



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1163 Wilmington Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-23-323
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2023, deferred since October 11, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location Corner of Richland and Oakland Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 9/19/23 a Stop Work was applied for substantial work. The siding, original windows have been removed. And door openings have been removed. The house was gutted. So, the recommendations require the Applicant install the appropriate material and abide by the correct procedure to allow for the residence to be used as a duplex.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the February 28th, UDC meeting

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

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

EDITS in RED for November 20, 2023

New EDITS Requirements for DECEMBER 13, 2023

Latest EDITS required for February 28, 2024—Detail and notes of the house is on pages A-2, A-3, A-4 and A-5

INTENTIONS

The existing house at one time was a duplex. However, the house has been dormant for many years and since that time the District underlying zoning has changed to R4-A, single family. The Applicant intentions were to use the dwelling as a duplex. This can not happen straight away. For the house to be used as a duplex, that Applicant must petition Zoning for non-conformity.

Same comment stands.

Same comments.

PLAN

Still on the plans, there are drawings discrepancies that need cleaning up:

- 1) The columns on the front need to extend down to grade.**

ALTERATIONS

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

Front Porch

railings

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

Same recommendation stands. The Applicant has shown the proposed work on the plans.

Same recommendation. Evidence of intent can be seen on A-4

columns

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

The Applicant proposes all columns to be kept in-kind top and bottom trim. Staff are not concerned. Staff notes all except for one the column are in good condition and should be repaired. The new column shall be replaced in-kind.

The Applicant has shown this and noted this recommendation on the plans.

The Applicant has made this correct and can be seen on pg. A-4

steps

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

**Same recommendation stands. Staff recommend the Applicant note this proposal on the plans.
The Applicant has noted this on pg. A-4.**

porch ceiling

The ceiling is not visible for Staff. However, the typical recommendation for porch ceiling is to be bead board. Staff recommends the Applicant install a bead board ceiling.

**The Applicant notes the bead board ceiling as being the proposed work.
No change in recommendation.**

Windows and Trim

After further examination, Staff modify the recommendation and requires the Applicant to install 6 over 6 wood windows that match the original woods as well as match the original wood trim. And must be shown on the plans.

Left Elevation

- **There are two sections of double windows, double hung and the rear window is a single double hung window. The Applicant proposes to replace all the missing windows in the same location, size and all windows. All the windows will be wood and 6/6**

Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Same recommendation. The intention is shown on A-5.

Right Elevation

- **There are no up-close photos of the right elevation. The floor elevation show, a proposal for new wood window. Staff recommend the Applicant retain, the shape, size and style of the new wood window which should match the other windows on the house.**

Staff recommendation remains.

Same recommendation.

Rear Elevation

- **Floor plans and elevation indicated the intention change the size of the upper window with what appears to be a different style window. This problematic. Staff recommend the Applicant comply with the District regulations which require all windows to maintain the same grouping, position and size. This should be a 6/6 double hung wood window**

Staff recommendation remains the same

Same recommendation

District regulations require, **“replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.”**

Staff recommendation remains the same.

Same recommendation

Provided photos show the windows are not on the house. The windows are boarded. Staff believe most of the original windows are no longer on the house and have been disposed of. Photos provided by Code

Enforcement do show a few windows. The wood trim appears to be in good shape. The Applicant proposes new one-over-one wood windows with the intact wood trim. Since there is no record of the original wood windows style, it is hard to determine what style the windows were originally. With this being the case, the window design will become a compatibility standard issue. With two houses on the adjacent blockface, one is one-over-one and the other has simulated lites. The one-over-one pattern the Applicant proposes is of no concern to Staff.

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

Missing Trim

The trim above the front door must be retained and shown on the plan. The Applicant has not done this. Staff recommend all trim be retained and shown on the plan.

**The Applicant has shown the trim on the plans and indicating the proposed work.
Same recommendation, intention shown and stated on A-4.**

Shutters roof brackets

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

Roof brackets are missing on the plans that must be retained because of their defining feature. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the exact amount of roof brackets and show them on the plan.

**Same recommendation.
Same recommendation**

Attic Windows

The original windows on the gable attic were casement windows. The Applicant shown a double window as replaced. This is problematic, as the windows must replicate in-kind the original windows in this case that would be wood casement windows.

The Applicant has satisfied some of the recommendations and put them on the plans such as the windows and trim. While the Applicant has not shown what is required, such as 6 over 6 wood windows. Staff recommends the Applicant not only state the requirement but show it as well on the plans. For instance, the 6 over 6 wood windows need to show 6 over 6 windows on the plans.

As well the roof rafters are not reflected as required, the attic is a casement window that must be stated if the Applicant depicts it correctly.

Same recommendation be shown and stated on A-4. This window is not a double hung window

Siding

The Applicant proposes smooth-faced cementitious siding. However, the original siding on the house is wood. While cementitious siding is permitted, when known wood siding existed, it is expected the replacement be wood. Looking at photos, the woods siding is in fair condition except for repairs and painting. Staff just learned all the siding has been removed. Staff recommend the Applicant replace all the siding to match in-kind with the wood siding in reveal that was on the house.

The Applicant is still proposing cementitious siding for replacement. Staff recommendation for wood for replacement stands for the reason listed above.

Staff's recommendations remain the same and request the Applicant to clean up the language on the plan (A-3) to state wood siding not smooth-faced wood siding.

Doors

All the doors are missing but the Applicant proposes all the exterior doors will comply with the District regulation which states, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood framing. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Staff recommends that Applicant maintain the size and shape of all windows and windows openings. He cannot turn them into doors.

The Applicant is showing on the plans the doors and new wood doors that complies with the District regulations. However as stated the windows cannot be turned in to doors.

Same recommendation.

Foundation

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

Staff recommendation changes brick covered with stucco is fine, the siding that extends passed the foundation is not in compliance. The siding must be removed from the foundation.

Recommendation Stands.

Recommendation Stands

Site Work

walkway

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

Staff has since realized that the current design possibly can be historic and recommend the Applicant repair and replace in-kind to match the original pattern. The Applicant has identified the walkway but has not indicated the proposal. Staff also recommend the Applicant note the recommendation on the plans.

Same recommendation

The Applicant has stated where the steps will be on the walk . Staff is not concerned with this proposal. (S-1)

sidewalk

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

The Applicant has indicated the proposed work on the plans.

Same recommendation

Recommendation is the same. (S-1)

retaining wall

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

The Applicant has indicated the proposed work on the plans.

Same recommendation

Same recommendations, note is on (S-1)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the February 28th UDC Meeting

1. The columns base shall extend to the grade of the house, per Sec.16-20M;
2. The window's lites shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the window, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(2);
3. The Applicant has noted the wood roof brackets but have not shown them all. They shall be shown on the plans as well, per Sec.16-20M.
4. The replacement siding shall be wood to match the original wood siding, the Applicant shall clean up the language to remove the smooth-face language per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
5. The walkway shall be noted to be replace in-kind or repaired in-kind, Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 26 Hilliard St.
APPLICATION: CA2-24-001
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 3) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: West block face of Hilliard St., south of the Auburn Ave. intersection and north of the Edgewood Ave. Intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: variance and new construction.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the November 25, 2019, hearing the Commission approved CA3-19-554 & 555 for the new construction of a multi-family structure and a variance to allow an alternate block face for compatibility comparisons and placed several conditions on the design of the proposed structure.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with conditions.

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

Revisions to previously approved plans

The Applicant has proposed revisions to the plans previously approved by the Commission due to the change in use from multi-family to two-family/duplex. Part of that approval included a variance to allow an alternate block for compatibility comparisons. The contributing properties used in the Commission's review and approval are as follows: 315, 319, & 345 Auburn Ave. The Commission approved the variance request (CA3-19-555) and placed several conditions on the design of the proposed structure (CA3-19-554) as follows:

1. The Applicant shall provide a site plan documenting that the project meets the sidewalk requirements, per Sec. 16-20C.007;
2. The Site Plan shall be amended to note compliance with this requirement and show the location of the bicycle parking which is to be provided, per Sec. 16-20C.009(1)(a);
3. 75% of each façade of the proposed structure shall be clad in brick; and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

In comparing the proposal to these properties, Staff finds that the proposal generally conforms to the fenestration pattern found on these properties. Staff does note the vertical embellishments on the three "column" massings on the first floor/base of the building. In general, Staff finds that the proposal is still compatible with the comparable properties, given the changes in general façade make-up on the first floor. Staff would also note that the proposal as currently designed would eliminate the need for condition #2 from the Commission's original approval. The project would meet condition #3, but compliance with condition #1 has yet to be documented. As such, Staff supports the proposal as currently designed but would recommend that conditions # 1 & 3 from the conditions of approval for CA3-19-554 be retained and applied to the currently proposed revisions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Conditions # 1 & 3 from the conditions of approval for CA3-19-554 be retained and applied to the currently proposed revisions; and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

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
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: 572 Atwood Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-004
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: circa. 1900

Property Location: East side of Atwood Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New South Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Fencing application (CA2S-24-005)

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA2S-24-005

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes replacement of the existing tongue-in-groove porch flooring. The Applicant has submitted photos showing that repairs have been made to the existing flooring. Staff notes that full replacement is warranted as the periodic repairs over time have caused a variation in quality of materials, leaving gaps and inconsistencies in the plane of the flooring, and is actually leading to accelerated deterioration. The Applicant will replace the flooring using wooden tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the façade. The Applicant will not exceed the scope of the porch flooring replacement and leave all existing porch features including supports and balustrades intact. The proposed fencing, though note in the application materials is being addressed under a separate application, CA2S-24-005 and is outside the scope of the Commission's purview.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) . The Applicant will replace the flooring using wooden tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the façade.
- 2.) The Applicant will not exceed the scope of the porch flooring replacement and leave all existing porch features including supports and balustrades intact.
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 220 Auburn Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA2-24-007
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1920s

Property Location: Northwest corner of intersection of Jesse Hill Jr. Drive NE and Auburn Avenue NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Early 20th century Romanesque Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Historical Marker

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

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

CA2-24-007 for 220 Auburn Avenue NE.

February 28, 2024

Page 2 of 2

The Applicant proposes to install a historical marker, provided by the Georgia Historical Marker Program and sponsored by the Georgia Historical Society, to recognize the historical significance of the Big Bethel African Episcopal Church. Staff recognizes the importance of historic markers to educate the public on historically significant African American places like Big Bethel. Staff has no general concerns but will make the following conditions:

Staff recommends that the Applicant use historically appropriate methods to attach the marker to the mortar of the building by anchoring the marker to the mortar joints.

In speaking with the Applicant, Staff understands that there may also be the wish to placing the marker on a steel pole located directly in front of the front façade of the building, if that happens Staff will have no opposition to that proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall use historically appropriate methods to attach the marker to the mortar of the building by anchoring the marker to the mortar joints.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 572 Atwood Street SW
APPLICATION: CA2-24-008
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: circa. 1900

Property Location: Southwestern corner of the intersection of Oglethorpe Avenue and Azalia Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New South Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00001753

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the March 13, 2024, 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-00001753) for unpermitted alterations on December 15, 2023. These unpermitted alterations included the following alterations:

- Siding replacement
- Trim replacement and repairs
- A rear stair addition
- Partial balustrade replacement
- Soffit and Fascia replacement and repairs

In addition to the violations the Applicant is requesting the following items be added to the scope of work for the proposed project:

- Roof replacement
- Gutter installation
- Ornament installation
- Installation of a gravel driveway
- Fencing replacement
- Repair of the front steps
- Tree removal

Siding Replacement

The Applicant has replaced a substantial portion of the original siding on the front and right-side elevations. The siding repairs on the front elevation were made with wooden siding with a five-inch reveal. The repairs on the right-side elevation were made with cementitious siding with a six-inch reveal. Sec. 16-20G.006 (1)(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." Cementitious siding is not permitted. The Applicant will remove the cementitious siding installed and replace it with wooden siding which matches the historic five-inch reveal to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (1)(d).

Trim

The Applicant has submitted photos illustrating that small repairs were made to window trim on three windows to close existing gaps. Staff is not concerned with these repairs.

Rear Stair Addition

The Applicant replaced a set of non-original steps, loosely constructed of concrete blocks, brick, and wood on the rear of the property. Staff finds that this was neither an original feature or actual permanent feature, but rather an unsafe conglomeration of materials that was used as a stand-in to access a rear door. The Applicant has submitted the design of the replacement steps constructed of

wood. Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d) requires, “New or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns, and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code.” The new rear stairs, as constructed, do not utilize closed risers or butt-joint construction railings. The Applicant will revise the rear stair to have closed risers and a railing of butt-joint construction to bring it into compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d).

Partial Balustrade Replacement

The Applicant has stated that the balustrade was not replaced but Staff notes based on the code enforcement photos only the top rail of the historic railing was left intact, the remainder, including portions of the historic posts has been fully replaced with new wood. The wood appears to have just been wood glued together, which does not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d) which requires, “New or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns, and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code.” Staff understands the small repair to the deteriorated base of the porch supports; however, the balustrade does not meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant shall remove the unpermitted balustrade and replace it with one of butt-joint construction which matches the historic features which were removed.

Soffit and Fascia

New pieces of soffit and fascia were replaced where missing. The Applicant has stated that layers were installed over the existing, which Staff would discourage, so that underlying rotten or deteriorated materials do not damage new materials. Staff has reviewed the submitted photographs and does not have concerns with the repairs, other than not adding new materials over deteriorated ones.

Roof Replacement

Staff is not concerned with the proposal to replace the roof as this falls under the purview of general maintenance. Staff would note that per Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(a), “Replacement roofing materials shall be of the same size, texture and material as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure.” The Applicant shall replace the existing roof with materials that meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(a).

Gutter Installation

Staff is not concerned with the proposal to install gutters as this falls under the purview of general maintenance. The Applicant will install gutters using minimally invasive methods to limit the impact on existing historic materials.

Ornament Installation

The Applicant has stated that they wish to install decorative ornamentation, purchased from salvage stores, on the existing porch. Staff cannot support this proposal. There are existing decorative brackets on the porch, which must be retained. Sec. 16-20G.006 (16)Ornaments states, “(a)Architecturally significant ornaments, such as corner boards, cornices, brackets, downspouts, railings, columns, steps, doors and window moldings, shall be retained.

(b)Replacement ornaments shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated.

(c)Installation of new ornaments, where none previously existed, shall be permitted only when it is in accordance with the architectural style of the original structure.”

Based on the submitted documentation the existing ornamentation on the porch appears to be in excellent condition, and the Applicant has not established a need for replacement of the existing historic materials. Further, Staff finds that introduction of new ornaments would create a false sense of history, as there are existing architectural elements in place. The Applicant will retain the existing architectural ornamentation on the porch. The Applicant will not install new ornamentation.

Gravel Driveway

The Applicant proposes replacement of an existing unpaved driveway on the Azalia Street elevation with gravel. Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(a) requires, “The original layout, patterns and paving materials of sidewalks, driveways, alleyways, curbs and streets shall be retained. The design and material of new replacement paving materials shall be subject to the compatibility rule.” Staff finds that gravel is not an appropriate replacement material for the driveway, as every property on the street has a concrete driveway. Gravel therefore does not meet the compatibility rule. Further, the submitted site plan does not clearly delineate the length or dimensions of the driveway, nor does it show lot coverage, leaving Staff unable to determine if the proposed dimensions would meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant will submit an updated site plan with the dimensions of the proposed driveway clearly delineated and lot coverage calculated. The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway materials to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(a).

Fencing Replacement

The Applicant proposes replacement of the existing deteriorated fencing on the Azalia Street elevation with galvanized chicken wire. Sec. 16-20G.006 (14)(a) requires, “Fences shall be fabricated of brick, iron, wood or metal pickets. Fence lines shall follow or run parallel to a property line in the front and half-depth front yards.” Staff finds that the proposed material does not meet the requirements of the code. The proposed material must be revised to meet the code. The Applicant shall not install the proposed fencing. The Applicant shall provide alternative fencing materials which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (14)(a).

Front Steps

The Applicant proposes to repair the existing concrete steps, using in-kind materials to level and

patch the broken concrete. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The Applicant will repair the steps in-kind, retaining the existing dimensions and all features including the existing brick cheek walls.

Tree Removal

The Applicant has submitted photos of a tree they desire to be removed. This is not under the purview of the Commission. Per Sec. 16-20G.006 (11), “The Tree Ordinance of the City of Atlanta shall apply to the West End Historic District.” The Applicant will not remove the proposed tree without approval from the Arborist Division to confirm compliance with the Tree Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until March 14, 2024 to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will remove the cementitious siding installed and replace it with wooden siding which matches the historic five-inch reveal to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (1)(d).
- 2.) The Applicant will revise the rear stair to have closed risers and a railing of butt-joint construction to bring it into compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d).
- 3.) The Applicant shall remove the unpermitted balustrade and replace it with one of butt-joint construction which matches the historic features which were removed.
- 4.) The Applicant shall replace the existing roof with materials that meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(a).
- 5.) The Applicant will install gutters using minimally invasive methods to limit the impact on existing historic materials.
- 6.) The Applicant will retain the existing architectural ornamentation on the porch.
- 7.) The Applicant will not install new ornamentation.
- 8.) The Applicant will submit an updated site plan with the dimensions of the proposed driveway clearly delineated and lot coverage calculated.
- 9.) The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway materials to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(a).
- 10.) The Applicant shall not install the proposed fencing.
- 11.) The Applicant shall provide alternative fencing materials which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (14)(a).
- 12.) The Applicant will repair the steps in-kind, retaining the existing dimensions and all features including the existing brick cheek walls.
- 13.) The Applicant will not remove the proposed tree without approval from the Arborist Division to confirm compliance with the Tree Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.
- 14.) 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



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams- Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2557 Hightower
APPLICATION: CA3-24-012
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1965

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? Yes,

Previous Applications/Known Issues: A Stop work order was placed 9/29/21 for unapproved work on the exterior; porch railings; painted brick..

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

PLANS

The new Applicant is proposing a fence and retaining wall. This will require a site plan. Staff recommend the Applicant provide a site plan that show the fence and retaining wall.

ALTERATIONS

Porch and Roof line

Off a front facing porch the Applicant is proposing wood steps with a gable roof over the porch. The original orientation for the porch was side facing with concrete steps and there was a shed roof extending from the hip roof. Metal railings and columns were the original to the porch. The Applicant is proposing new wood and metal railing and new wood stairs. This is problematic and a violation of the District's regulations which states, "original or historic porches or stoops including their component features shall be retained." Staff are not concerned with orientation of the steps because houses built during this period could have been front facing with steps, also if removed in the future this would not take way from the over style of the house. Staff recommend the gable roof be removed and the shed roof be installed from the hip roof as before, metal railings and columns must be reinstalled, and the steps be concrete to abide by the District Regulations.

Painted Brick

The unpainted masonry was painted. This also is a violation of the District regulations. Staff recommend the paint be removed in a manner that will not destroy the brick. Sandblasting is not permitted.

Windows

The Applicant is proposing new windows using the same window openings and sizes. This does not concern Staff. The proposed material of the new windows will be wood. Photos provided show the windows will retain the in shape and size or the original windows. District regulations state, "replacement windows shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape and size." The material on these windows probably was metal or wood framed and being that the shape and size match the original, the wood for replacement is not problematic to Staff.

Trim

The Applicant proposes new wood trim. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Garage

The original garage was not enclosed. The proposal now is to enclose the garage and add cementitious siding to enclose the garage with a new metal door. District regulations, states, "existing attached garages may be fully enclosed into conditioned space provided the original character defining features visible from the public street are retained and are identifiable." Staff deem the enclosure will allow for the defining features to be retained. Staff are not concerned with the enclosure. However, the proposed door must be compatible to the existing doors on the house. Staff can not determine if a metal door is currently on the house and recommend the door be compatible with the other doors on the house.

SITE WORK

Walkway

The Applicant proposes a walkway be installed from the front steps to the driveway with decreasing steps. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Fence

The Applicant proposes a new wood fence. The Applicant has not provided a site plan to show where the fence will be installed. Staff recommend the wood fence comply to the District regulation which states, “fences are not permitted between the principal structure and the public street, fences shall exceed six feet in height at any point.”

Retaining Wall

The original retaining wall lines the driveway. The Applicant proposes to install a new retaining wall to match the existing painted concrete way. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

Driveway

The current driveway is busted, the Applicant proposes to replace the driveway. The driveway must be 10 ft wide minus the apron. Staff recommends the Applicant comply and note this on the site plan.

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. A site plan shall be provided to show all site work, which includes, the fence, retaining wall and the walkway, per Sec.16-20Q.006;
2. The decorative metal railings and columns shall be reinstalled per Sec/ 16-20Q.006(10)(c);
3. The paint shall be removed in a manner that will not damage the brick. Sandblasting cannot occur, per Sec.16-20Q.001;
4. The garage door shall match other doors on the house that are reflective of the time period, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(2)(d);
5. The fence shall not be permitted between the principal structure and public street and shall no exceed 6ft in height at any point, per Sec.16-20Q.006(16);
6. The driveway shall be no wider than 10ft in width minus the apron, per Sec.16-20Q.006(15)(e) and
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 528 Cameron Street SE
APPLICATION: CA2-24-018
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: North block-face of Hansell Street SE, west block-face of Cameron Street SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of early 20th century Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Front yard and half-depth front yard retaining wall

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: Application received Stop Work Order on January 10th, 2024

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

CA2-24-018 for 528 Cameron Street SE.
February 28, 2024
Page 2 of 2

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

An existing retaining wall along the north and west boundaries of the property has been removed by the Applicant due to the fact that it was made of unfinished cinder blocks, had water damage, and was leaning. The Applicant proposes to rebuild both retaining walls with concrete, rebar, and cinderblock, with a 3-foot height. Upon completion, the new retaining wall will be finished with a smooth, Stucco finish.

Staff has no general concerns with the project proposal but would recommend the Applicant clarify whether the cement will be used as footers or as a vertical element of the retaining wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall clarify whether the cement will be used as footers or actual vertical element of the retaining wall, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B)(14); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 675 N. Highland Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA2-24-020
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Poncey Highland Historic District, Subarea 4 **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West side of N. Highland Avenue NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: High Rise Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20V

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes a porch addition to an existing restaurant storefront in the non-contributing commercial structure. This proposed porch addition would consist of a metal, standing-seam roof over square wooden supports, some of which would be full height, others which would be anchored to an existing low concrete wall.. It would not be attached to the existing building. It would wrap around from the principal street-facing façade on North Highland to the alleyway separating the building from the adjacent church to the left. Staff does have concerns with the site plan, as it is very low resolution, and this makes it difficult for Staff to determine if the proposal is meeting necessary setback requirements. The Applicant will submit a higher resolution site plan clearly showing all proposed features.

Staff is generally in support of the design, and finds that it is consistent with the existing design of the building, with the exception of the proposed wooden supports and horizontal fencing proposed. Sec. 16-20V.010 (2) requires, "Building materials, architectural elements, and ornamentation must be internally consistent with the architectural style of the building or the addition." Wood is used nowhere else on the building façade. The predominant material is metal, and the supports and screening should be revised to utilize metal to ensure internal consistency. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to utilize metal supports and screening materials to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20V.010 (2).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) . The Applicant will submit a higher resolution site plan clearly showing all proposed features.
- 2.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to utilize metal supports and screening materials to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20V.010 (2).
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 940 White Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-028
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927

Property Location: South side of White Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 24CAP-00000005

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order (24CAP-00000005) on January 12, 2024, for unpermitted removal of a porch balustrade. In reviewing the code enforcement photos Staff has also determined that full window replacement was also undertaken without a permit.

Balustrade

The Applicant removed the side balustrade on the left elevation of the existing porch, with the intent to install an outdoor fireplace, which would not be permitted by the code. The Applicant has submitted proposed drawings for the replacement balustrade, which unfortunately are contradictory. The intent states that the balustrade will be of butt-joint construction, and no taller than the window sills; however, the submitted diagram is for a front-nailed deck railing which would not be permitted by the code. The existing front-facing balustrade is a front-nailed deck railing, which is not proposed for replacement. Staff wants to ensure that the proposed railing meets the requirements Sec. 16-20G.006 (9)(d) which requires, "New or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code." The Applicant will submit an updated drawing depicting the proposed replacement railing as two-part, butt-jointed rather than as a front-nailed, deck railing.

Window Replacement

Based on code enforcement's photos of the property the house has had full window replacement with vinyl, one-over-one, double-hung windows. The historic photos of the property show that all of the windows were originally three-over-one, wood-framed, double-hung windows. The Specifications provided for the proposed replacement windows are for six-light casement and awning windows, with fixed windows for the basement level. All the replacement windows would be vinyl. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c) requires, "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. The use of simulated divided lite windows is permitted." The proposed replacement windows are in no way compliant. There is no indication that the house ever has casement windows, and the style is not appropriate to the historic time period of the house, architectural style of a Craftsman bungalow, or materials that would have been historically present. Staff is not concerned with the proposed fixed windows at the basement level; however, they must meet the code in all other respects. The Applicant will submit specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).

Rear Addition

The code enforcement photos also show a rear addition, which does not appear to be original to the house, that based on the photos has recently been reclad with new siding. The Applicant will

clarify the scope of work in regards to the rear addition. The Applicant will submit material specifications for the new siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) . The Applicant will submit an updated drawing depicting the proposed replacement railing as two-part, butt-jointed rather than as a front-nailed, deck railing.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in regards to the rear addition.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit material specifications for the new siding.
- 5.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 229 Walker Street NW

APPLICATION: CA3-23-206

MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Castleberry Hill Landmark District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** n/a

Date of Construction: 1952, 1989

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Peters and Fair Streets NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Commercial Warehouse

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20N

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred July 26, September 13, October 11, 2023, and October 25, December 13, 2023 and January 24, 2024

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes total renovation of the existing non-contributing structure on the property. The existing structure is a prefabricated, industrial warehouse, constructed of corrugated metal. The proposed renovations would construct a brick façade, which would create a parapet enclosure extending 6 feet 6 inches from the existing eave of the gabled roof, giving the building the appearance of a flat roof. This parapet wall would have an elaborate Mission-style detailing. Inset into the façade would be two storefronts facing Peters Street and six storefronts all facing the Fair Street entrance off the street. Specifications have not been provided for the form of the storefronts, though they appear to be standard commercial storefronts.

Staff has several concerns regarding the proposal. First, though a document was submitted labeled “site plan” it does not depict the full lot and all features. It is identical to the submission of elevations. The Applicant will submit an existing and proposed site plan, drawn to scale, illustrating the existing lot coverage, and the proposed alterations including all features present on the lot.

The Applicant has submitted an updated site plan. The proposed site plan shows proposed parking between the principal structure and the street on both the Walker Street and Fair Street elevations. Sec. 16-20N.008 (3)(a) states, “Off-street parking shall not be permitted between the principal building and the public street.” Staff cannot approve the proposed site plan without a variance to the code. The Applicant will submit a variance application to allow parking between the principal structure and the street for both the Walker and Fair Street SW elevations.

Secondly, no compatibility data has been submitted for the proposal. A number of featured elements including façade organization, proportions, scale, roof form and pitch, materials, fenestration patterning, style, and materials are all subject to the compatibility rule. The Applicant will submit compatibility data for all elements which are subject to the compatibility rule and establish how the proposed design meets the compatibility standards of the zoning code. The Applicant has submitted a several photos, located, with the exception of one, elsewhere in the Castleberry Hill Landmark District. Staff find that this information is not relevant due to not being on the adjacent block face, and they cannot be used for compatibility purposes without a variance. Staff has examined the two contributing structures present on the block face and notes that the proposed fenestration does not meet the compatibility rule. The existing businesses all have knee walls that extend approximately three feet above grade, as does the example submitted by the Applicant from elsewhere in the landmark district. The proposed fenestration must be revised to reflect this style, with windows above three-foot brick knee walls. The proposed door should be aluminum-framed. Staff is not concerned with the proposed transoms above the windows and doors, as they meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration to be located above a three-foot brick knee wall to meet the compatibility rule.

Staff has significant concerns with the elaborate Mission-style parapet ornamentation. This element does not exist anywhere within the landmark district, particularly not on the block of the subject

property. It is far to elaborate and an inappropriate style for the district. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to simply the proposed parapet in a design which meets the compatibility rule. Staff also has concerns regarding the proposed mixture of stone and brick veneer. The design appears to largely be based on suburban strip-mall style design and is not tailored to the landmark district and surrounding historic architecture. The Applicant will utilize materials which meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to simply the proposed parapet in a design which meets the compatibility rule. **The parapet has been simplified considerably, but Staff still notes that the building materials do not comply with the compatibility rule. Sec. 16-20N.008 (1)(c) requires, “All building elements shall be utilized in a meaningful, coherent manner, rather than a mere aggregation of random historic elements, including but not limited to their: design, size, dimension, scale, material, location on the building, orientation, pitch, reveal and amount of projection from the façade.” Specifically the proposed stone veneer and stucco are not present anywhere on the block face. The only existing building materials present on the block face are brick. All materials which do not meet the compatibility rule must be removed. The Applicant will revise the proposed design to use only unornamented red brick, with no decorative veneers, or extraneous detailing. The Applicant has also not submitted specifications for any of the proposed materials to be utilized in the design. The Applicant will provide specifications for all new materials to be used on the façade renovations.**

Signage

The updated elevation submitted by the Applicant show a significant amount of proposed signage. The proposal illustrates five separate units inside the proposed development. Sec. 16-28A.010 (49) (8), requires, “The combined area of these permitted building signs shall not exceed ten percent of the total area of the front wall of each said business establishment, and in no case shall any individual sign exceed 200 square feet. Notwithstanding these provisions, every business establishment shall be entitled to at least 60 square feet total combined sign area.” The front business space, has its primary entrance Walker Street elevation. The current proposal for this business is to have two 72 square foot signs on the Walker Street elevation. This does not include proposed signage to be placed on the door or awning. The proposed 144 square feet of signage far exceeds the allowable 60 square feet. The Applicant will revise the two signs from the Walker Street elevation of the building to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-28A.010 (49) (8).

The three central units on the Fair Street elevation all propose 28 square feet of signage, which meets the requirements of the zoning code. The rear unit on the Fair Street elevation has a proposed sign of 60 square feet, with an additional sign of 64 square feet proposed on the rear elevation. While the Fair Street elevation sign meets the allowable square footage, the combined 124 square feet of signage between the elevations does not. Staff would further note that the proposed 60 feet of signage is the maximum allowed for this unit and would recommend reducing the size to allow flexibility for additional signage on the door. The Applicant will remove the proposed rear elevation sign from the plans. The Applicant will note on the proposed plans that no signs may be internally illuminated to be in compliance with Sec. 16-28A.010 (49) (10).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit an existing and proposed site plan, drawn to scale, illustrating the existing lot coverage, and the proposed alterations including all features present on the lot. [The Applicant has submitted an updated site plan.](#)
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a variance application to allow parking between the principal structure and the street for both the Walker and Fair Street SW elevations.
- 3.) The Applicant will submit compatibility data for all elements which are subject to the compatibility rule and establish how the proposed design meets the compatibility standards of the zoning code. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration to be located above a three-foot brick knee wall to meet the compatibility rule. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 5.) The Applicant will utilize materials which meet the compatibility rule. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 6.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to use only unornamented red brick, with no decorative veneers, or extraneous detailing. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 7.) The Applicant will revise the proposed design to simply the proposed parapet in a design which meets the compatibility rule. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 8.) The Applicant will provide specifications for all new materials to be used on the façade renovations. [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 9.) The Applicant will revise the two signs from the Walker Street elevation of the building to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-28A.010 (49) (8). [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 10.) The Applicant will note on the proposed plans that no signs may be internally illuminated to be in compliance with Sec. 16-28A.010 (49) (10). [The Applicant has satisfied this condition.](#)
- 11.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 540 Langhorn Street SW

APPLICATION: CA3-23-350

MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

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)?: Yes, deferred November 8 & December 13, 2023 January 10, 2024.

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant 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. [The Applicant has clarified that the rear addition will be repaired rather than reconstructed. The only portion which requires reconstruction is the roof. The Applicant will provide a detailed accounting of proposed repairs beyond the reconstruction of the roof. The Applicant will clarify what materials will be used for the proposed addition repairs. The Applicant will submit photos illustrating the current state of the addition roof. The Applicant will provide a roofing plan for the addition.](#)

[The proposed design includes the addition of windows to this existing area, as well as removal of several windows and a door. Sec. 16-20G.006 \(3\)Windows and Doors states, “\(a\)Architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained.\(b\) Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed, in whole or in part” and “\(g\)New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.”](#) The door is on a street facing elevation and cannot be removed, it does not need to be operable. The Applicant will retain the existing door on the left elevation. The Applicant will submit material specifications (not just size) for all proposed new windows to be used, including the transom windows which will be on the rear elevation. The Applicant will utilize trim and reveal which match the existing present on the house.

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 has reviewed the revised plan submitted by the Applicant and still has significant concerns that many of the outstanding conditions (those highlighted below) have not been addressed. As such, Staff recommends further deferral to allow the Applicant to submit the outstanding materials required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify what work was completed on the house prior to the issuance of the stop work order. The Applicant has clarified the previously completed work in the updated application.
- 2.) The Applicant will remove the renderings from the plan set. The Applicant has removed the renderings.
- 3.) The Applicant will submit existing and proposed interior floor plans for the structure. A new floor plan has been submitted.
- 4.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed rear elevation to conform to the required setbacks. The Applicant has revised the application to clarify that the addition will be repaired, not reconstructed, with the exception of the roof.
- 5.) The Applicant will provide a detailed accounting of proposed repairs beyond the reconstruction of the roof.
- 6.) The Applicant will clarify what materials will be used for the proposed addition repairs.
- 7.) The Applicant will provide a roofing plan for the addition.
- 8.) The Applicant will submit photos illustrating the current state of the addition roof.
- 9.) The Applicant will retain the existing door on the left elevation.
- 10.) The Applicant will submit material specifications (not just size) for all proposed new windows to be used, including the transom windows which will be on the rear elevation.
- 11.) The Applicant will utilize trim and revel which match the existing present on the house.
- 12.) The Applicant will submit a proposed site plan with the new rear addition footprint. A revised site plan has been updated to show that the footprint will not change, as the existing addition will only be repaired. The Applicant still must add lot coverage, as the proposed drive would alter the site conditions.
- 13.) The Applicant will revise the site plan to show all features present on the lot. A revised site plan has been submitted illustrating all features, but lot coverage is still not shown.
- 14.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work regarding the existing driveway. The Applicant has updated the site plan illustrating the proposed driveway.
- 15.) The Applicant will redesign the proposed side dormer addition to not obscure the historic chimneys. The design has been revised. The proposed dormer does appear to encroach on the sideyard setback. The Applicant will revise the proposed dormer to conform to the setbacks.

- 16.) The Applicant will redesign the side dormer addition to more closely mirror the existing left dormer in scale and placement. **The design has been revised and a secondary dormer added to the rear. .**
- 17.) The Applicant may shift one of the proposed dormer additions to the rear elevation. **The dormer has been altered to decrease its size and a secondary dormer added to the rear.**
- 18.) 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. **A window schedule with the window types labelled on the elevation has been provided, but no photos of window conditions or an evaluation. These still must be submitted to establish the need for replacement. The Applicant has revised the proposal to remove the proposed full window replacement.**
- 19.) The Applicant will submit an evaluation of the condition and need for repair of all features proposed for replacement. **The Applicant has clarified the condition of numerous elements through submission of detailed photos and clarification of scope, with the exception of the rear addition which is addressed in Conditions #5 & 6 above.**
- 20.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed scope of work in regards to the porch and stoop. **The Applicant has clarified that repairs are limited to removal of the partial screened enclosure and repairs to the beadboard ceiling. No other alterations to the front porch are included in the scope of work.**
- 21.) **The Applicant will submit specifications for any materials proposed for replacement on the porch and stoop. The Applicant will supply specifications for the proposed beadboard.**
- 22.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 546 Atwood Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-354
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Atwood Street SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred December 13, 2023, January 10 & 24, 2024.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 21CAP-00000600

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

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 stop-work order 21CAP-00000600 on July 30, 2021, for full replacement of siding, windows, trim, removal of a gable vent and other decorative features, and enclosure of rafter tails. The Applicant is applying for retroactive approval of all unpermitted work related to the stop-work order. The scope of work also includes replacement of the roof, though it is not clear if this work has already occurred.

Staff has considerable concerns with the submitted elevations. Only the front, street-facing elevation has been included in the application materials. Only one photograph prior to the alterations has been included. As this is a retroactive approval, it appears that photographs of the property prior to the unpermitted work are unavailable. The Applicant will submit existing and proposed elevations or photographs illustrating all work that is included in the scope of the application. The Applicant will submit a detailed window and door schedule outlining the windows which were replaced and the exact specifications for the replacements. All of the information provided for the window and door replacements are photos of a product without material specifications.

Siding

The Applicant has replaced all the siding on the house with smooth-faced cementitious siding. Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d) states, "Siding repair or replacement shall match the original in material, scale and direction." As this work was completed unpermitted more than two years ago, it appears that it is not possible to obtain a condition assessment of the original siding, which has been discarded. Staff finds that the replacement materials do not meet the requirements of 16-20G.006(2)(d). The Applicant will remove the unpermitted smooth-face cementitious siding and replace the siding with wooden clapboard, which matches the historic reveal of the original wooden siding to meet the requirements of 16-20G.006(2)(d).

Windows

The Applicant has replaced all of the existing windows on the structure. The original windows present on the structure were nine-over-one, double-hung, wood-framed windows, with the exception of the windows in the front-porch gable which were four-pane. The replacement windows are one-over-one vinyl windows, which are a different size from the original windows. To accommodate these new unpermitted windows the original trim was removed and the reveal profile of the windows completely changed as a result. The four-pane windows in the gable were replaced with simple single pane vinyl windows. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(a) states, "Architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained." Further, Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c) states, "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. The use of simulated divided lite windows is permitted." As this work was completed unpermitted more than two years ago, it appears that it is not possible to obtain a

condition assessment of the original windows, which have been discarded. The replacement windows which were installed do not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c) in terms of size, style, or materiality. As noted above, a window and door schedule is required to clarify the scope of work. The Applicant will remove the unpermitted windows. The Applicant will submit to Staff specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c). The Applicant will replace the unpermitted windows with windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c). The Applicant will restore the window trim to the original dimensions and reveal present prior to the unpermitted work.

Doors

In the photographs taken by code enforcement from July of 2021, the original historic door is visible in photos. The Applicant has submitted photos of three new doors with the application materials. It is not clear if these doors are proposed for installation or have already been installed, and if so where they were installed. As noted above, a window and door schedule is required to clarify the scope of work. The Applicant will retain the existing doors or submit additional information regarding the need for replacement.

Roofing

It appears that the roof has been replaced in-kind. Staff is not concerned with the roofing itself; however, it appears as part of the roof replacement that the original exposed rafter tails have been enclosed. These rafter tails are a character-defining element of the architectural style of the house, and their enclosure has significantly altered the profile. The Applicant will remove the fascia board installed to enclose the exposed rafter tails.

Gable

The decorative gable vent was removed without a permit. This distinctive vent, which incorporated with the brackets along the gable was a character-defining element of the architectural style of the house, and its removal and replacement with cementitious siding has significantly altered the profile. Sec. 16-20G.006 (16)(a-b) states, "Architecturally significant ornaments, such as corner boards, cornices, brackets, downspouts, railings, columns, steps, doors and window moldings, shall be retained. Replacement ornaments shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated." As the original feature has been removed and discarded, it must be replicated in-kind. The Applicant will install a gable vent which replicates the historic feature which was removed in size, style, location, and material to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (16)(a-b).

The Applicant has not submitted any updated materials. Given that this application has reached the maximum allowable deferrals with no updated materials submitted, Staff recommends denial without prejudice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

- 1.) The Applicant will submit existing and proposed elevations or photographs illustrating all work that is included in the scope of the application.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a detailed window and door schedule outlining the windows which were replaced and the exact specifications for the replacements.
- 3.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted smooth-face cementitious siding and replace the siding with wooden clapboard, which matches the historic reveal of the original wooden siding to meet the requirements of 16-20G.006(2)(d).
- 4.) The Applicant will remove the unpermitted windows.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit to Staff specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).
- 6.) The Applicant will replace the unpermitted windows with windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).
- 7.) The Applicant will restore the window trim to the original dimensions and reveal present prior to the unpermitted work.
- 8.) The Applicant will retain the existing doors or submit additional information regarding the need for replacement.
- 9.) The Applicant will remove the fascia board installed to enclose the exposed rafter tails.
- 10.) The Applicant will install a gable vent which replicates the historic feature which was removed in size, style, location, and material to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (16)(a-b).
- 11.) The Applicant shall admit all reviewed 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

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 712 Pearce Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-23-388
MEETING DATE: February 28, 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, January 10, 2024.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the March 13, 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. **The Applicant has submitted data with the tallest foundation height on the block face listed as 656 Pearce street. Staff is concerned because this foundation (cited as 42 inches in height) is being used as the model. This house has a brick porch, and uses brick as it’s primary building material. The proposed house is not a full brick structure. The proposed foundation height is far too tall. It appears that a 24 inch foundation height is what predominates on the block face.**

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. **This issue has not been addressed.**

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 overall 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. **This issue has not been addressed.**

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 setback shown on the plans is 33 feet (as measured), stated as 35 feet in the written documentation, and written as 30 on the plans. The setbacks still do not match. The applicant must resolve this in discrepancy.**

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 March 13, 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. **Compatibility data has been submitted.**
- 2.) The Applicant will submit documentation of how height measurements were taken for the contributing structures on the block face. **No updated information has been provided, and the data actually shows taller buildings that previously stated.**
- 3.) The Applicant will revise the proposed roof pitch to meet the compatibility rule. **The slope has been updated to a 7/12 primary pitch.**
- 4.) The Applicant will revise the design of the proposed structure to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(a)(3). **Staff still finds that the structure is highly incompatible with the block face and must be substantially redesigned. The overall height and massing are a huge issue, and individual features, such as the fenestration, dormers, and porch do not meet the compatibility rule.**
- 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. **This has not been changed. The Applicant argues that there are full width porches on the block face; however, this is not what predominates. The Applicant must revise this detail, as it continues to make the massing and design of the house incompatible with the surrounding structures.**
- 8.) The Applicant will revise the proposed window style to meet the compatibility rule. **The design has been revised.**
- 9.) The Applicant will submit specifications for all exterior materials to be utilized, including the windows and doors. **This issue has not been addressed with the exception of the front door.**
- 10.) The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration patterning on the left and right elevations. **This issue has not been addressed.**
- 11.) The Applicant will reduce the scale of the front windows to not present as a fully articulated second level. **This issue has not been addressed. The Applicant states that these windows are needed for egress. Staff understands that there is an issue in terms of accessibility; however, as the current design is only articulated as such with a full front porch, which is not permitted, this must be completely redesigned.**
- 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. **This issue has not been addressed.**
- 13.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed setback and illustrate how it meets the compatibility rule. **The setback shown on the plans is 33 feet (as measured), stated as 35 feet in the written documentation, and written as 30 on the plans. The setbacks still do not match. The applicant must resolve this in discrepancy.**
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway design to ensure that they are not exceeding allowable lot coverage. **The design has been revised; however, Staff still has concerns that they are exceeding allowable lot coverage, as the site plan is unclear if the rear patio, which though listed as permeable pavers, is in fact impermeable is included in the overall calculations. The applicant will clarify.**

CA3-23-388 712 Pearce Street SW

February 28, 2024

Page 6 of 6

- 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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim-Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 109 Druid Cir
APPLICATION: CA2-24-002
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024 from February 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1992

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance to allow for front facing windows to be replaced.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None, known

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Chapter 28 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

VARIANCE REQUEST

The Applicant is seeking allowance to replace a front facing window:

The Applicant must address the following four questions:

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

Applicant writes: **“The subject property is a non-conforming corner lot of record which is highly irregular in shape, has non radial lot lines, and is encumbered by significant topography changes. The shape, topography, and interior arrangement of the current construction, coupled with tree coverage, severely limit future kitchen construction and its placement to only street fronting locations. The cost to relocate the kitchen to another part of the home is prohibitive.”**

2) How would the application create an unnecessary hardship?

Applicant writes: **“Subsequent to the construction of a new single-family detached dwelling on the property in 1992, the City of Atlanta enacted a historic district overlay for which the dwelling will never comply and will never be contributing to the district albeit without its demolition. Additional zoning changes have rendered the present structure legal, non-conforming which is the duality and curse of base and overlay zoning. When the property owner desired to improve the property and to enlarge/remodel their kitchen, it was identified that exterior street facing windows on the secondary facade in the kitchen may not be enlarged. The present façade exhibits an array of architectural styling and fenestration which clearly identifies its vernacular style there being no true pattern and/or symmetry to replicate. In contrast to the subjective views of staff, larger windows are as compatible as the windows found elsewhere on the home. There is nothing more High Victorian as eclecticism and serendipitous arrangement. The owners are desirous of additional light, air, ventilation, and views on their densely shaded in-town lot which these windows will provide. A second-story location provides the needed security for doing so.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“The property has an irregular lot arrangement that coupled with the existing dwelling footprint is unlike surrounding and nearby properties. Although the dwelling could be viewed a modern rendition of a period structure, it represents a place in time not unlike contributing structures.”**

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

Applicant writes: **“Aesthetic guidelines are a subjective application of the zoning ordinance. None were in place at the time the dwelling was constructed. There has been and would not be detriment to the public good to improve this dwelling in any manner. The enlargement of existing windows is so insignificant as to be hardly noticeable on a recessed, secondary façade with the present massing. The zoning ordinance identifies non-conformities such as these and provides necessary relief through the variance process. Unlike other non-conformities, the Code does not regulate how they are to be addressed upon alteration of the structure. Windows are specifically identified by the overlay district guidelines but treated the same for both contributing and non-contributing structures.”**

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff have determined the Applicant has met the variance and has articulated through the four requirements why a variance should be applied in this matter. Staff agree that because there were no regulations set forth in the construction of this house, the original owners were permitted to build a vernacular house in a manner that allows for varying styles and material, which includes windows. Staff also agree that the odd topography of the lot and the tree canopy shields these windows from view on the secondary facade. Because this house is not contributing, the change of these windows will not make it less contributing.

Staff support the variance.

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: 192 Hurt Street NE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-022
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District, Subarea 1 **Other Zoning:** R-5/ Beltline

Date of Construction: 1905-1908

Property Location: Southwestern corner of the intersection of Hurt Street and Euclid Avenue NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and Re-framing of portions of the roof in relation to a stop-work order

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 23CAP-00001787

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 24, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order on December 15, 2023, for unpermitted replacement of the existing roof, including a reframing that appears to increase the size of the existing dormer on the roof, removal of windows, chimneys, decorative elements, and alterations, including replacement of siding, the porch ceiling, and trim.

In reviewing the submitted materials Staff is extremely concerned about the lack of documentation provided by the Applicant. The roofing plan is simply an aerial photograph of the house, and does not address the removal of key features, nor the rooftop addition and reframing of the dormer. Staff cannot assess the extent of the alterations without the submittal of elevations, floor plans, roofing plans, including the re-framing. No details have also been provided as to the need for, and extent of the additional unpermitted alterations. Staff has assessed the scope based on the photographs of the house submitted by code enforcement. The Applicant has not provided any photos illustrating the need for replacement of any exterior materials. Staff would note that in general that the quality of the majority of the photos is of poor quality. The Applicant will submit elevations, roofing plans, and floor plans. The Applicant will submit a full scope of all exterior alterations completed. The Applicant will submit material specifications for all materials used on these exterior alterations. The Applicant will submit a proposal for restoration of the chimneys, which were removed.

Further, the proposed roofing materials submitted by the Applicant do not meet the requirements of the code. Sec. 16-20L.005 (1)(b)(ix) requires, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” The historic roof of the structure was slate, and constitutes a key, character-defining feature of the structure. The Applicant has noted that portions of the roof were not clad in slate. Staff has determined that the only portions of the roof that were not original to the house were porte cochere (added in approximately 1980) and the rear dormer, which was reframed (added in approximately 1989). All other roof planes are original to the house, based on the 1911 Sanborn Fire Insurance map (produced less than ten years after the house’s construction). The Applicant has stated that they desire to file a variance application to allow the use of a roofing material (fiberglass asphalt faux slate) which would otherwise be prohibited. As such, Staff recommends deferral of the application until the April 24, 2024, hearing, which is the earliest date that the proposed variance could be legally advertised and heard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the April 24, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant will submit elevations, roofing plans, and floor plans.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit a full scope of all exterior alterations completed.
- 3.) The Applicant will submit material specifications for all materials used on these exterior alterations.
- 4.) The Applicant will submit a proposal for restoration of the chimneys, which were removed.
- 5.) The Applicant shall submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 792 Lake Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-024
MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920 (County tax records say 1920, Applicant says 1907)

Property Location: Southwest block facing Lake Avenue NE, east of Brickworks Circle NE intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of early 20th century Queen Anne Cottage.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior siding, exterior windows and doors, front porch, and rear addition.

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: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing non-original shingle siding in order to expose and restore the original siding underneath. In addition, the Applicant proposes to remove the existing non-original front porch extension and restore the front porch to its original configuration. Finally, the rear addition will be extended, and its siding replaced, and the second floor will include screened-in siding in order to create a covered deck.

From the site plan provided, Staff finds that the work is within compliance of both Inman Park and R-5 Zoning Ordinances. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal as currently designed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Staff recommends that any window that the Applicant determines is unable to be repaired be documented via photographs and sent to Staff for review. Staff further recommends that window replacement only occur after Staff has confirmed the need for replacement

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 879 White Street SW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-025

MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5, Beltline

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of White 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:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a new duplex on the vacant lot at 879 White Street SW. The proposed house would have a hipped roof with a pitch of 9/12 and a brick foundation, with the exterior clad in smooth-faced cementitious siding. The house would be in the style of a Queen Anne Cottage with a partial width porch and one-over-one, double-hung windows. The Applicant has submitted detailed compatibility data and Staff finds that the proposed design is in line with the submitted compatibility data in terms of overall height, foundation height, roof form, roof pitch, porch style and orientation, foundation materials, window style, door style, void: solid, and front yard setbacks. Overall Staff is in support of the proposed new construction, but has some concerns with the site plan as submitted.

Side Yard Setbacks

The property in question was re-zoned from R4-A to R-5 on August 21, 2023. The underlying zoning for both zoning categories requires a set 7-foot side yard setback. The proposed site plan shows a left-side yard setback of 13 feet and a right-side yard setback of 5 feet. It appears based on the submitted drawings that this has been done to minimize impact to existing mature trees on the left side of the vacant property. Staff would note that a variance would be required to allow for the proposed side-yard setback as drawn. As of the hearing date, no application has yet been filed with the Office of Zoning and Development, who would have purview over the proposed setback variance. The Applicant will clarify if a variance is proposed for the side yard setbacks.

Driveway/Parking Pad

A driveway/parking pad is shown at the rear of the property, which appears to be accessed from the alleyway behind. It is not clear to Staff exactly how this parking area will be accessed as the alleyway does not appear to be open or accessible. The compatibility data submitted by the Applicant shows that concrete is the predominant paving material on the blockface; however, the material for this feature is not noted on the proposed plans. The Applicant will clarify the accessibility of the proposed parking area. The Applicant will clarify the proposed materials for the driveway/parking pad.

Sidewalk

Staff notes that in the photos of the site submitted by the Applicant that there appears to be a sidewalk constructed of hexagonal pavers, which varies in width across the parcel. There is an existing set of concrete stairs set accessing the property. Neither the steps nor sidewalk are shown on the proposed site plan for the project. Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(a) requires, "The original layout, patterns and paving materials of sidewalks, driveways, alleyways, curbs and streets shall be retained. The design and material of new replacement paving materials shall be subject to the compatibility rule." The Applicant will clarify the proposal for the existing historic sidewalk and steps. The Applicant will add the sidewalk and steps to the site plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify if a variance is proposed for the side yard setbacks.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify the accessibility of the proposed parking area.
- 3.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed materials for the driveway/parking pad.
- 4.) The Applicant will clarify the proposal for the existing historic sidewalk and steps.
- 5.) The Applicant will add the sidewalk and steps to the site plan.
- 6.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1144 Merrill Avenue SW

APPLICATION: CA4PH-24-021

MEETING DATE: February 28, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of Merrill Avenue and Cordova Street SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition due to a threat to public health and safety

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: n/a

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

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

Type IV and In-Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a threat to public health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the Application. In this case, the property has gone through the In-Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta's Office of Code Compliance.

An application for a demolition due to a threat to public health and safety (CA4PH-23-037) was heard by the Urban Design Commission at the March 22, 2023, hearing. The application was approved with the following condition:

1. The Applicant shall provide a site plan for the proposed reconstruction.

The Applicant provided the proposed demolition plan, and final approval was delivered by staff on May 25, 2023. Since that time the Applicant has not applied for the necessary demolition permit, and the house has further deteriorated to the point of partial collapse. The City of Atlanta's Office of Code Compliance has moved forward with a proposal for In-Rem demolition. As the demolition of the property has been previously approved, Staff finds that the new application, CA4PH-24-021 is not necessary, as the proposed undertaking has already been approved. As such, staff recommends denial without prejudice to close the unnecessary redundant application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File