



# 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 741 Elbert Street SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-317  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1930

**Property Location:** North side of Elbert Street SW.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Rear addition

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, differed October 11 (due to lack of sign posting, October 25)

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

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

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

The Applicant proposes a rear laundry addition that would be situated below the existing ridgeline. The Addition would have a brick foundation and wooden lap siding which matches the existing on the house in reveal. There would be an outdoor covered porch, with a brick foundation that extends into an uncovered portion towards the right elevation. The full addition and deck would not be wider than the existing footprint. As part of the addition the rear elevation would be clad in matching lap siding. This elevation appears to be a non-original previous addition, and the exterior does not match the remainder of the structure. Two stained glass windows would be installed on the right elevation of the laundry room, which is not visible from the public right of way and is located entirely behind the house. The Applicant proposes a wood door with a sidelight for the rear elevation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The porch would have brick piers with tapered columns supporting a gabled roof. The deck would be enclosed with a balustrade. It is not clear if the full porch would be brick, or if the deck would be made of wood. The Applicant will clarify the materials to be used in the porch flooring construction. The Applicant will install a balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify the materials to be used in the porch flooring construction.
- 2.) The Applicant will install a balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams- Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2704 Baker Ridge Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-341  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023 deferred since October 25, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1948

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Stop Work Order placed on 12/2/2022 for work done without permits.

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

## **ADDITIONS**

### *Side porch*

The Applicant proposes to enclose a side deck to allow for additional living space. The side porch enclosure is not problematic for Staff. The enclosure will not take away from the American Small house and if removed in the future would not remove any historical significance. The roof is continuing the existing roof ridge, and the Applicant is using the existing floor plan, so the side setback has not changed. The FAR has been accounted for and it meets the FAR requirements for R-4. Staff are not concerned with the side porch addition.

### *Addition*

The proposed 507sqft addition on the rear is not problematic. The addition meets FAR, lot coverage and setbacks. The roofline will continue the hip pattern and will not exceed the existing roofline.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes new windows for the entire house. This might be due to the fact all windows were discarded according to the inspector's photos. Research shows the original windows more than likely were wood with wood trim. The Applicant has not indicated the proposed material. District regulations state, "If original or historic windows or exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated, replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size." Staff recommend the Applicant comply and install windows that match the original light design, function, materials, shape, and size.

### *Door*

There are no clear photos that show the original door. Staff recommends the Applicant install a door that would be reflective of the style of the house or what is predominate on the house.

### *Rear Deck*

The District regulations require decks to be oriented to the rear of the house and not extend beyond the sides of structures. The Applicant proposes a l shape deck. This is problematic because it is on the side of the house. Staff recommend the Applicant construct a deck that is only in the rear of the house.

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

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

1. The windows shall match the original light design, function, material, shape and size, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c) ;
2. The door shall be reflective of the style of house or what is the predominate door on the house, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c);
3. The deck shall be only constructed on the rear of the house, per Sec.16-20Q.006(9)(a) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# 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:** 432 Hopkins Street SW

**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-353

**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East side of Hopkins Street SW

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Yes, 23CAP-00001072

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the December 13, 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.

The Applicant received a stop work order (23CAP-00001072) on July 12, 2023, for unpermitted exterior work. It appears that there has been complete siding and window replacement. No specifications have been provided for these replacement materials, so Staff is unable to comment on whether or not they meet the requirements of the code. Staff has significant concerns that key features have not been included on the plans, particularly the entire upper floor. The Applicant will submit a full plan set including all four elevations, and interior floor plans for all levels.

The walkway and driveway have been removed and repoured. The walkway does not connect to the sidewalk as it originally did. While the current L-shape can remain, the walkway must be returned to its original configuration, connecting with the sidewalk. Staff also finds that the site plan does not have the correct scale (listed as  $\frac{1}{4}'' = 1$  foot). It appears that this scale is incorrect as the measurements do not line up with what the survey states. As such Staff cannot determine if the new driveway is the appropriate width. Further the driveway is non-compliant. Sec. 16-20G.006 (13)(a) states, "off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard or half-depth front yard." The existing drive appears to stop at the front façade and must extend at least 20 feet past the front elevation. The sidewalk in front of the structure has also been repoured with concrete. Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(a) requires, "the original layout, patterns and paving materials of sidewalks, driveways, alleyways, curbs and streets shall be retained." Photographs from prior to the unpermitted work show that the sidewalk was historically hexagonal pavers. The Applicant will submit a revised site plan with correct scale. The Applicant will restore the walkway to its previous configuration extending it to the sidewalk. The Applicant will submit a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (13)(a). The Applicant will remove the unpermitted concrete sidewalk and restore the hexagonal pavers.

It appears that all windows on the house have been replaced without a permit or approval. Many of these windows appear to be significantly smaller than the windows which were existing. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3) (a) Architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained." Further, "(b)Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed, in whole or in part." Further, "(c) Replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Replacement windows and doors shall match the original in style, materials, shape and size, with no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size." No specifications for the windows have been submitted, no justification has been provided for the replacement of windows, including photos of their condition prior to removal. The Applicant proposes reconfiguration of windows on the left, right, and rear elevations, though based on photographs taken by the code enforcement team this change was already made. Staff is confused by the proposed window reconfiguration as it appears that the internal floor plan is not changing. Sec. 16-20G.006(e) states, "the replacement and reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted." It appears that the interior layout remains the same, and the removal of windows was not appropriate. The Applicant will submit specifications for the unpermitted windows. The Applicant will restore the original window configuration and size, with no more than an inch difference in size.

It also appears that the entirety of the exterior, with the exception of the porch gable, has been covered in smooth face cementitious siding. No justification for this replacement has been provided including photographs which illustrate the state of the siding which was removed. Given the age of the house, replacement with smooth face cementitious siding is not appropriate, as the original siding materials would be wooden lap siding. Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(d) requires, "Siding repair or replacement shall match the original in material, scale and direction. For new construction and additions, brick, wood or horizontal smooth cementitious siding is permitted." The Applicant will submit photos showing the exterior prior to the siding replacement. The Applicant will submit specifications to bring the siding into compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(d).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the December 13, 2023, hearing to allow the Applicant to address the following:**

- 1.) The Applicant will submit a full plan set including all four elevations, and interior floor plans for all levels.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a revised site plan with correct scale.
- 3.) The Applicant will restore the walkway to its previous configuration extending it to the sidewalk.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (13)(a).
- 5.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted concrete sidewalk and restore the hexagonal pavers.
- 6.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the unpermitted windows.
- 7.) The Applicant will restore the original window configuration and size, with no more than an inch difference in size.
- 8.) The Applicant will submit photos showing the exterior prior to the siding replacement.
- 9.) The Applicant will submit specifications to bring the siding into compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(d).
- 10.) The Applicant will 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams- Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2825 Baker Ridge  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-355  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1962

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

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** Yes,

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The house was set on fire.

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



## **ALTERATIONS**

There are several missing components on the house: the front windows, front door, and garage door. The Applicant proposes to replace many of the missing components.

### ***Windows***

The photos provided show the original windows were one-over-one and two-over-two wood, some with mullions. The Applicant proposes to install wood double-hung windows that match in-kind the original windows. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

### ***Front Door and Side Door***

The proposed front door is not problematic to Staff. The metal side door proposal is problematic. The original door would not have been metal. By the ordinance requirement, the replacement must be compatible in style. Staff recommend the door be compatible in style and material.

The proposed steel door in the rear of the house is not problematic for Staff since rear proposal are not the purview of the Commission.

### ***Metal railings***

The Applicant proposes to replace the damage railing on the front and stairs. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. Staff do recommend the intricate pattern the original railings had, which is a defining feature for the style houses of this period, be replicated as much as possible, to retain the historical significance of this period.

### ***Stairs***

The Applicant proposes to rebuild the concrete stairs. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

### ***Brick***

The masonry shall not be painted.

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

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

1. All replaced windows shall match the original wood windows, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c);
2. The side door shall be compatible in style and material, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(a)(b)
3. The replacement railing shall have a decorative pattern that would have been indicative of that time period, per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(d);
4. Unpainted masonry shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20Q.002(4) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2064 Butler Way  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-360  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Whittier Mill Historic District    **Other Zoning:** R-4A

**Date of Construction:** 1890

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Driveway repair

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** A new garage was permitted in February 2023

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

**ALTERATIONS**

The Applicant proposes to pave an existing driveway. The existing driveway is covered in pebble rocks and the Applicant proposes concrete. The District regulations states, “The original layout, patterns and paving materials of sidewalks, curbs and streets shall be retained.” The Applicant request for removing the original pebble rock and replacing with concrete would be problematic. Staff recommend the pebble rocks not be removed but to replaced in-kind the pebble rocks.

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**

- 1) The pebble works shall be replaced in-kind but not replaced with concrete, per Sec.16-20J.006(7)(a) and
- 2) Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://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:** November 8, 2023 deferred since 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:** 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."

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

### **EDITS in RED 11/8/23**

#### **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.

**It appears the Applicant has resolved the issues. Staff are not concerned with the recommendation.**

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 data is clearly identified and added up and meet Lot Coverage and FAR. Staff are not concerned with the recommendation.**

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

**The dormer is proposing site plans and appears to be meeting the side setback. But it is hard for Staff to determine this because the Applicant has not drawn the bottom line on the door. Right now, it is drawn to show it on the setback line. If this is so, then the dormer meets setback. Staff recommend the Applicant clarify.**

#### **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.

**The Applicant has edited the space on the attic to 1,819 instead of 1913.**

#### ***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.

**The Applicant has reduced the dormer to align with the existing dormers and other dormers on the block face. And the new dormer will add corbels that match the existing corbel on the existing dormer. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.**

### **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.

**The added window on the east elevation is problematic, it does not match any of the windows on the existing house. Staff recommend the window be changed to a smaller window that match the other smaller windows on the houses.**

### **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.

**The Applicant is proposing and showing the enclosed back porch as screened instead of the canopy structure. Staff are not concerned with this proposal. And the privacy wall is not problematic. The siding continues nicely.**

### **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.

**The Applicant has stated and shown the window on the east elevation on the rear is non-historic. Staff are not concerned with the removal.**

**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.

**The Applicant has decided to retain the west side porch. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.**

**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 smaller west elevation window shall be smaller to match the other existing smaller windows on the house, per Sec.16-20L.006(2)(b)(1) and
2. 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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 540 Langhorn Street SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-350  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** Southeaster corner of the intersection of Langhorn and Oak Streets SW

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Yes, 23CAP-00000610

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the December 13, 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.

The Applicant received a stop work order (23CAP-00000610) on April 26, 2023 for unpermitted work occurring on the property. This work appears to correspond to removal of interior materials and some windows based on the presence of a dumpster on site. The work which was completed without a permit has not been outlined or addressed by the application. The Applicant proposes an addition to the rear elevation of the existing house, a dormer addition to the right elevation, full window replacement, full door replacement, and repairs to the existing porch and siding. Staff has significant concerns with the proposal. No interior floor plans have been submitted, and the focus of the plans appears to be on three-dimensional renderings. The Applicant will clarify what work was completed on the house prior to the issuance of the stop work order. The Applicant will remove the renderings from the plan set. The Applicant will submit existing and proposed interior floor plans for the structure.

A site plan has been submitted, and the Applicant states that the impervious foot print will be maintained, so only one site plan has been submitted rather than existing and proposed. There is an existing non-original addition to the rear elevation, that appears to have been added in two phases. The Applicant proposes to reconstruct this addition in a more structurally sound manner, while maintaining the footprint. The foot print of this existing addition sits considerably outside the side yard setback, and it cannot be reconstructed in the same foot print. The new addition must conform to the required setback of 7 feet. The Applicant will redesign the proposed rear elevation to conform to the required setbacks. The Applicant will submit a proposed site plan with the new rear addition footprint.

There also appears to be an existing driveway on the Oak Street SW frontage, which is not shown on the site plan. There is a paved driveway apron, but in photos a dumpster is obscuring if there is a paved drive beneath. Given that the site plan shows an existing impervious coverage of 46% this property is already within 508.06 square feet of its total permissible lot coverage, all existing features must be shown to illustrate that the property is not exceeding its allowable lot coverage. The Applicant will revise the site plan to show all features present on the lot. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding the existing driveway.

The Applicant proposed a double gabled dormer addition to the right-side elevation. Staff has considerable concerns with this proposal. The existing house has an original plan of double chimneys, and the proposed double gables would flank this feature obscuring it from the street facing elevation. This is a character defining feature of the historic home, and the proposed dormers, which the Applicant states would be placed in the least visible location, would be anything but. Staff recommends that only a single dormer be added and that it be pushed to the rear of the structure, using dimensions that mirror the existing gabled dormer present on the left elevation. This would not obscure the historic chimney and would create a symmetrical and balanced addition to the structure. Staff would also be in support of a rear-facing dormer. Given that the proposed rear elevation addition must be significantly redesigned to meet the setback requirements, Staff would urge the redesigned rear addition to include a dormer which truly would have the least visual impact on the historic structure, and not obscure historic features. The Applicant will redesign the

proposed side dormer addition to not obscure the historic chimneys. The Applicant will redesign the side dormer addition to more closely mirror the existing left dormer in scale and placement. The Applicant may shift one of the proposed dormer additions to the rear elevation.

The Applicant proposes full door and window replacement on the structure. No photographs or assessment of the state of the existing doors or windows has been submitted to Staff as justification for the proposed replacement. No door or window schedule has been supplied to Staff. No specifications for proposed replacements have been provided to Staff. As such Staff has insufficient information to evaluate the need for replacement or if the existing features meet the requirements for replacement. The Applicant will submit interior and photographs illustrating the existing door and window conditions, keyed to a door and window schedule which clearly illustrates all elevations. The Applicant will submit an evaluation of the condition and need for repair of all features proposed for replacement.

The Applicant proposes repair of the existing porch. It is not clear if this only pertains to the existing front porch, or if there is additional work proposed to the side stoop on the left elevation. The only repair clearly shown on the plans is the removal of the existing screen on the porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. No further details are given regarding the necessary repairs to the porch. The Applicant will clarify the proposed scope of work in regards to the porch and stoop. The Applicant will submit specifications for any materials proposed for replacement on the porch and stoop.

The Applicant also states that they will, “repair/fix any exterior materials with similar materials to the original house.” This statement is vague and does not detail the proposed repairs in any way. Staff cannot evaluate if these proposed repairs, or the materials to be used meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant will outline a complete list and clarify the scope of work in relation to the proposed repairs.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the December 13, 2023, hearing to allow the Applicant to address the following:**

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify what work was completed on the house prior to the issuance of the stop work order.
- 2.) The Applicant will remove the renderings from the plan set.
- 3.) The Applicant will submit existing and proposed interior floor plans for the structure.
- 4.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed rear elevation to conform to the required setbacks.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit a proposed site plan with the new rear addition footprint.
- 6.) The Applicant will revise the site plan to show all features present on the lot.
- 7.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding the existing driveway.
- 8.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed side dormer addition to not obscure the historic chimneys.
- 9.) The Applicant will redesign the side dormer addition to more closely mirror the existing left dormer in scale and placement.

- 10.) The Applicant may shift one of the proposed dormer additions to the rear elevation.
- 11.) The Applicant will submit interior and photographs illustrating the existing door and window conditions, keyed to a door and window schedule which clearly illustrates all elevations.
- 12.) The Applicant will submit an evaluation of the condition and need for repair of all features proposed for replacement.
- 13.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed scope of work in regards to the porch and stoop.
- 14.) The Applicant will submit specifications for any materials proposed for replacement on the porch and stoop.
- 15.) The Applicant will outline a complete list and clarify the scope of work in relation to the proposed repairs.
- 16.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next scheduled 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams- Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 639 Ozburn Road  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-352  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** New Construction

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** Yes,

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

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

## **COMPATIBILITY**

In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

For the purposes of the compatibility rule, height and width shall be measured at the front façade.

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

When no structure exists on a block face that would qualify as a comparable structure under the compatibility rule, the comparisons shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) on the block, and if no such structure exists on the block, the comparison shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) on an adjacent block face or block, and if no such structure exists on an adjacent block face or block, the comparison shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) located in the district.

## **NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The Applicant provided nine houses for comparison for the new construction. Only eight will be qualified for the actual analysis. 2695 Oldknow is not considered a part of the block face.

- 629 Ozburn
- 633 Ozburn
- 643 Ozburn
- 649 Ozburn
- 655 Ozburn
- 659 Ozburn
- 665 Ozburn
- 667 Ozburn

## **Development**

The Applicant proposes to construct an 1834 sft house with 1450 sft of heated space with a hip roof construction with asphalt siding. There are no concerns with the proposed setbacks. All the setbacks are meeting the compatibility standard. The hip roof and 3:12 pitch is compatible with the blockface.

## ***Height***

The proposed height of 18ft is of no concern for Staff.

## **Design**

### ***Windows***

The Applicant proposes one-over-one vinyl windows. According to the compatibility chart, the Applicant provided, the one-over-one vinyl window is the predominate window material and style on the blockface. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

### ***Siding***

Proposal for the siding material is vinyl. The Applicant has provided information that indicates there are five houses with vinyl and five houses with wood. The proposal for vinyl is sufficient to meet the compatibility standard.

### ***Porch railings***

The Applicant proposes a half porch with railings. The Applicant has not indicated what type of railings being proposed, i.e., iron or wood. If wood, Staff recommend the railing be a two-part construction. The Applicant has also not indicated what type of porch material will be used. From the blockface the predominant porch flooring is concrete. Staff recommend the porch be concrete.

## **SITWORK**

### ***Deck***

The Applicant proposes a deck that will sit at the rear of the house and will not extend beyond the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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

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

1. If the railings are wood, they shall have two-part construction, per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(d);
2. The porch shall be concrete per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(d) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams- Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2801 Valley Heart  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-351  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1960

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

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** Yes,

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No none known.

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

## **PLANS**

The Applicant has not depicted the same front elevations accurately. On the proposed front elevation, the Applicant shows the full front windows as being existing. But on the existing front elevation there is a different configuration of windows and doors. This is problematic and maybe confusing to those working in the field. Staff recommend the Applicant correct the proposal front elevation as reading “proposed elevation windows”.

## **ALTERATIONS**

The Applicant proposes the following alterations:

### ***Garage Alterations***

The Applicant proposes to alter the front façade of the garage for conversion to a den. Currently, the front is enclosed and is a solid brick wall. The Applicant proposes to install two sets of wood doors allowing for access. The District’s regulations permit carports to be enclosed and existing garage to be enclosed for conditioned space. The regulations do not permit for destruction of historic material to allow for the conversion. So, this is problematic to Staff. The proposal for wood doors would destroy the historic brick that defines the house. Staff recommend the proposed wood doors on the front side of the garage not be added.

Staff are not concerned if the Applicant removes the current garage door and installs wood windows that is reflective of a room since the original character of the garage remains visibly intact from the public street.

### ***Front Window Alterations***

It appears as if the Applicant proposes to remove the current door and window configuration at the front façade to install an updated window configuration. Staff can’t determine why this proposal is requested. And being that these are not new openings, the removal of the existing windows and doors would destroy historic windows. Staff recommend if the windows and doors are original, the Applicant retain the windows to comply with District which states historic windows and exterior doors shall be retained. If the windows and door are inoperable, the doors and windows can be repaired or replaced in-kind to match the original ones.

### ***Door removal***

The Applicant is proposing to remove the door on the left elevation. This is problematic. Historic doors shall be retained. If the door is historic, the door can be repaired or replaced in-kind to match.

### ***Rear Alterations***

The Applicant has several rear alteration proposals. However, since the purview of the commission does not include the rear of the property, this review will be only for the rear deck. The deck is in the rear of the property and will not exceed the setback. Staff are not concerned.



**SITE WORK**

Fence

On the site plan, there is mention of chain link fences. Chain link fences are permitted. Staff are not concerned.

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.**

1. The proposed doors shall not be added on the front side of the garage, per Sec.16-20Q.005(1)(b)(ix);
2. All original windows and doors shall be retained or repaired or replaced in-kind to match the original windows and doors, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(a)(b) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# 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:** 425 Atwood Street SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-354

**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** n/a

**Property Location:** West side of Atwood Street SW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the December 13, 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.

The Applicant proposes new construction of a single-family home. The proposed home would have a brick foundation, with a cladding of smooth face cementitious siding. The house would be side gabled with front and rear shed dormers. The house would have a full basement. Staff would note that this basement appears to meet the criteria for a full basement and may result in concerns over exceeding the allowable floor area ratio. Further in regards to the basement, it is not clear if this design choice is based on existing topography or will be achieved through grading. The Applicant will clarify the state of the existing topography in terms of the proposed design. Individual concerns with the proposed design are addressed below.

Staff has several concerns with the submitted compatibility data.

- 415 and 441 Atwood Street SW are both non-contributing structures and may not be used for compatibility purposes.
- The submitted compatibility data lists the entire block face as having a standard 30-foot front yard setback. Even a basic visual examination illustrates that this is not accurate. Using previous data for the block face the front yard setbacks range from 24.3 feet to 35.4 feet, so the proposed setback of 30 feet does fall within the acceptable range, but the data as submitted is not accurate or representative of the actual conditions.

### **Roof Pitch**

The proposed roof form (side gabled) is acceptable given that the block face is evenly divided between front gabled, side gabled, and hipped roof forms. The proposed roof pitch of 9/12 is not. None of the houses on the block face have a roof pitch this steep. The pitch which predominates on the block face is 6/12. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to be in compliance with the submitted compatibility data.

### **Overall Height**

Staff has concerns with the submitted data for height. The proposed roof pitch will need to be revised, and as such this likely will cause a reduction in height. Overall, previous data for the block face does not put any structure at a height above 21.5 feet (449 Atwood Street SW is the structure listed at this height), while the submitted data from the Applicant shows the same structure at 24 feet in height. The Applicant will submit additional information regarding how the overall height measurements were obtained to ensure accuracy.

### **Dormer**

Staff has concerns with the proposed shed dormer on the street-facing elevation. While there is one property on the block face that features a front-facing dormer, this is not a feature that predominates, and based on historic aerial photography is not original to the house. While Staff is

not concerned with the proposed rear facing dormer, Staff cannot support the use of a dormer on the front elevation. The Applicant will remove the proposed front shed dormer.

### **Windows**

The proposed windows are a nine-over-one pattern, which meets the compatibility rule. Staff has concerns regarding the fenestration patterning on both the left and right elevations. There is a very minimal number of windows present, clustered at the front and back of the house, which does not reflect the largely symmetrical distribution of windows present on the contributing structures on the block face. The Applicant will revise the fenestration patterning on the side elevations to more accurately reflect the patterning present on the contributing historic structures.

### **Porch**

The overall partial-width, front-gabled porch design is compatible with the surrounding structures with the exception of the steps. The proposed design is for brick steps without a cheek wall. All of the steps present on the block face are made of concrete, with brick or masonry cheek walls. Further no detail is given regarding the porch flooring material. The Applicant will revise the step design to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant will clarify the proposed porch flooring material.

### **Site Plan**

The submitted site plan does not appear to accurately represent the lot, based on the survey also submitted as part of the application. The submitted site plan depicts the lot as being over a foot wider than the submitted survey which, lists the width of the lot on Atwood at 46.03 feet. Lot coverage is also not provided in the submitted site plan. This is of particular concern because the existing driveway straddles the property line between the subject property and the adjoining parcel at 421 Atwood Street SW. The driveway as depicted on the survey measures 17 feet in width, with 13 feet on 425 Atwood and 4 feet on the adjoining property. It appears that the existing driveway is proposed for removal and that the driveway will be reinstalled with a planting strip; however, this is not entirely clear from the proposed site plan. If work is proposed outside of the property line, the property owner at 421 Atwood Street SW will be required to submit a separate application authorizing that proposed work. It also appears that a fence is proposed for the property, and is depicted on the site plan. No specifications for this proposed fence were included in the application materials. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work for the existing and proposed driveway. The Applicant will submit an updated site plan that corrects the scale to accurately depict the lot as depicted on the survey and includes calculations for lot coverage. The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed fencing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the December 13, 2023, hearing to allow the Applicant to address the following:**

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify the state of the existing topography in terms of the proposed design.

- 2.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to be in compliance with the submitted compatibility data.
- 3.) The Applicant will submit additional information regarding how the overall height measurements were obtained to ensure accuracy.
- 4.) The Applicant will remove the proposed front shed dormer.
- 5.) The Applicant will revise the fenestration patterning on the side elevations to more accurately reflect the patterning present on the contributing historic structures.
- 6.) The Applicant will revise the step design to meet the compatibility rule.
- 7.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed porch flooring material.
- 8.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work for the existing and proposed driveway.
- 9.) The Applicant will submit an updated site plan that corrects the scale to accurately depict the lot as depicted on the survey and includes calculations for lot coverage.
- 10.) The Applicant will submit specifications for the proposed fencing
- 11.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff not later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

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:** 1105 Selwin Avenue SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-356

**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West side of Selwin Avenue SW.

**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:** n/a

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the December 13, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes a rear addition, alterations, full siding replacement, and full window replacement on the structure. No elevations for the north elevation have been included in the plan set. The Applicant will submit existing and proposed elevations for the north elevation. Further, the only one existing chimney appears to be shown in the accurate location, the second chimney is not shown at all. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to the existing chimneys and accurately depict them on the plans.

### **Addition**

The proposed addition would extend the existing ridge of the roofline back for an addition that is no wider than the existing house. The addition would have a brick foundation and smooth face cementitious siding, which matches the reveal of the existing historic wooden siding. Without the missing north elevations, Staff cannot fully comment on the proposed design.

### **Siding**

The Applicant proposes removal of the non-original aluminum siding present on the structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; however, there are inconsistencies between what is stated in the application and what is shown on the plans. The application states that any wood siding present beneath the aluminum siding would be retained and repaired. The plans show installation of cementitious siding and the addition of a decorative gable detail on the front porch. Historic siding should be retained and repaired, and no decorative elements added. The Applicant will retain and repair any existing historic wooden siding present on the house. The Applicant will not install the decorative gable element to the front porch. The Applicant will submit any proposed replacement of siding to Staff for review.

### **Windows**

It appears the Applicant proposes total window replacement on the structure. The existing windows appear to be in excellent condition and are protected by storm windows. No evidence has been submitted illustrating the need for replacement of the windows. The Applicant further proposes removal of three windows on the left elevation. One window would be replaced with a door and an additional window would be added on the original portion of the house. Staff cannot support this proposal. Sec. 16-20M,017 (b) requires, “alterations and additions shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.” Staff cannot support either proposal. Further the existing historic windows on the rear elevation should be retained and reused on the side elevations of the new addition. The Applicant will retain, and if necessary, repair the historic windows. The Applicant will not remove or reconfigure the windows on the south elevation. The Applicant will retain the historic windows from the rear elevation for use on the proposed addition.

### **Porch**

The Applicant proposes removal and replacement of the existing screen on the porch. Staff is not concerned with the proposal. The Applicant also proposes installation of a balustrade on the porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; however, the balustrade must be of wood, two-part, butt-joint construction, and no taller than the existing window sills, a plane extension may be added to bring the riling height to code. The Applicant will install a wood balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction, and no taller than the existing window sills, a plane extension may be added to bring the riling height to code.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the December 13, 2023, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to Address the Following:**

- 1.) The Applicant will submit existing and proposed elevations for the north elevation.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to the existing chimney and accurately depict it on the plans.
- 3.) The Applicant will retain and repair any existing historic wooden siding present on the house.
- 4.) The Applicant will not install the decorative gable element to the front porch.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit any proposed replacement of siding to Staff for review.
- 6.) The Applicant will retain, and if necessary, repair the historic windows.
- 7.) The Applicant will not remove or reconfigure the windows on the south elevation.
- 8.) The Applicant will retain the historic windows from the rear elevation for use on the proposed addition.
- 9.) The Applicant will install a wood balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction, and no taller than the existing window sills, a plane extension may be added to bring the riling height to code.
- 10.) The Applicant shall submit 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 800 Cherokee Avenue, SE (Zoo Atlanta)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-358  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Zoo Atlanta, South end of the Zoo

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** N/A

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Demolition of reptile building

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Commission has reviewed multiple applications at this address in the past given the complex programming of the site.

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

RC-23-358 for 800 Cherokee Avenue (Zoo Atlanta)

November 8, 2023

Page 2 of 2

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

There is missing information about the planting around the ponds and the removed concrete slab. Staff recommends the Applicant should include more information regarding planting on the site.

The tree replacement plan needs a site key to show proximity to the demolition site. The Applicant should revise this plan to indicate where the replacement trees are. Upon Staff looking at an aerial view of the location of replacement trees, there looks to be trees already here. For clarification, Staff recommends the Applicant should include the existing trees in this plan.

The Applicant informed Staff of the conditions of the building demolition. The Applicant also briefed Staff that the Zoo Master Plan in this area of the Zoo is not current and doesn't reflect future plans. Staff suggests updating the Zoo Master Plan for future development cohesion. Staff further recommends that the Applicant submit the updated Master Plan for review and comment. This would allow the Commission to comment on all parts of the plan and avoid the need for individual reviews for implementation of the individual pieces of the plan.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments.**

Cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 557 Lindsay St. NW  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-384  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A                      **Other Zoning:** SPI-3 (Subarea 4) / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** northeast corner of Lindsay St. NW and North Ave. NW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** N/A

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are required to adhere to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Act) as implemented by the City of Atlanta and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) through the “City of Atlanta Programmatic Agreement for HUD-funded Programs” (Agreement)

As federal funds are being used for the construction of the parking lot and other site improvements on Lindsay St. the Project is required to adhere to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Act) as implemented by the City of Atlanta and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) through the “City of Atlanta Programmatic Agreement for HUD-funded Programs” (Agreement), executed January 21, 2010. (A copy of the full Agreement was attached to a previous Section 106 Staff Report for reference and future use by the Commission.)

Previously the area of the English Avenue neighborhood where the Project is located was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a potential historic district by the City’s official Preservation Professional (an official, specific City Staff person called for under the Agreement, who is a member of the Commission Staff). As such, this area of the English Avenue neighborhood is considered a potential historic district for the purposes of the Act, the Agreement, and the Preservation Professional’s conclusion of the review process for the Project.

Proposals subject to review under the Agreement that do not include footprint-expanding additions or site work However, Stipulation V.B of the Agreement calls for proposals for “new construction” be “forwarded to the AUDC” within 30 days for comment. This comment process is accomplished through placing the proposed rehabilitation project / addition on one of the Commission’s regularly scheduled public hearings and advising the AUDC on the reasons for the review, the criteria to be considered and what is to come of the results of their comments. Under the Agreement, the Commission is charged with reviewing the proposed project with respect to:

*“compatibility with the historic district or adjacent historic buildings in terms of set-backs, size, scale, massing, design, color, features, and materials in terms of responsiveness to the recommended approaches for new construction set forth in the Standards; and in terms of the input received through the required public notification process as outlined in Stipulation X of this Agreement.”*

Further, the Commission’s comments should address all of the site work and new construction elements as outlined below:

1. Development of a three-story, mixed-income, affordable housing project
2. Construction of a new garage and surface parking lot for apartment building; and,
3. Landscaping related to the overall development.

The Preservation Professional is to take into consideration the Commission’s comments when making its final findings, as required under the terms of the Agreement. Per Stipulation V.B.4 of the Agreement requires that until such time as this Commission review has occurred, the Preservation Professional cannot provide their final comments or affects findings on the proposal.

As noted above, the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation are to be used, among the other considerations listed, as the basis for the Commission’s comments:

*Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

**The Preservation Professional has the following preliminary comments about the proposed project:**

1. Immediate adjacent properties along the one-way street are apartment complexes consisting of two-story buildings that date from the mid-1960s to the present.
2. Based on Google StreetView, a mid-century apartment complex in good condition currently occupies the lot and will be demolished as part of the proposed project.

**The Preservation Professional has the following preliminary comments about the design of the apartment building:**

Site Plan:

1. The proposed development will include a sidewalk, which is currently missing in large sections along the north side of Rock Street.
2. Based on the site plan provided, the building addresses the Rock Street frontage and pedestrians will be able to easily access the public leasing/amenity offices and private entrances to the residential units from a short walkway connected to the sidewalk.
3. It is unclear to the reviewer what type of parking facility is proposed at the southwest corner of the site.

4. Surface parking will be placed at the rear, northwest corner of the building. A fire access drive accessed from Rock St. is proposed along the east side.

Overall Massing, Form, and Height:

1. The massing and three-story height of the proposed building will generally be in scale with the surrounding streetscape, as well the multi-family use.

Architectural Components:

1. Based on the submitted floor plans and architectural renderings the building's primary entrance from Rock Street will be clearly articulated.
2. The fenestration pattern on the front and sides appears to have a balanced ration of solids (walls) to voids (window/door openings)

Materials:

1. The present design of the apartment building has a mix of brick veneer, cementitious clapboard siding with varying reveals, and fiber cement panels. The Preservation Professional finds variation of siding materials presents and unnecessarily muddled aesthetic to the building. Further, clapboard siding is a cladding material that is more appropriate to single-family residential dwellings, rather than large, apartment buildings. The Preservation Professional suggests a more simplified use of siding materials - possibly only consisting of the brick veneer and cement fiber board panel cladding – for a more refined, modernist design.
2. If cement fiber clapboard siding is still used, it should be smooth-faced siding.
3. All of the exterior trim, surface, front porch, and architectural components not noted above should be wood or a material with the same exterior finish and appearance as wood.
4. The inclusion of the roof overhang feature at the front, southwest corner of the building, appears to be purely ornamental. The Preservation Professional suggests the removal of this feature and a continuation of the more modest parapet wall coping depicted on the other façade walls of the rendering.

Preservation Professional Final Recommendation:

As required under the Agreement, these will be issued in the future, taking into account the Commission comments.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.**

Cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1211 McDonald Dr. SE  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-386  
**MEETING DATE:** November 8, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A                      **Other Zoning:** MR-4A-C / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Comprised of all 4 lots on the east side of McDonald Dr. beginning at the northwest corner of McDonald Dr. SE and Milton Ave. SE.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** N/A

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are required to adhere to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Act) as implemented by the City of Atlanta and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) through the “City of Atlanta Programmatic Agreement for HUD-funded Programs” (Agreement)

As federal funds are being used for the construction of the parking lot and other site improvements on Lindsay St. the Project is required to adhere to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Act) as implemented by the City of Atlanta and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) through the “City of Atlanta Programmatic Agreement for HUD-funded Programs” (Agreement), executed January 21, 2010. (A copy of the full Agreement was attached to a previous Section 106 Staff Report for reference and future use by the Commission.)

Previously the area of the Chosewood Park neighborhood where the Project is located was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a potential historic district by the City’s official Preservation Professional (an official, specific City Staff person called for under the Agreement, who is a member of the Commission Staff). As such, this area of the Chosewood Park neighborhood is considered a potential historic district for the purposes of the Act, the Agreement, and the Preservation Professional’s conclusion of the review process for the Project.

Proposals subject to review under the Agreement that do not include footprint-expanding additions or site work. However, Stipulation V.B of the Agreement calls for proposals for “new construction” be “forwarded to the AUDC” within 30 days for comment. This comment process is accomplished through placing the proposed rehabilitation project / addition on one of the Commission’s regularly scheduled public hearings and advising the AUDC on the reasons for the review, the criteria to be considered and what is to come of the results of their comments. Under the Agreement, the Commission is charged with reviewing the proposed project with respect to:

*“compatibility with the historic district or adjacent historic buildings in terms of set-backs, size, scale, massing, design, color, features, and materials in terms of responsiveness to the recommended approaches for new construction set forth in the Standards; and in terms of the input received through the required public notification process as outlined in Stipulation X of this Agreement.”*

Further, the Commission’s comments should address all of the site work and new construction elements as outlined below:

1. Development of a three-story, mixed-income, affordable housing project
2. Construction of a new garage and surface parking lot for apartment building; and,
3. Landscaping related to the overall development.

The Preservation Professional is to take into consideration the Commission’s comments when making its final findings, as required under the terms of the Agreement. Per Stipulation V.B.4 of the Agreement requires that until such time as this Commission review has occurred, the Preservation Professional cannot provide their final comments or affects findings on the proposal.

As noted above, the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation are to be used, among the other considerations listed, as the basis for the Commission’s comments:

*Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal



- change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
  3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
  4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
  5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
  6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
  7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
  8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
  9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
  10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

**The Preservation Professional has the following preliminary comments about the proposed project:**

1. Immediate adjacent properties along the one-way street are apartment complexes consisting of two-story buildings that date from the mid-1960s to the present.
2. Based on Google StreetView, a mid-century apartment complex in good condition currently occupies the lot and will be demolished as part of the proposed project.

**The Preservation Professional has the following preliminary comments about the design of the apartment building:**

Site Plan:

1. The proposed development will include a sidewalk, which is currently missing in large sections along the north side of Rock Street.
2. Based on the site plan provided, the building addresses the Rock Street frontage and pedestrians will be able to easily access the public leasing/amenity offices and private entrances to the residential units from a short walkway connected to the sidewalk.
3. It is unclear to the reviewer what type of parking facility is proposed at the southwest corner of the site.
4. Surface parking will be placed at the rear, northwest corner of the building. A fire access drive

accessed from Rock St. is proposed along the east side.

Overall Massing, Form, and Height:

1. The massing and three-story height of the proposed building will generally be in scale with the surrounding streetscape, as well the multi-family use.

Architectural Components:

1. Based on the submitted floor plans and architectural renderings the building's primary entrance from Rock Street will be clearly articulated.
2. The fenestration pattern on the front and sides appears to have a balanced ration of solids (walls) to voids (window/door openings)

Materials:

1. The present design of the apartment building has a mix of brick veneer, cementitious clapboard siding with varying reveals, and fiber cement panels. The Preservation Professional finds variation of siding materials presents and unnecessarily muddled aesthetic to the building. Further, clapboard siding is a cladding material that is more appropriate to single-family residential dwellings, rather than large, apartment buildings. The Preservation Professional suggests a more simplified use of siding materials - possibly only consisting of the brick veneer and cement fiber board panel cladding – for a more refined, modernist design.
2. If cement fiber clapboard siding is still used, it should be smooth-faced siding.
3. All of the exterior trim, surface, front porch, and architectural components not noted above should be wood or a material with the same exterior finish and appearance as wood.
4. The inclusion of the roof overhang feature at the front, southwest corner of the building, appears to be purely ornamental. The Preservation Professional suggests the removal of this feature and a continuation of the more modest parapet wall coping depicted on the other façade walls of the rendering.

Preservation Professional Final Recommendation:

As required under the Agreement, these will be issued in the future, taking into account the Commission comments.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.**

Cc: Applicant  
File