be a double grouped double hung window set that is proportional in size to the other double hung windows on the left side façade of the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o);

CA3-23-306 for 1062 Peeples St.

September 27, 2023

Page 4 of 4

4. Corner boards shall be added to all corners of the structure, and to delineate the front portion of the right-side façade from the rear portions of the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
5. The Applicant shall provide floor area calculations which confirm that the total floor area of the structure is less than 50% of the lot area, and shall provide floor-plans for Staff to confirm these calculations, per Sec. 16-20M.012(5); and,
6. 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: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 321 Glenwood Avenue

APPLICATION: CA2-23-308

MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Grant Street and West of Broyles Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop work placed on the property 4/15/23 for working without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant previously changed two elements of the house with out approval: siding and porch railings.

Siding

The Applicant has removed cementitious siding and replaced it with wood siding with a 5-inch reveal where applicable. The original siding is wood and the Applicant removing the non-compliant siding is applauded. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Porch Railings

Photos provided show a non-compliant extension at the end of the stair-railings. Staff recommends the railing be removed; it does not reinforce the historic integrity of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The non-compliant railings at the end of the stair-railings shall be removed, per Sec.16-20K.007(2)(D)(1) and
2. 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

Janide Prince
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Doug Young
Interim-Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 821 Oakdale Road
APPLICATION: CA2-23-311
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West of Ponce de Leon and East of The by Way

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Sitework: Mailbox Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

MAILBOX CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a mailbox on the property where a non-original standard box sits. The proposed mailbox will be set in stucco columns. Staff cannot find anything in the regulations that would preclude the Applicant from removing the non-original standard box and build this custom mailbox. Staff lean on the regulation which states, “new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” Staff reason this custom mailbox is more in line with the larger houses in the area where there are several different styles of mailboxes. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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: 284 Little Street
APPLICATION: CA3-23-284
MEETING DATE: September 27th deferred since September 13, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location: Corner of Little and Hill

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

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. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the October 11th UDC to allow the Applicant to make adjustments.

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

Edits are RED.

The property is on a corner lot. All sides will be reviewed.

PLANS

The existing left elevation is not accurately drawn. The pitch on the hip roof both right and left are drawn too steep. Staff are concerned a dormer cannot be built on the existing hip roof. Staff recommends the Applicant first measure and record the pitch on those hip roofs as well as measure the pitches on the entire house and record those pitches on the plans.

The Applicant has negated to include the proposed right elevation for review. Staff recommend the Applicant provided that information.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes two additions to the house to allow for added living space. The lower-level addition will sit directly behind the existing structure. The second level addition will be inserted in the existing structure but will not supersede the existing structure and will sit behind the existing bay windows. Both additions will meet the setback requirements. Both additions meet FAR and Lot Coverage. Both additions roofline will not exceed the existing roofline. Shingles are proposed for the second level to match existing and metal on the lower addition is proposed. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Dormers

The Applicant proposes three dormers: one on the addition and two on the existing roof. The dormer on the addition, isn't problematic to Staff. However, the two dormers on the existing left and right elevations roof are problematic. Staff do not believe those dormers are able to be constructed due to the pitch of the existing rooflines which is not depicted accurately on the plans. Staff recommend the Applicant achieve additional space by moving backwards and not by adding the dormers.

Windows

The proposed windows are not problematic for Staff. They are two-over-two. Staff has not indicated the material of the proposed windows. Staff recommend the Applicant identify the material and note that on the plans.

Siding

The Applicant has not indicated what type of siding will be put on the house Staff recommend the Applicant identify what siding will be use and note that on the plans.

Foundation

The plan shows the same type of foundation on the existing and proposed. Research shows the foundation is brick piers and concrete in fill. Staff recommend the Applicant note the foundation and put that information on the plan.

Side Landing

The side landing with the railings is shown on the plans, but not on the interior elevations. Staff can't determine if this landing is needed. Staff recommend the Applicant clarify the side landing proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

On the front elevation, the Applicant appears to be retaining the windows. However, the proposed windows are now drawn to be wider. Staff think this is a draftsman's error. Staff recommend the Applicant clarify the intent of the windows since there are no demarcations on the plans as to any intentions.

Siding

Staff recommend the Applicant clearly identify the intention of the siding and put those on the plans.

Foundation

The Applicant has not provided information regarding the foundation. Staff recommendation the Applicant provide the information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the October 11, 2023, UDC Meeting

1. The Applicant shall provide accurate plans that reflect the correct pitch on the side hip roof, per Sec. 16-20K.001;
2. The Applicant shall include the proposed right elevations in the submittal, per Sec.16-20K.001;
3. The Applicant shall not build the dormers on the hip roof because of inaccurate depiction of pitch. If added space is needed it should be achieved by moving back to the rear per Sec.16-20K.007 (2)(B)(5);
4. The windows specifications shall be identified and added to the plans, per Sec.16-20K.;
5. The siding specifications shall be identified and added to the plans, pe Sec. 16-20K;
6. The foundation specification shall be identified and added to the plans, per Sec. 16-20K;007(2)(B)(15):
7. The Applicant shall provide clarity on the side landing, which is not reflected in the interior elevations, per Sec.16-20K and
8. 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: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 553 Auburn Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-23-285
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther, King, Jr Landmark District

Other Zoning:

Date of Construction: 1998

Property Location: East of Howell Street and West of Bradley Street

Contributing (Y/N): No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Two-story Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to allow side solar panel to exist on

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

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 Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking solar panel to be install on the side of a hip addition which is attached to the principal structure at the rear.

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

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

Applicant writes: **“The extra ordinary circumstance is requirement of the panels not being able to be on the side of the structure. In this case, the structure is a hip roof addition. For the client to receive the full benefit of the solar panels all sides will need to be used. The structure is in the rear of the property which means the solar panels cannot be seen.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“Unnecessary hardship: Not allowing the solar panels to be placed where the client can get the absolute benefit from them when they are in the rear out of sight would be an unnecessary hardship.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The structure is in the rear of the property and not seen, yet the panel must be placed on the front and sides of the structure to get the full benefits.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The is saving cost and preserving energy in the community. It is more beneficial than damage. Besides with the variance, each matter is assessed individual.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

The Applicant has provided information to support the variance. The photo provided shows the solar panels will be in the rear of the property. While the panels are on the side of the addition because the addition sits at the rear of the house, these panels will not be visible. It would be a hardship on the Applicant not to be able to utilize the newest technology when the panels can not be seen.

Staff support the variance request.

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: 1090 Peoples Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-295
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: Southeast corner of the intersection of Peoples Street SW and Tucker Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved New Construction

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: CA3-23-098

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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 new construction home, garage, and accessory dwelling unit on the vacant lot at 1090 Peoples Street SW. Plans for this proposed structure were approved with conditions on April 26, 2023 (CA3-23-098), one of the outstanding conditions was that the proposed accessory structures must be brought into compliance with Sec. 16-20M.015 (5). To bring the accessory structures into compliance the Applicant has substantially redesigned the project, incorporating the previously freestanding garage into the rear of the structure. The accessory dwelling unit (ADU) has also been redesigned and brought into compliance. As the rear attached garage would be offset and narrower than the full width of the house, a side porch has been added. This design element matches the design of the previous historic home that was present on the lot (demolished 2018). Staff is not concerned with the proposed changes to the design, which meet the requirements of the zoning code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1178 Greenwich Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-128 & CA3-23-297
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Greenwich Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction, Variance to not utilize the compatibility rule.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, May 10, 24, June 14, 28, July 12, 26, August 9, 23, September 13

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial (CA3-23-128), Deferral until the November 8, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission (CA3-23-128).

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

Variance CA3-23-297

The requested variance is to allow the Applicant not to be required to use the compatibility rule for massing of the structure.

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

The Applicant states that there is an existing 20.1 foot driveway easement of the property. This easement, which extends approximately 89 feet back from the street, limits the width of the front buildable area of the property.

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

The Applicant states that the easement makes it impossible to meet all the requirements of the compatibility rule, specifically citing the requirements for massing and the front-yard setback.

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

The Applicant cites the driveway easement.

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

The Applicant states that because the driveway easement is such an exceptional feature of just this lot, the variance could not be used by other applicants seeking relief from the compatibility rule in terms of massing. The Applicant also states that having a vacant lot is not consistent with the historic patterning of the neighborhood and that granting of the variance would bring the property into greater compliance in terms of historic development patterning.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request does not meet the criteria for granting a variance. Staff acknowledges that existing driveway easement presents challenges to developing the lot. The granting of a variance to release the use of the compatibility rule for massing alone would not bring the proposed design into compliance. The design is a house type and form not found on the historic block face, and the scale is not compatible with the existing historic fabric of the block face. Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(e) requires, "Contemporary design of new construction, compatible with adjacent and surrounding structures, is permitted." An additional zoning variance would also be needed to allow a reduction in the side yard setback from 7 feet to 5 feet. Staff strongly feels that the appropriate variance needed to address all concerns with the least detriment to the zoning code would be to increase the allowable front yard setback to position the proposed structure behind the easement which is causing the hardship. The depth of the lot allows for ample buildable space for a house which does meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(e). This variance would also not require a second variance from the zoning to make the proposed project

buildable. Historically houses were built on different setbacks from the street. While the proposed setback would be larger than normally permitted by the compatibility rule, this variance is more in keeping with the historic neighborhood patterning. Granting of the requested variance for CA3-23-297, would be a significant departure from the zoning code for the district by allowing a structure that is completely incompatible with the surrounding environment. As such, Staff recommends denial of the proposed variance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

CA3-23128 New Construction

Given the recommendation of denial for variance CA3-23-297, the proposed structure cannot be built, as it does not meet the requirements of the zoning code, specifically Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(e). As such, Staff recommends deferral of the proposed project until November 8, 2023 to allow the Applicant to redesign and potentially apply for further variances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until November 8, 2023

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: 290 Ormond Street

APPLICATION: CA3-23-310

MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: Corner of Hill Street and Ormond Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the October 11, 2023 UDC meeting to allow the Applicant time to address the roofline.

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes an additional 1337 sq ft on the second floor of the existing structure. This addition will meet the lot coverage with 46.3% which does not exceed the allowable 55%. The addition will also meet FAR at 45% not exceeding the allowable FAR of 55%.

Roofline

At the rear of the house, the Applicant proposes to remove the existing roof frame to create the addition which towers over the existing hip roofline and does not engage the existing ridge. This does not reinforce the architectural character of this house and creates a massing that supersedes the craftsman bungalow. District regulations states, "Alterations and additions shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction." Being, that this house is on the corner lot, the review roofline because of the purview of the Commission. Additionally, the proposal roof pitch doesn't comply with the regulations which states roof pitch shall be a minimum of 6/12. Staff is concerned with roofline and recommend the Applicant design a roof form that engages the existing roof ridge that will allow for added space.

The proposed shingles, fascia, frieze do not concern Staff.

Siding

On the addition, cementitious siding with a match reveal is proposed. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The proposed windows are double hung window with wood exterior sash and with trim, that matches the existing windows on the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Back deck

Staff are not concerned with the rear deck proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the October 11, 2023 Meeting.

1. The Applicant shall install a roof form that will engage the existing roof ridge, per Sec. 16-K.007(2)(D)(1);
2. The non-compliant railings at the end of the stair-railings shall be removed, per Sec.16-20K.007(2)(D)(1) 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

Janide Prince
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Doug Young
Interim-Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1347 Fairview Road
APPLICATION: CA3-23-365
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: East of Springdale and West of Oakdale Road

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to build a master suite in the rear of the primary structure. This addition will sit over the garage. The removal of the existing deck will allow for the addition. The allowable lot coverage is 35%. The proposed lot cover is 31.7%. The Applicant has not provided information of FAR but nor does the regulations speak to FAR requirement.

The regulation does speak to a structure being permitted within any 100-year flood plan, “No structure shall be permitted within any 100-year floorplan.” The Applicant states, according to the F.I.A Official Flood Hazard Map dated August 15, 2018 portions of this property are in an area having a special flood hazards, .02%. While this is case, it has been confirmed that no part of this addition will be in the floor plan, that the City will be concerned with. Staff are not concerned with his proposal.

Roofline

The proposed roofline engages in a manner that will connect with the existing lower pitch 3:12 roof and not supersede the primary roofline. The proposed asphalt shingles will match the existing roof shingles. Additionally, the proposed trim will match the existing end gable trim. Staff are not concerned with the roofline.

Windows

The proposed windows reflected in the plans will match in-kind the windows that are present on the existing house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes cementitious panel with smooth trim board batten siding to match the board and batten on the original house. On the lower-level, the Applicant proposes brick veneer to match the brick on the lower-level of the existing house. Staff are not concerned with either siding proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to remove non-original windows on the existing house to match the original windows. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Door

On the East side elevation, the Applicant proposes to install a door where a window currently exist. Staff are not concerned with this alteration. Staff reasons, the Applicant complies with the general regulation which states, “if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

SITWORK

The Applicant proposes to remove portion of the existing concrete drive but leave the curbing to as a sediment barrier. Also, the Applicant proposes to remove portion on the rear walk and replace in-kind a small segment of the driveway in the rear. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

CA3-23-365 for 1347 Fairview Road
September 27, 2023
Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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: CA4PH-23-303
MEETING DATE: September 27, 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: Demolition Due to a Threat to Public Health and Safety

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: Denial

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

Type IV and In-Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a threat to public health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the Application. In this case, the property has gone through the In-Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta's Office of Code Compliance. Notices were sent via registered mail to the owner on record May 8, 2023, regarding the public hearing that was held on May 25, 2023. At the May 25, 2023, hearing, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. Staff finds that the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values do not apply in In-Rem cases where the City is the Applicant, but can be useful for informational purposes. Staff finds that the most relevant questions in In-Rem cases are as follows:

- **Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists;** and, While the Applicant did not specifically answer this question, they have provided documentation regarding their analysis of the property. The inspection of the property noted that the cost to repair the structure would be \$108,012 and the value of the home was \$37,560. Photographs of the property which were taken before the In-Rem board meeting have been provided and show substantial deterioration. No information was provided regarding the owner's participation in the In-Rem process. This is extremely concerning as the owner has submitted an application for renovation of the property to the Urban Design Commission, which was approved on August 9, 2023.

- **Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.** The Applicant has not directly addressed this question in their application. No information was provided regarding the owner's participation in the In-Rem process. This is extremely concerning as the owner has submitted an application for renovation of the property to the Urban Design Commission, which was approved on August 9, 2023. The property owner is in the process of addressing the deterioration on the property, which shows an intent to rectify the threat which does not involve demolition.

Staff Findings

Staff finds that the evidence presented does not provide sufficient evidence for demolition due to a threat to public health and safety. Demolishing a historic house should be the absolute last course of action, and the property owner has determined that retaining the property and restoring it is the appropriate course of action. Given that there is an approved application (CA3-23-244) with a fully designed proposal to renovate and improve the property, there is no need to proceed with in-rem demolition as this work will mitigate the threat to public health and safety. As such, 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: 1165 Arlington Avenue SW
APPLICATION: RC-23-295
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2004

Property Location: East side of Arlington Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Use Permit, Personal Care Home

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: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

RC-23-294 1165 Arlington Avenue SW

September 27, 2023

Page 2 of 2

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 has a pending application U-23-021 for a special use permit to allow the property at 1165 Arlington Avenue SW to be used as a personal care home. The property is non-contributing to the Oakland City Historic District, constructed in 2004. In the application the Applicant addresses the fact that the special use will not require modifications to the property. The existing house, driveway, and landscape will remain intact. The personal care home will house no more than six (6) individuals, and no more than two parking spaces are required for the care staff, which can be accommodated by the existing driveway. As no alterations are proposed to the existing property, Staff is not concerned with the proposal for the special use permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

Jayne Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 200 LaFayette Drive (Yonah Park)
APPLICATION: RC-23-298
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Intersection of Yonah and 15th Street

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

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.

SITE WORK

Through the Ansley Park Beautification Foundation, the Applicant seeks to upgrade the park through site grading; adding stone retaining walls; adding metal guardrails; adding concrete paths and landscaping with final stabilization. Two areas of focus have been identified: 15th Street and the Overlook. In addition to the list above the Applicant proposes granite steppingstones with handrails; a seat wall and concrete park path that will be beneficial to the occupants.

Staff support all the proposed changes the Applicant has identified.

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: 184 Forsyth St.
APPLICATION: RC-23-359
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 1)

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: east block face of Forsyth St., between the Trinity Ave. and Brotherton St. intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Confirm the delivery of comments.

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 subject property consists of six (6) parcels owned by the City of Atlanta, that are currently used as surface parking directly adjacent to the Garnett Marta Station. Per the site plan, the project would provide 40 efficiency dwellings consisting of repurposed shipping containers. The site plan also shows future phases of the project which would include the installation of a Community Building, and other amenities. In general, Staff finds that the concept of re-purposing surface parking in the Downtown Area to a higher-intensity use to be in keeping with Urban Design best practices and with the principles espoused in Atlanta City Design.

Given that elevations for the project are not available at this time, Staff will focus their comments on the concept, site planning, and pedestrian infrastructure.

Firstly, Staff would recommend that the Applicant discuss the concept for the project including its goals, the community it will be supporting, and how it will be managed. Staff further recommends the Applicant detail whether this project would create a repeatable template for future projects of this type throughout the City.

The site plan appears to show various amenities that would be provided, and show the planting of new trees on the site. Staff suggests the Applicant discuss the various plans for improving the site beyond the addition of housing units. Staff further suggests the Applicant discuss the plans for future improvements such as the Community Building proposed under phase 2 of the project. The site plan also shows that four (4) of the proposed units will be placed between the bulk of the project and the street. While this portion of the project is flanked by new trees, Staff finds that this placement, if not done thoughtfully, would create a condition where the project closes itself off from the public. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant consider ways that the frontmost housing units could be designed so that there is a public “face” to the site that contributes to the public realm on a street otherwise devoid of such considerations.

From the site plan, it does not appear that any changes to the existing sidewalk or public right of way are proposed. Staff would suggest that the Applicant clarify what the plans are for pedestrian connectivity to the space. Lastly, Staff finds that the use of fencing to separate public property from the public right of way is inappropriate. Further, given the design renderings provided, Staff finds that the use of fencing as shown could detract from the sense of community that the project is seeking to create. As such, Staff would also suggest that fencing not be used to close the space off from the public, and that the project instead focus on creating opportunities for “eyes on the street” and use urban design best practices to ameliorate any security concerns. Staff would note, however, that there could be legitimate concerns regarding the target demographic this site is intended to serve, that would require the use of fencing for their protection. If this is the case, Staff recommends that the Applicant discuss the need for the fencing and whether there are opportunities for it to be removed in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

Cc: Applicant
File