



# 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  
Interim Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 685 Holderness  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-23-415  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1946

**Contributing (Y/N)?**      **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations: Front porch, side deck and painted chimney

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues** : Stop Work issued 11/7/23 for unauthorized side deck and painting of the chimney. It has also been noted in 2014, the neighborhood complained about the unauthorized front porch, and nothing was done by the City at that time.

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

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

## **ALTERATIONS**

### **Front**

Research shows, in 2014 an unauthorized front porch was added to the house. The District does have porch requirements and new porches would be based off the compatibility, however, since this is a Minimal Traditional house, a full porch would not be appropriate for this style house. Staff recommend the porch be removed. If the Applicant wishes to reinstall the stoop, this may be done by reconstructing the stoop in-kind to the previous stoop.

### ***Side Deck***

The Applicant has built a deck that has not complied with the district's regulations which states all decks must be erected in the rear of the house and not extend beyond the side. The Applicant has not been granted permission for the work and the work is not complying; typically, Staff would recommend the side deck be moved to the rear and not supersede the rear setback. Or the noncompliant deck be removed all together. However, the Applicant is seeking an ADA ramp due to medical reasons. The City of Atlanta adheres to the American Disability Act and recommend the Applicant comply and construct a ramp that will comply to the ADA requirements. It appears the location would not be of issue.

### ***Painted Chimney***

The Applicant has painted the brick chimney. Research shows the chimney was not painted prior; therefore, the chimney cannot be painted. The Staff recommends the paint be removed from the chimney in a manner that will not damage the brick; sandblasting will not be permitted.

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

1. The unauthorized front porch shall be removed from the house. If the Applicant wished to reinstall the stoop, that can be done in-kind to the original stoop, per Sec.16-20G.
2. The side deck shall be constructed as ADA ramp and comply with the standards set by the City of Atlanta, per Sec. 16-20G.006(8);
3. The paint shall be removed from the chimney in a manner that does not damage the brick, no sandblasting shall be permitted, per Sec.16-20G.001 and
4. 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](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:** 89 Howell

**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-387

**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2023 deferred since December 13, 2023

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** New Construction

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Demolition approved for the historic house.

**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.

## **NEW CONSTRUCTION**

### **COMPATIBILITY RULE**

The intent of these regulations is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of each subarea and of the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block or block face. To further that intent and simultaneously retain flexibility, the regulations provide a "compatibility rule" which is: The element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall match that which predominates:

On contributing buildings of like use along the same **block face** in Subareas 1 and 2.

Where quantifiable, such as building height or floor height, the element shall be no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing building(s) along the same block face in Subareas 1 and 2

### **Analysis for Comparable houses**

The Applicant has provided six contributing compatible houses on the blockface, Staff will use these as references. The Applicant did submit several other houses for comparing, they were either recent construction which make them non-contributing, on the block or on the block and modern construction. The comparable houses are.

- 71 Howell Street
- 93 Howell Street
- 95 Howell Street
- 97 Howell Street
- 101 Howell Street
- 103 Howell Street

### **Land Development and Setbacks**

With the approval for demolition of the existing house, the Applicant proposes to keep the new construction as a duplex. Staff applauded this decision. The Applicant propose the setbacks as, the front setback as 12 ft, the left-side setback as 3 ft, the right-side setback as 3 and the rear setback as 6. District regulations require the side yards to be at least 3 ft, front 12 ft and the rear as 6 ft. The proposal by the Applicant aligns with the District regulations. Staff are not concerned with the setback proposal.

### **Roofline**

The Applicant proposes a single front gable with a shed roof with double cross gables with a hip extension. The predominate roofline from the contributing house is a gable roof with hip extension. The historic house has a double hip/gable front with a hip extension. While Staff understands the double hip roofline is unique and distinctive, the functionality of the extended gable roof keeps with what is predominated on the blockface because of this Staff supports the Applicant proposal. Staff would recommend that it could be possible for the Applicant to retain the double gables and extend

an over-hang roof line over the front porch which would allow for more functionality yet keeping the historical appearance.

### **Height and Pitch**

The historical house was a one-story house, and the Applicant proposes the new build to be one-story. The pitch is shown to be in-line with what is predominate on the blackface at 10:12. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. The height is shown on the elevation and Staff are not concerned.

### **Lot Coverage and FAR**

Lot coverage is determined by compatibility analysis. Staff are not concerned with the lot coverage. 17.92% is between 17.11% and 65.45%.

### **FAR**

Staff are not concerned with FAR.

## **DESIGN**

### **Windows**

The original windows were 6 over 1 double-hung wood windows. The Applicant appears to be proposing the same type of windows, which would not be problematic to Staff. However, the window shown on the elevations depicts a different style of window. This is problematic. Staff recommend the Applicant clean up the elevations and show the 6 over 1 double hung wood windows and note that on the elevations so there will be no confusion.

### **Siding**

The Applicant has not marked what type of siding is planned. Research shows the original siding on the house was wood. Staff cite the District regulations which states, “due to the close proximity of structures and other characteristics unique to this Landmark District smooth face cementitious siding shall be authorized as replacement materials when replacement is warranted, and materials for new construction within these subareas. Siding shall exhibit a horizontal, clapboard profile. Siding shall have no less than a four-inch reveal and no more than a six-inch reveal.” Therefore, the Staff recommends the Applicant install horizontal cementitious siding with a reveal no less than 4 inches and no more than 6 inches.

### **Porch**

The Applicant proposes a full porch. This is supported by Staff. However, the orientation of the railings gives Staff pause. District regulations do not prohibit horizontal railings. The regulations do state that “decorative metal, resin, fiberglass and plastic columns are prohibited.” Staff recommend the Applicant comply and not have decorative metal, resin, fiberglass or plastic. The railings along with the columns shall be wood. Staff also recommends the steps be wood, brick or concrete to comply to the District regulations

### **Doors**

The doors the Applicant has shown on the elevations, appears to comply. However, to ensure this is the case, Staff recommend the Applicant comply to the District regulations which states, “front doors shall be solid wood panel or single-pane fixed glass and shall be composed of no more than 50 percent glass.” And not this on the elevations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The front roofline shall retain the double gables but employ an over-hang in to allow functionality, per Sec.16-20C.008(2)(b)(ii);
  2. The windows on the elevations shall be shown as 6 over 1 double hung wood windows, per Sec. 16-20C.008(2)(a)(c);
  3. The siding shall be horizontal cementitious siding with a 4inches to 6 inches reveal, per Sec.16-20C.008(2)(c)(1);
  4. The railings and columns shall not be metal, resin, fiberglass or plastic, per Sec.16-20C.008(2)(b);
  5. Doors shall be solid wood panel or single-pane fixed glass and shall composed of no more than 50 percent glass, per Sec. 16-20C.008(2)(8)(iv) and
  6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.
- 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 712 Pearce Street SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-388  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

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

**Date of Construction:** n/a

**Property Location:** South side of Pearce Street SW.

**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. 16-20I

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, deferred December 12, 2023.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the February 14, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

**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 new construction of a single-family home on the vacant lot at 721 Peace Street SW. The proposed new construction would be a two-story structure, 27 feet 4 inches in height, with a front-gabled roof, side dormers, a brick foundation, and smooth-faced cementitious siding. The Applicant also proposes a drive, located to the right of the house, connecting to a large rear parking pad, and an accessory structure composed of a garage with an accessory dwelling unit above. Staff has a number of concerns regarding the proposed plan. The first has to do with the submitted compatibility data. The compatibility study submitted by the Applicant has a number of issues. Not all of the contributing structures on the blockface have been included in the study, there is not a complete set of data for all contributing properties, and analysis has not been provided for all features subject to the compatibility rule. The Applicant will submit a complete compatibility study including all features on all contributing structures subject to the compatibility rule.

### **Height**

The Applicant proposes an overall height of 27 feet 4 inches. Staff is very concerned with this proposal as it appears to exceed the height of all the contributing structures on the block face. While construction is permitted within the range of heights present, Staff is particularly concerned regarding how measurements were obtained. 702 Pearce Street SW is cited as being 27 feet 4 inches in height, but no supporting documentation has been provided as to how this measurement was obtained. This is of particular concern as this particular property sits significantly above grade, which should not be included in the overall height calculation. The Applicant will submit documentation of how height measurements were taken for the contributing structures on the block face.

### **Roof Form**

The Applicant proposes a front gabled roof. Staff is not concerned with this proposal as it is the roof form which predominates on the block face.

### **Roof Pitch**

Complete compatibility data has not been submitted for roof pitch on the block face, but from Staff's analysis there is only one house on the block face with a roof pitch of 8/12, and the proposed pitch is too steep and does not meet the compatibility rule. The predominant roof pitch appears to be evenly split between houses with roof pitches of 5/12, 6/12, and 7/12. The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to meet the compatibility rule.

### **Massing**

The Applicant proposes a full two-story structure. The porch roof is integrated as the primary roofline, which does occur elsewhere on the blockface; however, the proposed design would actually have the primary roofline rise towards the rear of the structure. The proposed 3,719 square



foot house is markedly different from the existing housing stock. Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(a)(3) states, “Contemporary design of new construction, compatible with adjacent and surrounding structures, is permitted.” Staff finds that the proposed design is inconsistent with the existing contributing structures on the block face and must be revised. The Applicant will revise the design of the proposed structure to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(a)(3).

### **Foundation Height**

The Applicant has not submitted any compatibility data supporting the proposed foundation height.

### **Foundation Material**

The Applicant proposes a CMU foundation with a brick veneer. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, as this is the material that predominates on the block face; however as noted above compatibility data must be submitted to support the proposed foundation height.

### **Exterior Cladding**

The Applicant proposes smooth face cementitious siding with a 6-inch reveal. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Porch**

The proposed porch, which is a full width porch does not meet the compatibility rule. Staff’s analysis shows that the porch form which predominates on the blockface is partial-width, with a separate roof form. The Applicant will utilize tongue-ingroove porch flooring installed perpendicular to the face. The Applicant will utilize two-part, butt-jointed construction for all railing. The Applicant will revise the proposed porch design to meet the compatibility rule.

### **Windows**

The Applicant proposes use of three-over-one windows. Based on Staff’s analysis this window style only occurs on one house on the block face. The predominant window style appears to be equally distributed between two styles, diamond-patterned-over-one and one-over-one. Further, it appears that windows are proposed which do not match the proposed style in several locations. The fenestration style must be consistent throughout the house. The Applicant will revise the proposed window style to meet the compatibility rule.

### **Fenestration Patterning**

Staff is extremely concerned with the proposed fenestration patterning on the side elevations. There are virtually no windows on both the left (8, with two smaller inconsistent style windows)and right-side (only three, with one of inconsistent style) elevations. This is extremely inconsistent with the existing historic housing stock. The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration patterning on the left and right elevations.

### **Dormers**

Staff has concerns with the proposed dormers. The front facing second story windows do not present as a dormer, but rather as an integrated second level, which does not match the existing housing stock. Side dormers are not present anywhere on the block face, and the design as proposed is problematic because the dormers are almost at the very front façade, creating an effect that dominates the over all roofline. The Applicant will reduce the scale of the front windows to not present as a fully articulated second level. The Applicant will revise the proposed side dormers to push them further back from the front façade so they do not dominate the overall roofline creating a batwing effect.

### **Accessory Structure and ADU**

The proposed accessory structure is a 622 square foot garage, with a 340 square foot ADU above. The second floor would also include 282 square feet of unconditioned space on the second level. The overall proposed height of 9 feet also meets the requirements of the code. While the proposed accessory structure appears to meet the requirements of the code, given the number of revisions required to the new construction of the primary residence, the design of the accessory structure also may require revision.

### **Site Plan**

Staff notes that the front yard setback listed on the compatibility study (20 feet) does not match what is shown on the proposed site plan (35 feet). The Applicant will clarify the proposed setback and illustrate how it meets the compatibility rule.

The Applicant proposes a driveway of parallel concrete strip separated by a center gravel strip. Staff would note that the proposed site plan does not count this center gravel strip as impervious surface, which it is. Staff believe that this would increase the impervious surface above the allowable lot coverage. Staff recommends removing the proposed gravel in favor of a permeable surface such as turf. The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway design to ensure that they are not exceeding allowable lot coverage.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until February 14, 2024, to allow the Applicant to address the following:**

- 1.) The Applicant will submit a complete compatibility study including all features on all contributing structures subject to the compatibility rule.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit documentation of how height measurements were taken for the contributing structures on the block face.
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to meet the compatibility rule.
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the design of the proposed structure to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(a)(3).
- 5.) The Applicant will utilize tongue-ingroove porch flooring installed perpendicular to the face.

- 6.) The Applicant will utilize two-part, butt-jointed construction for all railing.
- 7.) The Applicant will revise the proposed porch design to meet the compatibility rule.
- 8.) The Applicant will revise the proposed window style to meet the compatibility rule.
- 9.) The Applicant will submit specifications for all exterior materials to be utilized, including the windows and doors.
- 10.) The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration patterning on the left and right elevations.
- 11.) The Applicant will reduce the scale of the front windows to not present as a fully articulated second level.
- 12.) The Applicant will revise the proposed side dormers to push them further back from the front façade so they do not dominate the overall roofline creating a batwing effect.
- 13.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed setback and illustrate how it meets the compatibility rule.
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway design to ensure that they are not exceeding allowable lot coverage.
- 15.)** The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight 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:** 463 Hill St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-396  
**MEETING DATE:** *January 10, 2024*

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West block face of Hill St. SE, south of the Glenwood Dr. SE intersection.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional Cottage

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** *Yes. Deferred on December 13, 2023. Updated text is in bolded italic font.*

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** *Denial without prejudice.*

***CONCLUSIONS:*** *The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.*

Plans

In reviewing the plans, Staff noted that the elevations shown as existing contain several errors, internal inconsistencies, and deviations from the inventory photographs and publicly available Streetview photography available to Staff. Those deviations include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- The front stoop gable is shown as being attached to the front roof plane instead of intersecting it. Staff also has concerns that the dimensions of the gable shown does not match the proportions of the actual stoop gable shown in the inventory photographs and publicly available Streetview photography.
- The front stoop railing shown on the inventory photographs and publicly available Streetview photography are missing from the provided elevations.
- The windows shown on the elevations are one over one, whereas the windows shown in the inventory and publicly available Streetview photography are six over six.
- The window casing and mullions shown on the elevations are comparatively thin when compared to the inventory photographs and the publicly available street view photography. In some cases, the mullions between double grouped windows are missing and are shown as siding. Also missing from the elevations are the faux shutters shown in both the inventory photographs and the publicly available Streetview photography.
- The chimney shown on the existing elevations does not appear to match the dimensions of the chimney shown in the inventory photographs and publicly available Streetview photography.
- The left and right-side elevations show the steps terminating above the stoop.
- The right-side elevation shows an extension of a wall that is perpendicular to the front façade which is not shown on the front or left-side elevations and is not shown on the inventory photographs or the publicly available Streetview photography.

Given these errors and omissions, Staff recommends that the existing elevations be re-drawn to accurately reflect the existing conditions of the structure and to be internally consistent.

General notes on second story additions to historic structures

Given Staff's experience with proposals involving second story additions to single story historic structures, Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that any approval for adding a second floor would not permit the demolition or exterior alteration of first floor portions of the structure to accommodate the additional structural components required to support the weight of the second floor. For this reason, Staff would strongly suggest that the Applicant consult with a State licensed Engineer that is familiar with historic structures constructed before modern building codes to assess the foundation of the existing structure and the internal wall structures to determine whether additional support would be required for a second floor addition. Staff would also note for the benefit of the Applicant that any additional structural support would need to be added to the structure from the inside. At no point should the first floor portions of the structure be demolished

to add any additional support to the foundation or walls that is needed to accommodate a second floor addition.

Scope of work

While the application notes, and the plans obviously show, the second floor addition, no additional information regarding the scope of work has been provided. The plans seem to indicate that the project may include replacement of existing materials including windows and siding, but it is unclear the intent or extent of that work. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the total scope of work on the exterior of the structure.

Alterations and additions to contributing structures

The District regulations in Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D) provide two options for the review of alterations and additions to contributing structures where the project is reviewable by the Commission (i.e. the work affects a street facing façade or roof plane). Given that the work proposed is an extension of the principal street facing roof plane, Staff finds that this work is required to be reviewed by the Commission using one of these two options.

The first of the two criteria for review requires alterations and additions to be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure while also complying with the regulations for new construction contained in Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B). In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that the effect of the work would be an extension of the existing roof plane that would increase the vertical massing of the existing single-story structure. As such, Staff finds that this proposal is neither consistent with, nor reinforces, the historic architectural character of the existing structure. As such, Staff finds that the proposal would not meet this criteria.

The second of the two criteria for review requires alterations and additions to not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. While structural plans have not been received for review, Staff finds that given the proposal is an extension of the front roof plane it is likely that portions of the existing front roof plane, including historic materials, will be destroyed as part of this work while significant portions of the rear roof plane and its historic materials will certainly be destroyed. As such, Staff finds the proposal does not meet the second of the two criteria.

Given Staff's findings regarding the two options for reviewing alterations and additions to contributing structures in the District, Staff cannot support the proposal as currently designed. Staff would recommend that the plans be redesigned to meet the District regulations. Staff would note that such a change would likely result in the review of the addition shifting from a Commission review to an administrative review, thus negating the need for the work to be reviewed at a subsequent public hearing. However, any alterations to the front roof plane or street facing façade would still require a review by the Commission.

**Updated plans for the January 10, 2024 hearing**

***The updated plans provided by the Applicant for the January 10, 2024, public hearing show that the addition has been moved behind the main ridgeline of the structure. The scope of work also shows that no work will be taking place that affects the front façade or front roof plane other than what would be***

CA3-23-396 for 463 Hill St. SE

**January 10, 2024**

Page 4 of 4

*expected for a standard roofing shingle replacement. As such, Staff finds that this revised scope has shifted the project away from a scope that the Grant Park Historic District regulations would permit the Commission to review. Staff recommends that the Commission deny the project without prejudice to confirm this change to the project scope and clear the item from their consideration. Staff will work with the Applicant to complete a Type II Staff Review application to review the setbacks, lot coverage, floor area, and height of the proposed work consistent with the requirements of the underlying R-5 zoning and the Grant Park Historic District overlay zoning.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** *Denial without prejudice.*

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:** 646 Ormewood Avenue SE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-428 (variance) & CA3-23-436 (addition)  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 2

**Other Zoning:** R-5, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** North side of Ormewood Avenue SE.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Variance to allow a reduction of the side yard setback from 7 feet (required) to 3 feet (proposed), addition

**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:** No

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** CA3-23-428 (variance): Approval;  
CA3-23-436 (addition): 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 Applicant proposes removal of an existing sun porch, and reconstruction of a new sunporch over a one-car carport.

**Variance CA3-23-428**

The Applicant requests to allow a reduction of the side yard setback from 7 feet (required) to 3 feet (proposed);

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 existing non-conforming nature of the lot, with a house that does not conform to modern setbacks. The existing structure is built significantly within the required setbacks, due to predating the current zoning regulations. The Applicant further cites the existence of a mature elm tree to the left rear of the house. By allowing a reduction in the right side yard setback the proposed addition can be shifted to a point where it would not impact the critical root zone of the mature tree.

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 historic non-conformity and unusual placement (not perpendicular to Ormewood Avenue) orientation of the house as limiting the ability to place an addition. The Applicant further cites the presence of a mature elm tree, which further limits the potential for a rear addition.

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

The Applicant cites the placement of the house, non-conforming nature of the lot, and presence of mature trees with critical root zones within the buildable area of the lot.

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 proposed addition is in the rear of the property, not visible from the public right of way. The Applicant further states a lesser impact than impacting the critical root zone of the mature tree.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting a variance. Staff finds that the existence of a mature elm tree on the left side of the property limits the ability to build the sunporch without a side yard setback variance. Staff is in support of the variance to allow for the preservation of the critical root zone of the existing tree canopy in accordance with the City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance. As such, Staff recommends approval of the proposed variance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

**CA3-23-436 (addition)**

As the proposed addition is to the rear elevation, sits below the existing roofline, and would not be visible from the public right-of-way, staff does not have any concerns with the proposal. As such, Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition so long as the side yard setback variance (CA3-23-428) is approved to allow the construction as proposed.

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

- 1.) The Applicant shall construct the proposed porch addition only if approval is granted of variance CA3-23-428, granting the proposed side-yard setback reduction.**
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the proposed 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:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 116 Chastain Park Avenue NW (Chastain Park)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-416  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** N/A      **Other Zoning:** R-3

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** North block facing Chastain Memorial Parkway, East block facing Dudley Lane, and South block facing Chastain Park Avenue NW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** City Park Playground

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Replacement of the current playground treehouse with a new treehouse

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

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

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

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

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

RC-23-416 for 116 Chastain Park Avenue NW (Chastain Park)

January 10, 2024

Page 2 of 2

**PROPOSAL:**

While Staff generally supports the development of new infrastructure in parks, due to the lack of documentation regarding site plans and the location of the new treehouse, Staff is unable to comment further than we would normally be able to.

Staff is aware of several master planning efforts that affect parks in the City but is unable to determine if this work is the result of one of these studies. Staff suggests the Applicant provide a Master Plan for this area if one exists.

Staff suggests the applicant create a detailed site plan that specifies the location of the existing treehouse, along with the location of the proposed replacement treehouse. With respect to future permitting processes, a site plan specifying the materials used for the replacement treehouse would be helpful.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Confirm delivery of comments at the commission 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:** 880 Cherokee Avenue SE (Grant Park)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-417  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Southwest block facing corner intersection of Cherokee Avenue SE and Atlanta Avenue SE

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Office building/City property

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior and exterior renovations of former Zone 3 Headquarters of Atlanta Police Department, including modifications to get the building in compliance with 2010 ADA requirements, to serve as the new headquarters for the Grant Park Conservancy

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20.SA1

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

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

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

**PROPOSAL:**

The Applicant proposes to renovate an existing office building that formerly housed the headquarters of Zone 3 of the Atlanta Police Department. The renovated building will serve as the new headquarters for the Grant Park Conservancy. While the subject property is geographically located in the Grant Park Historic District, it is also within the boundaries of the City owned Grant Park and is not subject to the Grant Park Historic District regulations. The existing building consists of an enclosed front porch, a rear deck, and a rear parking lot directly behind it, situated on the southwest corner of Cherokee Avenue SE and Atlanta Avenue SE. In the surrounding area, there are several residential and commercial properties that date to the early twentieth century.

The proposal includes an interior renovation that will reorganize the current floor plan to create offices for the Grant Park Conservancy, as well as interior modifications to comply with 2010 ADA requirements. As part of the interior renovation, doors and windows will be replaced, and the floor plan will be reorganized to create office space and a wheelchair lift. Additionally, the bathrooms will be rebuilt and new lighting and electrical systems will be installed.

Exterior renovations will include the reopening of the currently enclosed front porch, as well as exterior modifications to comply with 2010 ADA requirements. The existing rear deck will be reconstructed to include a new set of steps and an accessible ramp to allow ADA access to the lower level of the building. A re-stripping of the existing rear parking lot will also be conducted to create ADA-compliant parking spaces and an accessible route from the parking lot to the building.

Due to the lack of a site plan, floor plan, or elevations as part of the application documents, Staff finds that it will be difficult to comment fully on the impact of the proposed work on the building and site. Since these details must be provided before permitting can be approved, Staff suggests the Applicant provide existing and proposed site plans, floor plans, and elevations for the project. No details have been received regarding the materials used for the proposed alterations including the opening of the front porch, replacement of the rear deck, and the window and door work. It may be useful to have this information in order to better review the impact of the proposed work on the existing building and site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Confirm delivery of comments at the commission meeting.

Cc: Applicant  
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:** 408 Woodward Avenue SE  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-434  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 2

**Other Zoning:** SPI-22, SA-4

**Date of Construction:** n/a

**Property Location:** Southeastern corner of the intersection of Woodward and Oakland Avenues SE.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** n/a

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** n/a

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Special use permit to allow the use of the property as a church

**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:** U-23-033

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm Delivery of Comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board at the January 10, 2024, 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.

The Applicant proposes use of the currently vacant property as a church, office building, and coffee shop. Staff would note that this application only addresses the use of the property, it is not an application for the new construction proposed for the site. No elevations have been submitted as part of this application; however, a site plan has been provided. Staff notes that according to the proposed site plan the complex would have 16 parking spaces. While the historic district regulation do not govern the use of the property, Staff would note that given the multiple proposed special uses, the proposed parking does not appear to be adequate based on the responses provided by the Applicant, which indicate that parking will be sufficient for the employees of the proposed church, but not to accommodate regular attendees and its use as an office and coffee shop (calculated at as many as 120 individuals). The Applicant states that there is little to no traffic on Woodward Avenue SE; however, this is a busy throughfare with numerous commercial and residential properties, and parking permitted on both side of the street. This analysis is inconsistent with the realities of the location. This parking issue is directly linked to the proposed special use of the property and is an important consideration that must be resolved.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board at the January 10, 2024, 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:** 533 Mobile Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-439  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A **Other Zoning:** R-4A

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** North block face of Mobile Ave. SW, east of the Metropolitan Pkwy SW Intersection.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Section 106 review of proposed work.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** City of Atlanta City-wide Programmatic Agreement for HUD-funded Projects

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

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

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

**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 use, 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 Sylvan Hills 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 Sylvan Hills 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 the site work and new construction elements as outlined below:

1. Installation of 3 pre-fabricated, “shipping container” living units and 1 pre-fabricated, “shipping container” community / common building (2 pre-fabricated living units will be installed in Phase 1 and the other pre-fabricated living unit and the community / common building will be installed in Phase 2);
2. A deck connecting each of the living units and the community / common building;
3. A fence around the courtyard created by the living units and community / common building;
4. A fence around the entire portion of the property, including between the courtyard / living units / common building and Mobile Avenue, and,
5. Landscaping and sidewalks related to the overall development, including the establishment of what appears to be a “lawn” between the installed units and Mobile Avenue.

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.

**Existing Conditions of the Site and Surrounding Area:**

1. The proposed development will take place on an existing deteriorated parking lot immediately to the west (left) of the Applicant's existing building, which appears to be an eligible mid-century modern, one-story, brick building. Further to the west is a vacant lot and then Metropolitan Parkway. To the east is the church building for the Applicant, which appears to be an eligible mid-to late century, one-story, brick building. To the north is a contemporary (non-historic) commercial building that faces Metropolitan Parkway and several eligible mid-century modern one-story houses that face St. John's Street. To the south, across Mobile Avenue, is a eligible mid-century modern one-story, brick house, an overgrown vacant lot, and a contemporary (non-historic) commercial building that faces Metropolitan Parkway.
2. The subject property is a rectangular lot, that slopes gently down from the back to Mobile Avenue at the front. There is a tree line to the west and north, and the lawn of the adjacent building and more trees to the east.

**Preservation Professional preliminary comments about the project:**

Site Plan:

1. The proposed development will ultimately include the installation of four, pre-fabricated, shipping container buildings that will create a courtyard with a small opening (enclosed by a mesh fence) in the southeast corner close to the adjacent building. The most significant concern of the site plan is the use of what appears to be a solid, "fence" / wall between the created courtyard and Mobile Avenue, a site feature that is not found on the surrounding properties, both eligible and non-historic. It is not clear the purpose of the proposed fence as the courtyard is otherwise secure with its own fence farther back from

the street. Regarding that fence, it is not clear that its “mesh” pattern is compatible with the surrounding buildings.

Overall Massing, Form, and Height:

1. While the concern about the materials will be addressed below, the height of the one-story pre-fabricated units are compatible with the height of the surrounding one-story buildings – both institutional and residential.
2. However, it is not clear that the flat roof, pre-fabricated units are compatible with the nearby mid-century and late-century buildings. While the immediately adjacent building has a flat roof (as viewed from the street), the surrounding buildings have pitched roofs of various forms.

Architectural Components:

1. With the ultimate build out, most of the pre-fabricated buildings will have limited visibility from the street, such that the community / common building will have the most exposure. Its use of a window wall (at least on its right hand side) is compatible with the adjacent building, given its use of a somewhat similar window wall.
2. Otherwise, the use of simple rectangular window and door units in the pre-fabricated buildings is somewhat compatible with the nearby buildings.

Materials:

1. The most significant concern of the project is the exposed finish / material of the shipping containers in relationship to the surrounding buildings, of which the eligible ones are uniformly clad in brick. While the use of metal is used as a cladding material in mid-century, commercial and institutional buildings, it typically appears in a more “finished” state (flat panels, polished or brushed finish, fitted corner / edges, etc.) rather than corrugated steel.
2. As noted above, it is not clear that the “mesh” material (presumably metal) material of the more interior fence is compatible with the surrounding buildings. Further, what is assumed to be a wood privacy fence is also potentially incompatible with the surrounding buildings.

**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:** 810 Joseph E Boone Blvd.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-23-448  
**MEETING DATE:** January 10, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-19 (Subarea 8)

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Property contains frontages along the Joseph E. Boone Blvd. NW (to the north), Sciple Ter. NW (to the west), and Andrew J. Hairston Pl. NW (to the east).

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Section 106 review of proposed work.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** City of Atlanta City-wide Programmatic Agreement for HUD-funded Projects

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

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

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

**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 use, 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 five-story, affordable housing project inclusive of one level of parking on the first floor of the building and an in-house gym on the northwest corner and the leasing / management office on the northeast corner of the building; and
2. Installation of a typical City of Atlanta streetscape treatment along all three street frontages.

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.

**Existing Conditions of the Site and Surrounding Area:**

1. The proposed development will take place on an existing, generally vacant lot with various types of paving, former building footprints, parking lot areas, and associated general, contemporary landscaping.
2. To the north across Boone Boulevard are eligible one-story, 1910s-1930s houses, as well as vacant and altered 1910-1930s residential / commercial buildings and more contemporary commercial buildings. To the west across Sciple Terr are eligible, 1910-1030s one and story residential buildings. To the south and southeast are more eligible, 1910-1030s one and story residential buildings. To the east, across Hairston Place is a contemporary, multi-story church building, owned by the Applicant as well.
3. The subject property is a generally rectangular lot with a generally flat topography in its northern portion that slopes up in its southern portion.

**Preservation Professional preliminary comments about the project:**

Site Plan:

1. The proposed development will include a main mass facing Boone Boulevard, with three wings projecting to the south creating an “E-shaped” footprint to the building. Along the three street frontages, the building will be setback creating a small linear lawn between the building and the sidewalk. While the overall size of the building will be addressed below, the general arrangement of the building is compatible with the surrounding buildings and generally pre-World War II site planning pattern of the area – that is buildings either at the back of the sidewalk or within a short distance of the back of the sidewalk.

2. Installation of a typical and required City of Atlanta streetscape treatment (planting strip, concrete sidewalks, street trees, etc.) will occur along all three street frontages which is also compatible with the surrounding buildings and setting.
3. In between the wings of the buildings, the two courtyards will have various amenity features and spaces for the residents of the building.
4. The rear of the site will be graded down creating a flat development pad abut also a steeper slope up to the adjacent properties to the south.

#### Overall Massing, Form, and Height:

1. The proposed height of the building is significantly taller than surrounding buildings, including the church to the east of the proposed building which itself is one of the largest buildings in the vicinity. At the same time, it is acknowledged that there are some mitigating circumstances that potentially reduce the effect of the proposed building height:
  - a. The far southern portions of the building appear to be reduced in height to three stories, making those portions of the building somewhat less out of scale with the surrounding buildings and setting.
  - b. The proposed building does not directly abut any surrounding buildings given the three street frontages and the front setbacks / front lawn previously noted; and
  - c. The properties to the south of the proposed buildings (nearest the rear of the proposed building) have a higher starting base elevation / grade meaning that sit above the development pad for the subject project.
2. Another feature of the design that is potentially incompatible with the surrounding context is the placement of parking on the first floor that faces the two side streets – Sciple Terr to the west and Hairston Place to the east. Placing the parking in these locations will preclude any active uses on that level in those portions of the building. While these two streets are considered secondary to Boone Boulevard (which is a major east-west corridor in the City), a lack of active use would appear to be incompatible with the surrounding context which includes residential, institutional or commercial activity on the ground floor adjacent to a public street.
3. Lastly, it is not clear that the inclusion of angled / “pointed” roof lines at the northwest and northeast corners of the building is compatible with the surrounding context. While there are certainly gabled and hipped roof forms in the surrounding context, these typically are the main and only roof form for the building and are not paired with an otherwise flat roof form as would be typically found on commercial or institutional buildings.

#### Architectural Components:

1. The large, rectilinear mass of the building and its rectilinear would suggest the use of a more pronounced termination / cornice line at the top of the building to “cap” the vertical architecture expression of the architecture.
2. While acknowledging the very consistent pattern of window groupings as a compatible attribute of the architectural design (most of the eligible buildings have regular window patterns typically associated with their building form / typology), the use of the highly contemporary light pattern in the windows units themselves is concerning.

#### Materials:

1. One of the most significant concerns with the overall design is the inconsistent placement / use of the various materials, particularly the brick facing. While the first floor of the building is mostly faced with brick (particularly the east and west facades), on the first floor of the north façade (along Boone Boulevard) and above the first floor on all three external-facing facades its use appears to be inconsistent. In particular on the north façade the brick is absent from five “bays” of the façade on the first floor and is extended to the top of the building only on the northeast and northwest corners. This inconsistency diminishes the



presumed delineation of the “blocks” / “segments” on the building which if reinforced vs. diminished would help reduce the overall visual presence of the massing of the building.

2. Further, it is not clear that the use of the black cladding at the northeast and northwest corners of the building in a “suspended” application is internally consistent or compatible with the surrounding buildings and context.

**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