



# 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:** March 13, 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)?:** Yes, deferred February 28, 2024.

**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. This railing was added in 2012 following removal of the original masonry balustrade. Staff is not concerned with the removal of the non-compliant railing; however, it must be restored to its original design with a decorative brick pattern and a concrete cap. The existing front-facing balustrade is a front-nailed deck railing, above the original masonry railing, which would be removed. Staff wants to ensure that the proposed masonry replacement 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 replace the masonry railing on the left elevation of the porch using brick and concrete, which matches the style of the existing on the house.

### **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, the age of this addition is unknown; upon completion of a site visit Staff has determined

that given that this addition is post-construction, but not recently built, there is no way to determine if it predates the district regulations or not. Given that the addition is not visible from the public right-of-way, Staff finds that no further documentation is required regarding the addition.

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

- 1.) . The Applicant will replace the masonry railing on the left elevation of the porch using brick and concrete which matches the style of the existing on the house.
- 2.) The Applicant will submit specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).
- 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 182 Elizabeth Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-24-038  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1903

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Additional Revisions

**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:** This is revision to a previously approved plans form 10/21.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

## **REVISIONS**

### ***Added Rear Columns Structure***

In the rear of the property, the Applicant has changed the columns' structure, allowing for a completed and full appearance. This is not problematic for Staff; all is happening in the rear of the property.

### ***New Rear Hip Roof***

The Applicant proposes a rear hip roofline to replace the seamed roof plan. Staff are not concerned about the proposed roof; it attaches to the existing roofline in a meaningful manner, and it is in the rear of the property.

### ***Basement Plan***

The Applicant proposes lattice at the basement level that will be attached to the footers. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

### ***Screened Deck***

The Applicant proposes to screen in the entire rear deck in oppose to screening in a small section. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: 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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1021 Spark Street SW

**APPLICATION:** CA2-24-039

**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1950

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

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** No Academic Style

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Site work related to a stop-work order

**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:** Yes, 23CAP-00001739

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

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order on November 27, 2023, for exceeding the scope of work on their building permit. There has been a new driveway and fence installed without proper permitting. This application is intended to bring the property into compliance.

### **Driveway**

The driveway which was installed exceeds the allowable dimension per the zoning code, extending up to 18 feet in width. Sec. 16-20M.012 (4) (a) requires, "Off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard or half-depth front yard," the current driveway terminates in a turnaround just past the front façade of the house. The driveway must extend a minimum of 20 feet past the front face of the house. While the site plan shows the driveway extending past the front façade, the site plan does not appear to accurately depict its length. Further, Sec. 16-20M.012 (4) (c) requires, "If constructed, independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare." The Applicant will supply an updated site plan with a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance. The Applicant will install a driveway that is no more than 10 feet in width exclusive of the flare at the street and extending a minimum of 20 feet past the front façade of the house to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.012 (4).

### **Fence**

A six-foot privacy fence has been installed starting at the front façade and extending along the property line towards the street. Sec. 16-20M.013 (1)(1) requires, "Fences not exceeding four feet in height may be erected in the front yard or half-depth front yard." The Applicant will remove all portions of the six-foot fence location before the front façade.

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

- 1.) The Applicant will supply an updated site plan with a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance.
- 2.) The Applicant will install a driveway that is no more than 10 feet in width exclusive of the flare at the street and extending a minimum of 20 feet past the front façade of the house to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.012 (4).
- 3.) The Applicant will remove all portions of the six-foot fence location before the front façade.
- 4.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 540 Langhorn Street SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-350

**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 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, and February 28, 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 some of the outstanding conditions (those highlighted below) have not been addressed. No material specifications have been supplied to Staff for any proposed repairs or replacements, and simply noting they will be repaired in-kind is not sufficient. The Applicant has exceeded the maximum allowable deferrals permitted and was granted an additional deferral by the Commission with the understanding that no further deferrals would be permitted. The Commission placed clear expectations as to the level of documentation needed. Revised plans were submitted to Staff on March 5, 2024; however, Staff still feels that the comments and conditions have been addressed, with the exception of supplying the cross-section drawing specifically requested by the Commission.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with 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 reveal 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.
- 13.) The Applicant will revise the site plan to show all features present on the lot. The Applicant has satisfied this condition.
- 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.

- 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  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 712 Pearce Street SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-23-388  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 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, and February 28, 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. 16-20I 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. **In the most recent set of plans the Applicant has revised the foundation to be coated with stucco. This would not meet the compatibility rule, the foundation must be brick.**

### **Exterior Cladding**

The Applicant proposes smooth face cementitious siding with a 6-inch reveal. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. **The Applicant has submitted proposed wood patterned cementitious siding. The code requires it be smooth faced. The Applicant will revise the proposed cladding material to be smooth-faced cementitious siding.**

### **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. **The Applicant has revised the fenestration patterning,**

### **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. **The dormers have been greatly reduced in size.**

### **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. This issue has been resolved.**

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: Approval with the following conditions:**

- 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. **New data has been submitted.**
- 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). **The overall design has been reduced in scale to be more compatible with the surrounding historic structures.**
- 5.) **The Applicant will revise the proposed cladding material to be smooth-faced cementitious siding.**
- 6.) **The Applicant will utilize tongue-ingroove porch flooring installed perpendicular to the face. The Applicant has submitted proposed decking, Staff would note that while this is acceptable in the rear of the house, the front porch must use tongue-in-groove flooring.**
- 7.) The Applicant will utilize two-part, butt-jointed construction for all railing.
- 8.) The Applicant will revise the proposed porch design to meet the compatibility rule. **The design has been revised.**
- 9.) The Applicant will revise the proposed window style to meet the compatibility rule. **The design has been revised.**
- 10.) **The Applicant will submit specifications for all exterior materials to be utilized, including the windows and doors. The window specifications give no details, a full specifications must be provided. As noted above neither the foundation materials nor the proposed siding meet the regulations.**
- 11.) The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration patterning on the left and right elevations. **This issue has not been addressed.**
- 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. **The scale of the dormers has been revised.**
- 13.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed setback and illustrate how it meets the compatibility rule. **This issue has been addressed.**
- 14.) The Applicant will revise the proposed driveway design to ensure that they are not exceeding allowable lot coverage. **Lot coverage has been added to the site plan and overall impermeable coverage reduced.**
- 15.) The Applicant will submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Janide Prince  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Doug Young  
Interim-Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 876 Lullwater Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-041  
**MEETING DATE:** October 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1929

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations to main and carriage house

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None, known.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

## **MAINHOUSE**

### ***Addition***

At the rear and the rear corner of the existing house there is a non-contributing terrace, the Applicant proposes to remove it and to construct a 484-sf two-story addition for added living space and interior configuration.

In addition, the existing attic space is proposed for a 745 sf build out. All located under the flat part of the existing roof.

### **Roofline**

The new roofline for the addition will continue the hip formation and have a 7/12 pitch to align with the existing 7/12 pitch on the house with shingles as the roof material.

### **Siding**

The proposed siding will be cementitious with 1x6 board and brick veneer to match the existing on the house.

### **Skylight**

The Applicant proposes to install a skylight at the top of the existing house, which will limited visibly from the public right away and one custom steel frame skylight in the rear.

### **Flue**

The Applicant proposes a flue with cementitious siding and battens.

### **Window boxes**

Window boxes are proposed for the rear for decorative appeal.

The proposed added space, new roofline and skylights, flue and window boxes, are not problematic for Staff. The addition is not destroying any historical elements and if removed in the future, “the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

### ***Windows and Door***

At the rear of the house and side elevation, the part of the existing bay, 10 windows and French door will be removed allowing for the addition. The Applicant proposes new wood casement windows, new wood double hung windows with SDL muntin and one window with brick detail that matches at the front elevation. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

## **CARRIAGE HOUSE**

The proposed changes to the non-historic carriage house align with the District requirements. The roofline and windows will match what is on and proposed for the main house. The continuous veneer siding is consistent with the existing siding. The house fixtures are no problem with Staff and the reorientation of the staircase is not problematic.

## **SITE WORK**

Staff are not concerned with the proposed sitework. The proposed built-in grill and walkway will not be seen because it is between the existing house and carriage house.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

CA3-24-061 for 876 Lullwater Drive  
March 13, 2024  
Page 3 of 3

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams- Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 3042 West Peek  
**APPLICATION:** CA4PH-24-023  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024 deferred since February 28, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1954

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

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

**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:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Denial

## **PROPOSAL**

The Applicant seek to demolish the house at 3042 West Peek due to the threat Public Health in Historic Collier Heights.

## **CRITERIA FOR THREATS TO PUBLIC HEALTH.**

To prove the existence of a threat to public health and safety, the applicant must establish, and the commission must find, the following:

- Demonstrate through independent analyses and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists.

The Applicant writes, **“The house is structurally damaged, and unsafe for habitation as supported by the attached engineer’s report. “At the time of the assessment, the existing framing members of the structure displayed evidence of damage and loss of structural integrity throughout the home. In addition, the existing foundation wall displayed evidence of cracks and separation, damage, water intrusion, possible mold growth, and bowing from possible hydrostatic pressure. Furthermore, the existing flooring, exterior walls, doors, and windows were missing and easily accessible throughout the structure.” Per the report, “In my opinion, the structure has experienced a loss of structural integrity, and poses a risk to public safety.” City of Atlanta Department of Planning and Community Development, APD Code Enforcement Section has posted a placard stating, “This property has been inspected and conditions have been found which are unsafe or unsanitary and which are in violation of the Atlanta Housing Code.**

- Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives; and

The Applicant writes, **“Per the engineer’s report, “In my opinion, to correct the structure, it is recommended to hire a qualified professional to properly redesign the existing structure to meet the requirements of the City of Atlanta’s minimum Building Code. This may require a redesign of the existing framing members, foundation, and applicable structural components. Additional mold remediation and waterproofing measures may be required. Blocking off access to the structure should be considered. In my opinion, the existing structure does not meet the City of Atlanta’s minimum Building Code and requirements.” Due to the extent of damage, this solution is equivalent to demolishing the property and rebuilding.”**

- Demonstrate that the costs associated with rectifying the threat would create a condition whereby the investments in the project are incapable of earning a reasonable economic return as described in subsection (d)(2)b below.

The Applicant writes, **“The Conservation Fund is aware of the landmark designation in the Collier Heights Historic Site, which is why this application is being made before they close on this property.**

**The current owner, Willy and Family Real Estate, LLC received the property via a \$10 Quit Claim Deed in April 18, 2023, from Srebro Real Estate, LLC. Srebro Real Estate LLC has worked with Willy and Family Real Estate, LLC as partners in real estate projects, but no longer wanted to be involved in this particular property.**

**Residential Home did not generate income. The maintenance costs are estimated to have been about \$300 a month to pay property taxes, and any upkeep required.**

**There is no outstanding mortgage on the property.**

**Real Estate Taxes: 2023 Fulton County \$916.58 Atlanta \$3,230.84 2022 Fulton County \$918.61 Atlanta \$3,180.20 2021 Fulton County \$556.76 Atlanta \$1,807.42 2020 Fulton County \$595.03 Atlanta \$1,846.13 Assessed Valuations: 2023 Assessed Value \$101,280 2022 Assessed Value \$101,280.**

**The appraisal is attached, and the house is appraised at \$230,000.**

**June 23, 2009 designated Collier Heights Historic Site. Fair Market Value in 2008 \$100,700. Fair Market Value Assessed in 2023 is \$230,000 (based on appraisal) to \$253,200 (from FMLS Record).**

**Residential Home owned by Willy & Family Real Estate LLC, a for-profit corporation.**

**No Tax Returns relating to the property.**

**Willy and Family Real Estate LLC has never used a broker or firm in real estate projects, but can't speak to the developers that owned the property before him. Once Ms. Geneva Evans passed away and her relatives finally decided to sell the property (in 2021), the property has changed hands four times, essentially being sold from developer to developer. Each developer determines they can't/don't want to take on the expense of rehabbing the house within the historic district guidelines, so they end up selling it. They end up selling the property for a reasonable enough rate that it sells, but not reasonable enough to afford someone the opportunity to finance the rehab of the structure.**

**Can't sell low enough to afford the opportunity to rehab the property according to historic district guideline.**

**Willy & Family Real Estate LLC has not advertised the sale of the property.**

- *Unreasonable economic return:* To prove the existence of a condition of unreasonable economic return, the applicant must establish, and the commission must find, both of the following:

**The Applicant writes, "Per the report from Knoble Engineering, "In my opinion, the structure has experienced a loss of structural integrity, and poses a risk to public safety."**

**The proposal for demolition is \$52,865.**

**The estimated market value of the property in its current condition is about \$230. And if renovated at high cost, the estimated value might be \$250 - \$300,000. If demolished the lot may be worth \$50,000, but as a park for the community would give back in other ways.**

**The estimates to rehabilitate / rebuild this property make it too expensive for most people to take on, without much return.**

**Not feasible to build around the existing building on residential lot.**

**This property does not seem to qualify for any Economic Incentives**

### **Staff Comments**

Staff agrees with the Applicant that the house, is not safe to reside in at this moment and should be boarded not to allow for public access. The wear on the house has created an atmosphere that makes the house a threat to the public. Staff do not believe the level of deterioration merits demolition. The Applicant has not shown any financial evidence of the cost of repairing the structural problems. Although, there is evidence showing the cost of demolition of the property and rebuilding.

The Applicant has not shown that all efforts have been made to retain an historic property, which is always the first concern for Historic Preservation. It appears, the emphasis is most people could not take on the cost of retaining the house. However, there is no real evidence of that cost, and it is presumptuous to know what everyone would do . Staff realize this is not an easy task but must be the charge and certainly there could be someone willing to take on restoring a historic house. The Applicant focus it seem is to create a park. Parks are great resources; however, the house sits in a historic district and the objective is to retain as many historic structures as possible. While a park is certainly nice is not the prime objective of historic preservation.

Lastly, Staff believes the house in the shape it is in now, hold much of it value at \$230,000. So, if rehab, that value could increase. Photos seem to indicate this property is viable.

Staff cannot support the proposal for demolition.

**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: Denial for demolition**





# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 65 Rogers St NE  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-032  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Northeast corner block-face of Rogers Street NE and Hosea L. Williams Drive NE intersection

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Community schoolyard

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Proposed additions to schoolyard at Fred A. Toomer Elementary School that include ADA accessibility

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

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

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

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

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

RC-24-032 for 65 Rogers Street NE  
March 13, 2024  
Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant proposes to add recreational spaces in the existing schoolyard at Fred A. Toomer Elementary School. Plans include the construction of a shade structure measuring 18 feet by 24 feet, a boulder embankment slide, a music station, and a concrete gathering area with seating. ADA accessibility would include the construction of an 18-inch retaining wall that would allow access to the concrete gathering area from the sidewalk. The existing playground area will also be surrounded by a concrete perimeter curb that is 6 inches wide.

Staff supports the proposed additions to the Fred A. Toomer Elementary School schoolyard. Staff is, however, concerned that the documents that have been submitted do not provide sufficient information regarding plans for ADA accessibility. Staff would suggest that the Applicant discuss their plans for ADA accessibility with HP Studio Staff, and/or submit plans specifying what areas of ADA accessibility will be included in the proposed site plan.

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

Cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1904 Tremont Dr NW  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-033  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Southeast block-face intersection of Tremont Drive NW and Dixie Hills Circle NW.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Community playground

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Current playground structures to be removed and replaced with new playground structures that accommodate for ADA accessibility

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

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

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

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

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

RC-24-033 for 1904 Tremont Drive NW  
March 13, 2024  
Page 2 of 2

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

Under the Moving Atlanta Forward Infrastructure Bond, the Applicant proposes to remove existing playground structures at the Tremont Playlot and replace them with new playground structures that will accommodate ADA accessibility.

Staff generally supports replacing existing playground structures with new structures that are more accessible in accordance with ADA standards. However, Staff finds that the current documents omit key information that Staff would expect to be included in the review process, such as a site plan, a plan showing the existing conditions of the site, and a detailed plan of the parking area and entrance area. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide these documents as they are required for permitting the proposal and need to be stamped by HP Studio Staff to confirm that the Commission has reviewed the proposal.

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

Cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2930 (2922) Forrest Hills Drive SW  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-042  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A **Other Zoning:** I-1

**Date of Construction:** 2006

**Property Location:** East block-face of Forrest Hills Drive SW, south block-face of Old Hapeville Road SW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** City of Atlanta Public School

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Proposed addition to the southwest corner of the existing building, repurposing a portion of the building's interior, adjustments to parking area

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The existing structure was built in 2006, the previous building structure was built in 1958

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

RC-24-042 for 2930 (2922) Forrest Hills Drive SW  
March 13, 2024  
Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant proposes the Henry Louis "Hank" Aaron New Beginnings Academy school cafeteria to occupy space in the existing building, adjacent to the school's kitchen. The Applicant also proposes an addition to the southwest corner of the existing building. This would house a gymnasium, additional classrooms, a production stage, and changing facilities. By adding new space, existing functions replaced by the school cafeteria in the existing building will be reorganized into the proposed addition. To accommodate the increased square footage and program additions, the existing parking lot and loading area will be modified and expanded.

Staff notes that the applicant prioritized pedestrian infrastructure well, as pedestrian entrances and exits can be clearly seen on the site plan. Also, Staff notes the use of green infrastructure and additional parking areas, rather than a total net increase in parking. Staff believes that this proposal would be suitable for use in a public high school. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

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

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 104 Trinity Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-090  
**MEETING DATE:** March 13, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A

**Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 1)

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** southeast corner of Trinity Ave and Central Ave.

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

The Applicant proposes a new multi-family structure with ground floor mixed use at the corner of Trinity Ave and Central Ave. In general, Staff is supportive of this type of project, but finds that the design proposed by the Applicant could be greatly improved with a few minor changes and the use of a traditional building composition, including a base, a shaft, and a cap, would unify the overall design without impacting the overall projects functionality or layout. Staff finds that the resulting project would contribute positively toward the urban design and fabric of the Downtown area.

First, Staff is concerned regarding the amount of “pedestrian height” blank wall space along the Trinity Ave façade. The first floor plans show a retail space with frontage along Trinity Ave. that could accommodate the use of clerestory windows to break up the blank wall space and improve the pedestrian experience. While Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that portions of the Trinity Ave sidewalk level façade will be unexcavated, so it would not be possible to add fenestration along this entire area. Still, Staff finds that the inclusion of fenestration into the retail space would improve the overall experience for pedestrians.

Second, on the Central Ave. façade, Staff recommends that the material color used for the base of the building be added to the second-floor façade to match the Trinity Ave. façade. This would unify the two facades and create more cohesion in the design of the building’s “base.”

Third, Staff is concerned regarding the mix of material colors and textures on both the Trinity Ave. and Central Ave facades. Staff finds that a simplified palate of material colors and textures would allow for the facades to read as a single building rather than multiple distinct buildings. Staff would suggest that the Applicant consider reducing the façade palate to no more than 3 color/texture materials. Staff would also suggest that accents be provided in a horizontal orientation to emphasize the linear massing of the building along the streetscape.

Lastly, Staff finds that the proposed building cap consists of approximately 4 or 5 distinct cornice lines and designs. As the portion of the parapet wall over the Trinity Ave. and Central Ave. “corner” of the building has the most traditional composition, Staff would suggest that it be used across both street facing façades of the building.

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

Cc: Applicant  
File