



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 25, 2023, deferred since 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. So the recommendations requires the Applicant install the appropriate material.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the November 8th UDC Meeting

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. 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, when known wood siding existed it is expected the replacement be wood. Looking at photos, the woods siding is in fair condition except

for repairs and painting. Staff just learned all the siding has been removed. Staff recommend the Applicant replace off of the siding to match in-kind the wood siding in reveal that was on the house.

Doors

All the doors are missing but the Applicant proposes all the exterior doors will 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: November 8th UDC Meeting.

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

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: CA2-23-325

MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20A, SA3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1991

Property Location: West side of Pearl Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

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

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: 23CAP-00000489 & 23CAP-00001049

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 23CAP-00000489 on May 13, 2023, this case was closed when they found that the features were previously existing. A second stop-work order 23CAP-00001049 was issued when the work was determined to have not been properly permitted. This application addresses the remainder of the un-permitted work. The deck, spa, and fencing were addressed under CA2S-23-266. The driveway was not. Staff overall has concerns with the site plan as submitted, which does not show the four corners of the property, establish that the property is in compliance in terms of impermeable surface/lot coverage, and show the dimensions of all features. The Applicant will submit a site plan showing all four corners of the property, including all the previously un-permitted work, with lot coverage calculated.

Deck & Spa

The Applicant reconstructed a 448 square foot deck under CA2S-23-266. There was also a concrete pad poured beneath a spa associated with this work. The existing site plan is both incomplete and does not have a scale on it. As a result, Staff is unable to determine if the spa is in compliance in terms of meeting setback requirements.

Fence

The Applicant seeks retroactive approval of construction of a new six-foot wooden fence. Staff notes that this fence was installed approximately 9 years ago; however, it remains unpermitted. Staff finds that the fence meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Driveway

The Applicant has repaved a drive that was previously pavers with a planting strip with solid concrete. As previously noted the site plan submitted does not show the dimensions of this driveway, but Staff can see that the drive as constructed does not appear to extend 20 feet past the front facade of the structure and appears to exceed 10 feet in width. Sec. 16-20A.006 (19)(f) requires, "The driveway of a lot used for residential purposes shall extend at least 20 feet behind the front façade of the house." The Applicant will submit a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit a site plan showing all four corners of the property, including all the previously un-permitted work, with lot coverage calculated.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 907 Beecher Street SW
APPLICATION: CA2-23-326
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1908

Property Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of Joseph E. Lowry Blvd. and Beecher Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00001215, CA3-21-114

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant previously came before the Urban Design Commission for the proposed work in 2021 (CA3-21-114), since that time they have gone outside the scope of work by completely replacing the windows on the structure and not repairing siding in-kind and received a stop-work order on August 10, 2023. The windows shown on the previously approved plans were shown as six-over-six, double-hung windows, which Staff has determined was not accurately depicted. Historic photos of the house show that the original window style was one-over-one, double-hung. That being said, the previous approval for CA3-21-114 did not permit full replacement of the windows. No follow-up materials were ever submitted to Staff regarding the infeasibility of repairing and restoring the historic windows. The replacement materials were also never reviewed by Staff. Staff's major concern with the window replacement is that it appears pre-fabricated units with standard brick molding have been used, not fitting them to the historic openings and the historic trim has been discarded. The Applicant will submit specification for the proposed replacement windows illustrating that they meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant will install the replacement windows in the original openings with no more than an inch difference in size. The Applicant will restore or replicate the historic trim and reveal surrounding the windows.

The original approval did permit replacement of up to 20% of the deteriorated siding on the structure. The issue appears to be that there are two types of siding present on the structure, clapboard and shiplap, and incorrect siding types have been used on portions. The Applicant will make all siding repairs in-kind with appropriate matching materials.

The historic shingling in the front gable has been infilled with siding. This alteration was not approved. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted siding from the front gable. The Applicant will restore the gable to its historic appearance using shingles which exactly match those which were removed. The Applicant will supply specifications for the proposed shingles to be used.

The porch ceiling has also been removed unpermitted. The Applicant will restore the porch ceiling using beadboard. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed beadboard to be utilized.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit specification for the proposed replacement windows illustrating that they meet the requirements of the zoning code.
- 2.) The Applicant will install the replacement windows in the original openings with no more than an inch difference in size.
- 3.) The Applicant will restore or replicate the historic trim and reveal surrounding the windows.
- 4.) The Applicant will make all siding repairs in-kind with appropriate matching materials.
- 5.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted siding from the front gable.

- 6.) The Applicant will restore the gable to its historic appearance using shingles which exactly match those which were removed.
- 7.) The Applicant will supply specifications for the proposed shingles to be used.
- 8.) The Applicant will restore the porch ceiling using beadboard.
- 9.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed beadboard to be utilized.
- 10.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 995 Oakland Drive SW

APPLICATION: CA2-23-343

MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1935

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Oakland Drive and Plaza Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant is seeking retroactive approval of the replacement of a single window on the street-facing façade. The window was replaced was a one-over-one, double-hung vinyl window according to the application. It appears it was replaced in kind; however, the photos are of such poor quality, Staff cannot determine if this is actually the case. The Applicant will clarify which window was replaced. The Applicant will submit higher quality photographs of the window which was replaced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify which window was replaced.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit higher quality photographs of the window which was replaced.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the project.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 378 Grant Park Place SE
APPLICATION: CA2-23-346
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1908

Property Location: North side of Grant Park Place SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne Cottage

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: Yes, CA2S-23-231, 23CAP-00001347

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the November 20, 2023 Hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

In July of 2023 the Applicant received an approval with conditions for a proposed project (CA2S-23-231). The scope of the work was proposed as minor repairs (not to exceed 20% of the existing historic material) to the tongue-in-groove porch flooring, porch railing, porch ceiling, broken glass in existing windows, and removal of the non-historic aluminum siding. The approval with conditions also included work outside the purview of Staff including interior renovations, full window replacement on the side and rear elevations, a side gabled dormer addition, and removal of one chimney. The original scope of work was limited to The Applicant received a stop work order 23CAP-00001347 on September 12, 2023, for exceeding the scope of work for CA2S-23-231. Staff and code enforcement determined that the following were violations exceeding the approved scope of work:

- **Porch Decking Replaced.** The conditions of approval for CA2S-23-231 indicated this work would require a separate Historic Preservation application. This work was done outside the scope and not permitted. Staff notes that the porch flooring was replaced in-kind using historically appropriate tongue-in-groove flooring, Staff is not concerned with this work.
- **Porch Columns Replaced.** Application CA2S-23-231 did not indicate such work. The existing porch supports which were installed do not match the historic features which were removed. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted porch supports. The Applicant will replace the porch supports which were removed with four square wooden supports which match the historic features which were removed in dimensions, material, and design.
- **Porch Railings.** The condition of approval for CA2S-23-231 indicated this work require a separate Historic Preservation application. The original plans only indicated the removal of the screen enclosing the porch and minor repairs. The Applicant will install a two-part, but-jointed railing which matches the design of the one which was illegally removed and is not taller than the bottom of the historic window sills. The Applicant may install a plane extension as needed to meet the requirements of the building code.
- **Window and Door Replacement.** CA2S-23-231 required a separate application required would be needed for door and window replacement. Repairs were limited to 20% of the cubic inches PER window. It is not clear based on the new application what the proposed scope of work is for windows on the front elevation. Staff notes that the front door, with its historic sidelights is extant and appears to be in excellent condition. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in terms of windows on the street-facing elevation. The Applicant will retain the historic front door unit including the historic sidelights.
- **Wood siding.** The scope of work indicates that the non-historic aluminum siding would be removed, and the conditions of approval for CA2S-23-231 require retention of the historic wood siding beneath for the front elevation. It is not entirely clear based on the submitted elevations if this is the intention. It is notes that the siding will be replaced with 8-inch cementitious siding on the sides and rear. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The

Applicant will retain the historic wooden siding on the front elevation. The Applicant will submit any proposed repairs to the historic wooden siding to Staff for approval.

- **Porch Steps Replaced.** The application did not indicate such work. Staff notes that while the steps were replaced in-kind in terms of material (wood) they are not an appropriate historic method, but rather are constructed with gaps in the risers similar to deck steps. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted steps and reconstruct them as fully closed risers.
- **Stucco applied to the foundation.** The application did not indicate such work. The brick foundation was a character defining feature of the structure. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.” The Applicant will remove the unpermitted stucco and restore the historic brick foundation.
- **The removal of the western chimney.** The removal of this chimney is not an issue, and the newly submitted plans) dated September 23, 2023, indicate this removal.
- **Dormer is installed in the wrong location and incorrect size.** The dormer which was constructed is a completely different style (hipped) and three times as large as what is shown on the previously approved plans. Though the dormer as proposed was not reviewable, the as-built dormer stretches to the front plane of the roof making it reviewable. The Applicant has submitted a second set of plans (dated September 23, 2023) which still show the original plan for the dormer. The larger dormer is neither an appropriate style for the house, nor does it reflect the proposed plans. There is an existing, end-gabled dormer on the tree-facing elevation. The proposed dormer fits the existing character of the house and distinctive architectural features. The dormer as-built is a hipped Craftsman-style which is inappropriate for the style of the house and out of scale. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted dormer. The Applicant will construct an end-gabled dormer as shown on the approved plans on the side roof plane.
- **Site Work.** The application did not indicate any site work would be completed. The existing historic walkway, composed of hexagonal pavers has been removed and discarded. The Applicant will restore the walkway to its historic proportions using in-kind materials. The Applicant will clarify if any additional site work is proposed. The Applicant will submit an updated site plan showing all features present on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the November 20, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to Address the Following:

- 1.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted porch supports.
- 2.) The Applicant will replace the porch supports which were removed with four square wooden supports which match the historic features which were removed in dimensions, material, and design.
- 3.) The Applicant will install a two-part, but-jointed railing which matches the design of the one which was illegally removed and is not taller than the bottom of the historic window sills.
- 4.) The Applicant may install a plane extension as needed to meet the requirements of the building code.

- 5.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in terms of windows on the street-facing elevation.
- 6.) The Applicant will retain the historic front door unit including the historic sidelights.
- 7.) The Applicant will retain the historic wooden siding on the front elevation.
- 8.) The Applicant will submit any proposed repairs to the historic wooden siding to Staff for approval.
- 9.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted steps and reconstruct them as fully closed risers.
- 10.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted stucco and restore the historic brick foundation.
- 11.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted dormer.
- 12.) The Applicant will construct an end-gabled dormer as shown on the approved plans on the side roof plane.
- 13.) The Applicant will restore the walkway to its historic proportions using in-kind materials.
- 14.) The Applicant will clarify if any additional site work is proposed.
- 15.) The Applicant will submit an updated site plan showing all features present on the property.
- 16.) The Applicant shall submit all revised materials to Staff, no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

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

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 715 Brookline
APPLICATION: CA3-23-330
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the November 8th UDC.

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

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

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."

The house is located on a corner lot, so all four sides are reviewable.

PLANS

The Applicant has erroneously identified this as a two-story house. The house is a one story which appears to have attic space for build out. Staff recommend the Applicant make the correction on labelling and identify the house as a one-story house.

Additionally, the Applicant's building data numbers are not adding up correctly. This would make the FAR and Lot Coverage wrong. Staff recommend the Applicant check the calculations and record the correct information on the final plans.

The proposed site plan is not reflective of the dormer on the left elevation. Staff recommend this information be provided on the site plan.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to add 340 sf to the rear of the property along with an added 1,913 sf with a buildout on the attic space living space.

Addition

The addition will extend to the rear of the property utilizing the existing roof line with a proposed pitch of 67/8:12 Pitch is a compatibility issue. The Applicant has noted the pitch on the existing roof is 7:12 and 67/8:12. The proposal roof does comply with what is on the house. Staff have no concern regarding the pitch.

Dormer

The proposed dormer on the east elevation gives Staff pause. There are dormers on the blockface, so Staff isn't concerned with the added dormer. The only regulation regarding dormers is dormers cannot be added to the front of the house unless they are original to the structure. The dormer is proposed on the side of the house, not the front. However, the District does regulation the massing. Staff deem, the proposed dormer is much larger than the existing dormer on the house and other dormers on the blockface; because of this the house massing would not be compatible. Staff recommend the dormer be smaller to be compatible with the existing dormer.

Siding

The proposed siding is wood. District regulation requires siding on addition to be wood or horizontal smooth cementitious. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

District regulation requires windows on new construction shall be wood or wood fiber composite. The Applicant is proposing varying wood windows that will match what are matching the existing styles on the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

The foundation is proposed as stone to match the existing stone foundation. Staff are not concerned about this proposal.

Deck

The proposed deck with the two-part railing is not problematic. However, the wood canopy structure screening is. Being that house is on a corner lot, the deck is reviewable. The canopy structure is a contemporary feature and the District regulation states, contemporary design of new construction, which this canopy can be classified as, is permitted if it was compatible with other adjacent structures. The Applicant has not shown this to be the case. Staff recommend the canopy be removed unless it can be shown the canopy is compatible with other adjacent structures or the deck can be enclosed with screen wire.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant has indicated no changes are proposed at the front elevation. But the following alterations are proposed for the house.

Windows

The window removals on the east elevation are problematic to Staff. District regulation state, original windows and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed in whole or in part. Staff recommend the windows not be removed but be retained.

Siding

The Applicant has not proposed any changes to the existing siding.

Side Porch

The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing west side porch, stoop, and stairs. This is problematic to Staff. District regulation states, "architecturally significant porches, steps and stoops shall be retained." Staff recommend the side porch be retained.

Door

The Applicant proposes several types of doors for the addition. Staff are not concerned with the proposed doors.

Foundation

No change is proposed to the existing foundation.

SITWORK

No sitework is being proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The house shall be labelled as a one-story house not a two-story house, per Sec.16-20L.006;
2. The Applicant shall recalculate the FAR and Lot Coverage and note them on the final plans, per Sec.16-20L.006;
3. The site plan shall include the dormer, per Sec.16-20L.006;

4. The dormer on the east elevation shall be smaller to be compatible with the existing dormer on the west elevation, per Sec.16-20L.005(2);
5. On the addition the cementitious siding shall be smoothed face with a 4 to 6 reveal, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(a)(2)
6. The canopy structure on the rear deck must be removed, unless the Applicant can show compatibility with other adjacent properties, per Sec.16-20L.005(1)(10);
7. The rear porch shall be screened in screen wire if the Applicant chooses, per Sec.16-20L.006(g)(3);
8. The windows shall be retained on the east elevation, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(b)(1);
9. The side stoop and stairs shall be retained, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(g)(1)
10. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 740 Clifton Road NE
APPLICATION: CA3-23-332 & 333
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District **Other Zoning:** n/a

Date of Construction: Contributing, 1912, Non-Contributing, various

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Ponce de Leon and Clifton Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Dutch Colonial Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction and Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval (CA3-23-332), Approval with Conditions (CA3-23-333)

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

Variance CA3-23-332

The Applicant requests a variance to reduce amount of required parking from 425 spaces (required) to 266 spaces (proposed) parking; and to reduce the half depth front yard setback from 64.5 feet to 50 feet;

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

The Applicant cites the location, shape, and use of the lot as exceptional and extraordinary circumstances which would require a variance to the code. The location on a corner lot and larger than ordinary lot size, which creates a deep half depth front yard, the lack of a uniform lot width due to the inward curve of the property on the Clifton Road frontage, the topography which dictates where buildings and parking may be constructed, and the use of a large portion of the property as active recreation in the form of a golf course limits the buildable space.

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

The Applicant cites the inability to make improvements based on the application of the zoning code as the unusually deep setback on the Clifton Road frontage. The parcel at 33 acres does not fit the standard plating for the neighborhood. The active use as a golf course further limits the buildable area. Imposing the 64.5-foot setback would create an unnecessary hardship as the possibilities for construction would be limited by this setback. The use as a country club, with limited membership also means that the parking requirements imposed by the increased square footage creates an unnecessary hardship because the Applicant would be forced to add parking, which would remain unused, further restricting the buildable area of the lot.

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

The Applicant cites the dimensions, shape, and location of the lot, active use, and topography.

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

The Applicant states that the project will not negatively impact the public good or impair the purposes or intent of the zoning ordinance, as the granting of the variance allows for reasonable expansion and updating of a longstanding institution in the community. The proposed improvements would enhance the historic landscape of the Druid Hills Country club, and granting of the proposed variances would alleviate the restrictive nature of the code for a property that does have extraordinary and unusual features present.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting a variance. Staff is satisfied by the responses given in which an unnecessary hardship was created by the 64.5 foot setback and requirements to add additional parking. Staff finds that the application of the setback requirements of the Druid Hills Landmark District, would create an unnecessary hardship preventing the proposed new construction and as such, Staff supports the requested variance. Staff further notes that imposing the requirement to add 425 parking spaces, when the expansion in square footage would not create a need for more parking in this circumstance, would create an unnecessary hardship further limiting the buildable area of the lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval (CA3-23-332)

CA3-23-333 (New Construction and Site Work)

The Applicant proposes demolition of an existing non-contributing building constructed in 2002. The building would be replaced with a new, larger structure. Due to the increase in size the structure would be located closer to the street than the existing setback. Variance CA3-23-333 addresses the reduction in setback from 64.5 feet to 50 feet to allow for this proposed new construction. In addition, the plans indicate that the proposed new construction would in no way impact the historic clubhouse building with all activities being physically removed by the existing pool deck, which would largely remain in place.

The proposed new construction would be a three-story structure, with a maximum height of 36 feet 9 inches. The building would be designed in the Dutch Colonial style to match the existing historic campus architecture. The exterior would have fieldstone foundation, with stucco and brick cladding, and a slate roof all matching the existing materials found on the original contributing structures on the property. The gambrel roof would have shed dormers, similar in style to the existing on the smaller non-contributing pool house, which would be demolished. Staff is not concerned with the proposal, and finds that the architectural style, scale, materials, and overall design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property.

As part of the proposed demolition, the existing active recreation pool area would also be expanded, with one pool being enlarged and a smaller baby pool being added. There is also a new entrance to the pool area proposed, which would incorporate a set of stairs with two small check-in buildings and a covered pergola. The demolition and new construction would require the removal of 7 mature trees and new landscaping. The Applicant will comply with the requirements of the City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance for removal of mature trees. As the historic landscape is a significant feature of the Druid Hills Landmark District, this addition must be in compliance with the historic Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. The Applicant will submit a detailed proposal for the new landscape design.

Staff only has one concern with the material design proposal for this area. On the plans it appears that there is a canopy proposed to cover the new baby pool. Materials are not noted but it appears that it is to be of metal construction which does not match any of the other historic materials. The Applicant will clarify the design of the proposed canopy over the new baby pool.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will comply with the requirements of the City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance for removal of mature trees.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a detailed proposal for the new landscape design.
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify the design of the proposed canopy over the new baby pool.
- 4.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1168 Lucile Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-334
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1906

Property Location: South side of Lucile Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Gabled-El Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and Accessory Structure

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00000526

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the November 20, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

Staff notes that the submitted site plan does not show all features present on the lot, nor does it show lot coverage. The Applicant will submit a revised site plan which illustrates all features present on the lot and calculates lot coverage.

The Applicant received a stop work order (23CAP-00000526) on April 14, 2023, for an unpermitted addition and enlargement of an accessory structure and has received multiple citations for continued work including erection of a fence. The existing structure is a non-conforming triplex. The Applicant proposes an addition and conversion of the property into a duplex. As the lot is zoned R4-A, the property must first be confirmed as an existing non-conformity. The Applicant will submit a letter of legal non-conformity for the property. Once legal non-conformity has been established, a special exception must be applied for to allow expansion of the principal structure as an addition would increase the degree of non-conformity. The Applicant will not construct the proposed addition.

Staff has additional concerns that the elevations as submitted do not accurately reflect the existing conditions, particularly reconfiguration of windows on side elevations. Staff has particular concerns regarding the addition of several windows, and complete removal of the bay window on the right elevation. The bay window in particular is a character defining feature visible from the public right of way. While Staff understands that the reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations is permitted to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms, and that the bay is proposed to become a bathroom; however, this is an extreme alteration that removes a key historic structural feature. It also appears that several windows are being added to increase the number of bedrooms, which is not permitted by code. There is also annotation on the plans which describes, "Existing roof pitch is estimated to be at a 12/12 slope. The proposed roof is to be at an 8/12 slope." It is not clear to staff precisely what this means. Is this the proposed addition roof slope? Is there a proposal to remove the existing roof and replace with a different form and slope? The Applicant will clarify the scope of all proposed roof work. Given that unpermitted work has taken place, Staff needs the floorplans and elevations to accurately depict all changes. The Applicant will submit floorplans and elevations which accurately depict the structure prior to the unpermitted work. The Applicant will remove the proposed new windows being added to increase the number of bedrooms and retain the bay window.

Staff is also concerned with the current scope of work because notations suggest that alterations would be carried out which are not clearly outlined, such as "fix or replace" in regards to balustrades and columns on the porch. The Applicant will clarify the scope of proposed work to the porches. No information has been supplied regarding the existing doors, windows, siding, or other exterior features. The Applicant will clarify if any alterations are proposed to the existing doors, windows, or siding. No specifications have been provided for any of the features to be used

on the proposed addition. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding, windows, and doors to be utilized on the addition.

Staff also has considerable concerns regarding the proposed accessory dwelling unit. The existing structure must be demolished, as it does not meet the requirements of the zoning code in terms of height or square footage. The proposed ADU also does not meet the requirements of the zoning code as it covers 936 square feet (768 conditioned, 168 unconditioned deck). No accessory dwelling unit can exceed 750 square feet of conditioned space. Total rear yard coverage cannot exceed 25%, or 867 square feet. At most the Applicant would be permitted an ADU of 750 square feet with and exterior unconditioned space that cannot exceed 117 square feet. The Applicant will revise the proposed ADU to bring it into compliance.

The Applicant has installed fencing on the property. This is not shown on the site plans, nor has it been outlined in the scope of work. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding fencing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the November 20, 2023 hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit a revised site plan which illustrates all features present on the lot and calculates lot coverage.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a letter of legal non-conformity for the property.
- 3.) The Applicant will not construct the proposed addition without a special exception.
- 4.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of all proposed roof work.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit floorplans and elevations which accurately depict the structure prior to the unpermitted work.
- 6.) The Applicant will remove the proposed new windows being added to increase the number of bedrooms and retain the bay window.
- 7.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of proposed work to the porches.
- 8.) The Applicant will clarify if any alterations are proposed to the existing doors, windows, or siding.
- 9.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed siding, windows, and doors to be utilized on the addition.
- 10.) The Applicant will revise the proposed ADU to bring it into compliance.
- 11.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding fencing.
- 12.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1033 North Avenue

APPLICATION: CA3-23-335

MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Poncey Highland Historic District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1920

Contributing (Y/N): Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Cable Cod Traditional

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to allow solar panels to exist in the Lot Compatibility Zone.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

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

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking a variance to allow solar panels to exist in the Lot Compatibility Zone.

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

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

Applicant writes: **“The roof structure pertaining to 1033 North Ave has a unique design that only permits the solar panels in a particular arrangement. Unfortunately, the code’s 60 FT ordinance(s) is incursive to this proposal; the panels’ must be within the 60 FT radius.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“This project’s solar proposal at the rear of the home will be hidden from the public. Conventionally, this layout for solar panels within historical zones would be ideal; however, this zoning ordinance creates a hardship for the owner and surrounding community members because even though the solar panels will be virtually indistinguishable from the public, the City’s ordinance still prevents the alternative renewable energy resource.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“For this specific Atlanta City resident, production of at least 5.67 DC (KW) would need to be generated to merit its value from renewable energy. At a minimum, 14-15 individual solar panels will be needed to create this offset. This proposal suggests the establishment of only 14 solar panels. Keeping all 14 panels within the 60 FT radius is not possible unless relief is granted.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“To allow the panels to be install would not be detrimental to the public because one the panels will not be seen. Nor, will the allowance of the panels affect the zoning ordinance because each variance request is decided individually and just so happen the roof on this house has a unique design that will only allow for the panels to be installed in the LCZ.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

The Applicant has provided information that supports the variance. While the solar panels will be in the LCZ, they will not be visible from the public right-away. To allow for the most efficiently the panels must be placed on this unique roof line. While this roof is unique and is in the LCZ, the solar panels will not be visible, Staff leans on this as being the primary reason for support Not to allow the Applicant to utilize cost saving and energy efficient methods when they are not visible from the public right-away is more harmful.

Staff supports the variance.



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

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 751 Catherine
APPLICATION: CA3-23-330
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

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."

PLANS

The Applicant proposes to add 1308 sf to the rear of the property along with an added 672 sf pool on the side rear and 60 sf on concrete. The Applicant as shown meeting the FAR and Lot Coverage of R4-A. However, the calculations on the site plan are not clear. The numbers are not added correctly. Staff recommends the Applicant check the numbers so that FAR and Lot Coverage can be calculated correctly.

ADDITION

House Addition

The roofline is continuing the extension of the existing roofline. Staff are not concerned with the roof proposal.

Windows

District regulations states, "new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be placed on the side and rear of the structure and be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors." The proposed windows on the side elevations are not in compliance with the regulations. The Applicant is proposing a one-over-one window. The existing windows are four-over-one wood windows with wood trim. Staff recommend the proposed windows match in kind the existing windows.

On the right elevation, the Applicant is proposing full glass windows. While adding windows on the side of the house is permissible, the proposed window sizes are not. As stated above, the Applicant must install windows that are compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style. The windows are not. Staff recommends the proposed windows on the right elevation match in-kind the existing windows on the house, in style, size, proportion.

The proposed windows on the left side are not in compliance. The proposal for the one-over-one and the horizontal window does not match the existing windows. The same recommendation applies. The window on the left side must match in kind to the existing.

The Applicant has also proposed ribbon style clear glass windows on what appears to be the roof. This is problematic and those windows cannot be installed. Staff recommend the window be removed from the proposal.

Trim

It appears the Applicant is not employing the same wood trim that is reflected on the existing windows. Staff recommend the Applicant install trim that matches the original wood trim.

Siding

The proposed siding is cementitious. Staff recommend the siding be horizontal smooth cementitious siding.

Door

The Applicant proposes a side door on the left side elevation. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. However, Staff recommend the door comply to the District regulation which states, “new doors should be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement and style to the existing doors.”

Foundation

The foundation is proposed as brick veneer. District regulations require a new foundation to be masonry or concrete construction. Other foundation materials are permitted provided they are appropriate to the building own which they are located and in scale, materials, and style with adjacent and surrounding house. Staff are concerned with this proposal; the existing foundation is brick. The proposed foundation will be concrete and with brick veneer.

SITWORK

Accessory Structure

The Applicant is proposing a pool and patio on the side rear of the property. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, District regulations states, “all new accessory structures shall contain a side yard setback of no less than 3' and a rear yard setback of no less than 5'.”

Fence

The Applicant proposes a wood privacy fence that will run long the sides of the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend the fence be 6ft.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall check the calculation to ensure the FAR and Lot coverage are met, per Sec.16-20L.006;
2. All proposed windows shall match in style, size proportion, size, placement and scale to the existing windows, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(b)(6);
3. All trim on the windows and house shall match the original trim, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(b)(6)
4. The proposed siding shall be smooth cementitious, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(a)(2)
5. New doors shall be compatible in scale, size proportion, placement and style, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(b)(6);
6. The privacy fence shall be 6ft in height, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(i)(3) and
7. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood



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

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 432 Cherokee Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA4PH-23-337
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1902

Property Location: Southeastern corner of the intersection of Cherokee and Glenwood Avenues SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00001327

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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 property in question was badly damaged by a two-alarm fire on February 9, 2023. Prior to that the house had been uninhabited for over a decade and was preparing for a major restoration. The meant that the underlying structure was deteriorated, and the fire damage only exacerbated prior structural instability. The fire destroyed the roof in its entirety and a significant portion of the rear elevation is in a complete state of collapse. The remaining hardscape of the property, including walkways, steps, and retaining walls are intact and were unaffected by the fire.

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists;

The Applicant has not submitted an engineer's report analyzing the structure. Staff does note both the damage caused by the fire as well as additional deterioration due to the building being open to the elements for approximately 8 months as evidence of the threat posed by the structure. Staff notes that virtually none of the interior remains, with massive structural failure from fire damage. Though portions of the street facing façade are intact, the rear of the building has collapsed in part on the upper level and continues to deteriorate.

As such, Staff finds that a major and imminent threat to public health and safety has been established; however, a structural engineering report must be submitted fully analyzing the feasibility of proposed salvage activities.

2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.

No alternatives to demolition have been provided beyond the proposed salvage activities. Staff notes that the extent of the damage is so great that any repairs would be tantamount to complete reconstruction. Restoration of the severely fire damaged structure is not a reasonable alternative for rectifying the threat to public health and safety.

As such, Staff finds this criterion has been met.

The photographs provided by the Applicant illustrate that the sky is clearly visible through the structure, and none of the roof remains. In addition, the photos of the rear of the property show an almost complete collapse of the back wall. As noted above, Staff finds that any rehabilitation of the structure would require wholesale replacement of much of the original portions of the property, which would result in either a partial or full demolition. Though the street-facing façade sustained less damage, and portions of the structure may be salvageable, it is not entirely clear what the soundness of these elements may be.

Staff finds that the existing building has suffered a fire and much of the original structure has been destroyed. The remaining portions have been compromised by exposure to the elements during the approximately 8-month period that the building has been open to the elements, and the previous

level of neglect and lack of habitation only exacerbated the overall structural integrity. Repairs of the structure in its current condition would likely cause further collapse and loss of the remaining historic materials. While Staff understands the impact that the loss of a historically contributing structure can have on the District, this building presents a significant threat to public health and safety in its current unsecured state. Staff sees no reasonable alternative to the demolition of the structure. As such, Staff supports the request.

Staff would recommend that detailed architectural photographs, particularly of the street-facing façade, which remains largely intact, be provided by the Applicant to document the existing structure prior to any attempts at salvaging of materials. The Applicant shall provide detailed architectural photographs of the structure prior to commencement of any salvage efforts. In terms of proposed salvage, Staff acknowledges that the extreme deteriorated state of the structure means that salvage will be a challenge, and the ability to salvage may not be determined until the demolition is underway. Staff supports salvage where possible, but only to the degree that is safe and feasible based on the condition of materials. The Applicant shall only utilize the proposed onsite storage for the purpose of salvage of building materials, the structure will only be utilized for temporary storage, not a permanent fixture. The Applicant shall submit the missing structural engineering report prior to commencement of any salvage or demolition activities. The Applicant shall undertake discretionary salvage of building materials from the structure prior to demolition, pursuant on structural soundness and feasibility.

There is currently a stop-work order on the property regarding the erection of fence posts. Staff finds that there is no violation of the zoning code, as the fence posts remain from a previously existing fence that was destroyed by the fire department during the blaze which destroyed the house. The Applicant has clarified that there is no proposal to erect a fence on the property and the posts will be removed as part of the demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide detailed architectural photographs of the structure prior to the commencement of any salvage efforts.
2. The Applicant shall only utilize the proposed onsite storage for the purpose of salvage of building materials, the structure will only be utilized for temporary storage, not a permanent fixture.
3. The Applicant shall submit the missing structural engineering report prior to commencement of any salvage or demolition activities.
4. The Applicant shall undertake discretionary salvage of building materials from the structure prior to demolition, pursuant on structural soundness and feasibility.
5. The Applicant shall not demolish those historic hardscape features which remain unimpacted by fire damage, including walkways and retaining walls.
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
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams-Interim, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 80 Palisades
APPLICATION: RC-23-328
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills **Other Zoning:** Conservation

Date of Construction: 1925

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory Structures and Site work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20(B)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

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

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

SITE WORK

The Applicant proposal several sitework which includes the following:

Swimming Pool

The proposed pool sits behind the existing house and doesn't exceed the setbacks and will not be visible to the public right away. A 5 feet fence around the area for attend protection. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Swimming Pool equipment

The swimming pool equipment will sit further behind the pool and will not be visible to the public right away. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Additional Driveway, pavers and retaining wall.

Staff are not concerned with the driveway or pavers. There is a relatively large back yard, and it appears lot coverage will not be an issue.

Retaining Wall

Retaining wall is not problematic to Staff.

Staff Comments

Staff are not concerned with the proposed work on the property. Most of the work is being handled in a manner that can't be seen by the public.