



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: October 11, 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: Approval with Conditions.

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

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 GREEN for the October 11, 2023, meeting

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. The Applicant has changed the front gable pitch from 6:12 to 8:12. And in the rear of this gable the pitch is 6:12. The Applicant has extended that gable to look larger than the previous rendering.**
- 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 continuous 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.

The Applicant has made the correction and listed the correct underlying zoning of R4-A. Staff are not concerned with this any longer.

- **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.**

The Applicant is complying to a rear setback that is 15ft. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

- **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.**

The Applicant has indicated the rain garden in the lot coverage calculation. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

- **Floor Area Ratio—The Applicant has not provided the floor area ratio. Staff recommend they supply this information.**

The Applicant has provided FAR information, which complies. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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 are 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 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. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The proposed siding is cementitious siding. Cementitious is permitted. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

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

This recommendation remains. New foundation cannot be brick surround. Now the Applicant has indicated the original foundation in brick sound. The photo shows the original foundation as brick.

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 which includes the steps and cheek walls. The Applicant has changed the steps and cheek wall as brick surround. Staff recommend the steps and cheek wall be brick.

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. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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 not 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.

The Applicant shows a wood door with a rectangular light. However, the Applicant shall note wood door.

Screen door

Apparently, the screen doors (2) appear to be original to the house while there is no definitive information to confirm the original. 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.

The Applicant propose removing the screen door. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

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 still 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.

The Applicant has shown the concrete pillars will be repaired. Staff recommend the language on the plan read as repaired in-kind.

Driveway

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

The Applicant has indicated the driveway will be replaced in-kind and be 10ft wide.

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, but the language shall read in-kind to the existing.

Sidewalk

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

The Applicant has noted the sidewalk will be repaired with 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 cannot 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.

While the Applicant has reflected the raingarden in the lot coverage calculation and has moved it from the front of the house to the rear in the buildable lot. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall indicate the door will be wood, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
2. The proposed foundation shall be either solid masonry or concrete, per Sec.16-20G.006(5)(b)
3. The existing brick foundation shall be repaired and replaced in kind if needed, per Sec. 16-20G.006(5)(a);
4. The existing steps and cheek wall shall be solid brick does not brick surround;
5. The chimney shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20G;
6. A note shall be placed on the plans stating the concrete pillars shall retained or replaced in-kind if, per Sec. 16-20G.006(16);
7. 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);
8. The retaining wall shall be noted to be repaired or replaced in-kind per Sec.16-20G.006(15) and
9. 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: 1163 Wilmington Avenue

APPLICATION: CA2-23-323

MEETING DATE: October 11, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location Corner of Richland and Oakland Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 9/19/23 a Stop Work was applied for substantial work. The siding, original windows have been removed. And door openings have been removed. The house was gutted.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The house is on a corner. All sides will be reviewed.

ALTERATIONS

The original material on listed alteration has been removed. This review is centered on replacement.

Front Porch

railings

Photos provided for the house show most of the railings on the front porch have been removed or are not original to the house. The Applicant proposes to install railings that appear to comply to the District requirements: two-part railing construction, with the top railing be no higher then the bottom of the front windows. Staff are not concerned with the railings.

columns

The columns are not drawn correctly. The base of the column and top of the column has the same pattern. The Applicant has not reflected this. Staff recommend, the Applicant make the correction and show the column exactly like the original. The brick base on the column is fine.

steps

The current steps are concrete. The Applicant has proposed a wood closed riser and ends with the steps as concrete. Porch material is governed by compatibility stand on the blockface. On this blockface, there are no other standing houses for comparisons so the adjacent blockface will be used for comparison. On the adjacent blockface most houses' steps are concrete, and the railings are wood. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows and Trim

Provided photos show the windows are not on the house. The windows are boarded. Staff believe most of the original windows are no longer on the house and have been disposed of. Photos provided by Code Enforcement do show a few windows are recognizable. The wood trim appears to be in good shape. The Applicant proposes new one-over-one wood windows with the intact wood trim. Since there is no record of the original wood windows style, it is hard to determine what stye the windows were originally. With this being the case, the window design will become a compatibility standard issue. With two houses on the adjacent blockface, one is one-over-one and the other has simulated lites. The one-over-one pattern the Applicant proposes is of no concern to Staff.

In the gable, the Applicant proposes double four-over-four wood windows. Staff are not concerned about this proposal. However, Staff does recommend the lite be integral to sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of the glass.

shutters

The Applicant proposes are in-kind the shutters. The current shutters do not appear to be original to the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes smooth-faced cementitious siding. However, the original siding on the house is wood. While cementitious siding is permitted, it is not when known wood siding existed. Looking at photos, the woods siding is in fair condition except for repairs and painting. Staff recommend the Applicant repair and replace in-kind the wood siding.

Doors

The proposed exterior doors comply with the District regulation which states, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood framing. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

In the front, the current foundation is brick covered with stucco. The Applicant proposes the same in-kind material. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Site Work

walkway

The existing walkway at the up level is too wide. Staff recommend the walkway take out the excessive walkway at the top and have it comply with other's walkway in the District.

sidewalk

The sidewalk exists. Staff recommend if needed the sidewalk be repaired or replaced in kind to match the existing one.

retaining wall

The retaining wall appears to be in good condition. Staff recommend any repair should be done in-kind to match the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The front porch columns shall match exactly to the original columns and shown on the plans, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
2. The window's lites shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the window, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(2);
3. The replacement siding shall be wood to match the original wood siding, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
4. The Applicant shall remove the added walkway at the top of yard and comply to other width of the walkway in the District, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c)
5. The sidewalk shall be repaired or replaced in-kind to the existing sidewalk, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c)
6. The retaining wall shall be repaired and replaced in-kind to the existing, Sec.16-20M(m) and
7. 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: 284 Little Street
APPLICATION: CA3-23-284
MEETING DATE: October 11th 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: Approval with Conditions

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

10/11/23 in GREEN

Edits are RED.

Edits for 10/11/23 in GREEN

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 new plans reflect an accurate roofline. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

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

The Applicant is showing the right elevation with the dormer. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

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.

The Applicant has changed the roof proposal, now proposing dormers only on the addition. They are depicted in a manner that will permit them to sit behind the original roofline. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

Windows

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

The new windows are proposed as wood. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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.

The proposed siding is smooth faced cementitious. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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.

The Applicant is proposing stucco as the foundation. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. Stucco is a permitted foundation material.

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.

Staff mistakenly perceived a rear deck as a side landing. Staff are not concerned with this 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.

The Applicant still have not clearly specified the intention of the existing windows but only labelled them as wood. The Applicant also have not shown the existing trim around the wood windows. This is problematic. Being that this is a contributing house, the original trim and style will need to be retained. Staff recommend the style of the original window be retained, and the style of the trim must be retained and be shown on the proposed elevation.

Siding

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

The Applicant has shown all the siding as cementitious. This is problematic. However, Staff understand that the original siding on the house has been removed. Staff deems since cementitious siding is a permissible material and the siding on the addition is proposed as cementitious, it would look better to have one type of siding on the house. Staff reasons this proposal will not deter from the historic architectural character of the house.

Foundation

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

Staff is not concerned with his proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The original windows style and trim style shall be retained and added to the plans, per Sec.16-20K 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

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: October 11th deferred since 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: Approval

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

Updates in RED

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 are concerned with roofline and recommend the Applicant design a roof form that engages the existing roof ridge that will allow for added space.

The Applicant has provided plans that show the roofline is engaged with the existing roof and the pitches are reported as 6/12. Staff are not concerned with the new roof proposal.

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 with the two-part railing system.

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)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the August 23, 2023 hearing, the Commission reviewed and approved CA3-23-086 for new construction at this address with conditions.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval.

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.

At the August 23, 2023 Commission meeting, the Commission approved the application CA3-23-089 with several conditions. One of the conditions of approval was related to the lack of active use along one of the primary facades of the structure. The discussion in the Staff Report of this condition was as follows:

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.

The current request is for a variance to remove the requirement for ground-floor active use along the entire Bell Street façade of the site.

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 in their response that the .98 acre site is bound by three rights of way creating a triple frontage for any proposed structure. Due to this condition, the site has 945 linear feet of frontage along public rights of way. The shortest frontage is to the north along Bell St. at 155 linear feet. In responses to other criteria, the Applicant also notes the existence of a sewer easement which further limits the development of the site.

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 application of the Zoning Ordinance would create a situation where it would be impossible for the site to fully comply with the requirements of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District regulations for this Subarea. The culmination of these regulations would result in a condition where the construction of the otherwise compliant parking structure would not be possible.

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

The Applicant states that the combination of sewer easements constricting the development as well as the abnormally large frontages that the proposal will have constitute a peculiar condition that would not be experienced by the majority of properties in the District.

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

The Applicant states that the proposed relief would not impair the purposes or intent of the Zoning Ordinance and that the resulting project would preserve an extant historic building which otherwise would continue to fall into disrepair. The project would also eliminate an existing park for hire lot and replace it with a higher density use.

Staff agrees with the Applicant's assessment of the conditions of the site, their finding of a hardship, and their analysis of the peculiarity of the conditions affecting this property. While multiple frontages are not unique in this District, Staff finds that the application of the Zoning Ordinance would create a condition that is impossible for the site to meet as it relates to ingress and egress. As such, Staff finds that the variance criteria have been met by the Applicant's submission and supports their request for a variance.

CA3-23-315 for 229 Auburn Ave.

August 23, 2023

Page 3 of 3

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: 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

Janide Prince
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Doug Young
Interim-Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1486 Fairview Road
APPLICATION: CA3-23-319
MEETING DATE: October 11, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923

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.

No changes are proposed for the front of the house, nor any sitework is proposed.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes a second-floor addition in the rear of the primary structure. There is also a proposal for the second-floor screened porch to be enclosed to allow for this addition. Staff are not concerned about second-floor screened porch closure because the rear is not original to the house. Since the Applicant is utilizing existing space, lot coverage is not of concern, the floor area ratio of additional 375 plus heated space is of no concern either. There is no limit in the district. Everything sits behind the original and existing house. Staff are not concerned with this addition.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to reconfigure four ground floor windows at the non-original kitchen addition. These windows will align with windows that reflect the Tudor style. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 616 Linwood Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-323
MEETING DATE: October 11, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Poncey Highland Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West side of Linwood Avenue NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition, Deck, Window Replacement, Alterations, Fencing

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20V

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 23CAP-00001008

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the November 8, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes a second story dormer addition to the rear roof plane. In conjunction with this addition a new rear deck would be added to access the upper stories. The proposed addition is no higher than the ridgeline of the principal structure and maintains the setbacks of the principal structure. The proposed rear deck would be situated entirely behind the principal structure. The existing structure appears to be an existing non-conforming tri-plex. The Applicant will submit evidence that the tri-plex is an existing non-conformity.

The Applicant also proposes total window replacement on the structure. Staff finds that the proposed window replacement meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20V.006 (a)(i) and is not concerned with the proposal.

The stop-work order on the property also mentions that the siding has been removed and is being replaced. The associated photos also show what appears to be soffit repair and removal of character defining rafter tails on the left elevation. These alterations are not mentioned in the application. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding siding replacement. The Applicant will clarify the scop of work regarding soffit and rafter tail removal.

The stop-work order photos also show installation of a new fence, which is not shown on the site plan. The Applicant will add the location of the new fence to the site plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until November 8, 2023, to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit evidence that the tri-plex is an existing non-conformity.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding siding replacement.
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding soffit and rafter tail removal.
- 4.) The Applicant will add the location of the new fence to the site plan.
- 5.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of all materials.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File