



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: 1129 Arlington Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA2-24-091
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District/Beltline

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East side of Arlington Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations & Site work subject 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)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 24CAP-00000269

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.

The Applicant received a stop-work order on February 20, 2024, for erection of an unpermitted fence. The Applicant has applied for a certificate of appropriateness for the fence and additional exterior alterations. Staff has significant concerns regarding the scope of work as described and depicted on the plans. The elevations do not show all four elevations, but it appears that siding is being replaced. The elevations that were submitted do not accurately depict the structure. For example, tapered piers are shown, which do not exist on the house. Balustrades are depicted where none exist on the cheek walls. The elevations must be updated to accurately depict all features present and all elevations where work is proposed. The Applicant shall supply updated elevations depicting all elevations and features accurately.

The scope of work is also far too vague. The application suggests that the porch flooring, railings, and porch supports will be “repaired” no evidence for the need for repairs or description of the extent of the proposed repairs have been submitted. The Applicant shall provide existing photographs of all features proposed for repair. The Applicant shall supply a detailed explanation of the scope of proposed work to all porch features. The Applicant shall supply material specifications for all materials proposed to be used for repairs.

Further, siding replacement is proposed, but the existing siding is not accurately described nor depicted. The existing siding appears to be aluminum. The Applicant is proposing that it be replaced with shiplap siding, with no evidence that this existed historically on the structure. There has been no evidence submitting clarifying if historic siding is present under the non-historic aluminum siding, nor if it’s condition warrant replacement. The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work regarding the proposed siding replacement.

Fence & Site Work

The submitted site plan is not acceptable. It is not to scale, nor does it accurately depict the conditions on the lot or calculate lot coverage. In addition, it is not clear what the scope of work in the rear is, the only notation being “existing rear deck wood.” The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work regarding the rear elevation. The Applicant shall submit a site plan showing all four corners of the property and all features present, with impervious lot coverage calculated.

The Applicant has requested that this application be withdrawn. As such Staff recommends denial without prejudice to officially close the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice

- 1.) The Applicant shall supply updated elevations depicting all elevations and features accurately.
- 2.) The Applicant shall provide existing photographs of all features proposed for repair.
- 3.) The Applicant shall supply a detailed explanation of the scope of proposed work to all porch features.

- 4.) The Applicant shall supply material specifications for all materials proposed to be used for repairs.
- 5.) The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work regarding the proposed siding replacement.
- 6.) The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work regarding the rear elevation.
- 7.) The Applicant shall submit a site plan showing all four corners of the property and all features present, with impervious lot coverage calculated.
- 8.) 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: 2763 Baker Ridge Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-24-126
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: Cross section of Baker Ridge and Forrest Ridge Drives

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? NO

Previous Applications/Known Issues: SWO placed 12/26/23 for full renovation taking place without a permit, the basement has been converted into finished space, a second kitchen has been added creating an illegal duplex; building permits, and all trade permits are required.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

PLANS

Being that the basement has been converted to a full living space with an illegal basement , the Applicant will need to provide existing and proposed site plans and elevations, including floor plans. The site plans will need to indicate the lot coverage and FAR. On the proposed plans, the illegal kitchen shall be removed.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The windows appear to have been replaced at some point, however, the style and shape appears to have remained the same as the original windows. The original windows on the house were either metal, aluminum clad or wood. District regulations, states “replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size.” The current windows appear to be vinyl. Staff recommend the Applicant install aluminum clad or wood to comply to the District regulations.

Trim, Gutters and Shingles

The Applicant proposes to paint the wood trim on the house. Staff are not concerned with this long as the non-painted masonry is not painted.

If the Applicant means changing the gutter. That is fine with Staff, gutters are considered routine maintenance repair.

As the gutters, roof replacement for shingles is routine maintenance. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Landscaping

The Applicant only indicates trim scrubs and landscaping. Routine lawncare such as trimming scrubs and cutting grass do not concern Staff. However, a photo also shows that a retaining wall needs repair. The Applicant has not mentioned a retaining wall and Staff is not requiring the Applicant to repair the wall; however, if the Applicant plans to repair the retaining wall it shall be done in-kind to look like the existing wall. This also will need to be placed on the site plan.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. Existing and proposed elevations and floors plans shall be provided. Likewise existing and proposing site plans shall be provided with lot coverage and FAR shown on the site plan reflective of R-4 requirements, per Sec.16-06.008;
2. The illegal second kitchen shall be removed from the proposed elevations and site plan, per Sec.16-06.008;
3. On the existing and proposed site plan the retaining wall must be shown if it is to be repaired in-kind, per Sec.16-20Q.006(17)(a);

CA2-24-126 for 2763 Baker Ridge Drive

May 8, 2024

Page 3 of 3

4. The Applicant shall install aluminum clad or wood windows to comply to the District regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c)
5. Non-painted masonry shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20Q.005(1)(iv)(v) 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: 2693 Washington Street
APPLICATION: CA2-24-142
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: Corner of Ozburn Road and Washington Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? NO

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order placed 11/28/23 for working taking place without a permit; brick has been painted.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions.

SCOPE

The scope of work for this proposal is replacement of windows, replacement of side entry door and painting of unpainted masonry.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The original windows on the house were either aluminum clad or wood. District regulations, states “replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size.” The current replacement windows are one-over-one vinyl. Staff recommend the Applicant install aluminum clad or wood to the District’s regulations.

Side Entry Door

Staff do not have a clear photo of the side door entry, or the replacement side door. As with windows, the District’s regulation states, “replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size.” From the one photo, it appears the Applicant has kept the distinctive screen door which was definitive of houses during this period. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Painted Brick

The Applicant has painted the unpainted masonry (brick siding) which is not permitted. Staff recommend the Applicant remove the paint in a manner that will not be harmful to the brick. Sandblasting is not permitted.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall install aluminum clad or wood to comply to the District regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c)
2. The paint shall be removed in a manner that is not harmful to the brick. Sandblasting is not permitted, per Sec.16-20Q.005(1)(iv)(v) and
3. 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
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: 539 Hopkins Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-053
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Hopkins and Oak Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred March 27 & April 10, 2024.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 12, 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 proposes new construction of a single-family home at 539 Hopkins Street SW. The home would have a hip-on-gable roof, and the exterior would have CMU foundation and be clad in wooden siding.

Site Plan

Staff has several concerns with the site plan as proposed. The driveway, located on the Oak Street SW side of the property is proposed as 14 feet in width. Per. Sec. 16-20G.006 (12) (c), “New driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet not including the flare at the street.” The Applicant will reduce the width of the driveway to no more than 10 feet, exclusive of the flair. It is not clear if there is any existing sidewalk, or if installation of side walk is proposed. There is existing chain link fencing and a low brick wall present on the property. It is not clear if these are proposed to remain or be removed based on the site plan. The site plan shows overall lot coverage; however, given the change in driveway square footage that needs to occur, the lot coverage will be recalculated, and enumerated based on feature. The Applicant will submit an updated site plan with the lot coverage enumerated. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to the existing features on the lot. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to sidewalks. **The Applicant has addressed all issues and updated the site plan accordingly.**

Height & Massing

The overall height of the structure must be reduced. The compatibility data submitted by the Applicant shows that the tallest contributing structure on the blockface is 24.5 feet in height. The proposed structure would be 28.5 feet. The Applicant will reduce the proposed overall height to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant also shows a full width porch. None of the contributing structures on the block face has a full width porch. In terms of the massing the predominant form is gable-on-hip, but this is achieved with an L-shaped gable projection, rather than presenting as a front gable as proposed. The massing must be reconfigured to more closely match the historic housing stock, with a partial width porch and appropriate massing. The Applicant will revise the design to utilize a partial width porch. The Applicant will revise the massing of the structure to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant has also proposed that a dormer be added on the right elevation facing Oak Street SW. The Applicant will revise the dormer to be located on the left elevation, where least visible. **The Applicant has updated the design to address the partial width porch and the moved the dormer to the left elevation. While the Applicant has not elevated to utilize the L-shaped front gable projection, the revised design is more compatible with the existing historic housing stock and Staff is not concerned with the revised design. Staff does note in the updated design that the fenestration patterning on the left elevation does include significantly less windows than are on the right elevation. For consistency Staff recommends the addition of at least two windows to ensure compatibility with the existing housing stock. As the portion of the elevation which is without fenestration is two bedrooms, the addition of windows is not a**

challenge. The Applicant will add additional windows to the left elevation to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(h).

Further, no material specifications have been provided for any of the materials to be used. The Applicant will submit material specification for all exterior features so Staff may determine if the proposal meets the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant has submitted material specifications for all materials to be used and Staff finds they meet the requirements of the zoning code. The two materials with which Staff remains concerned are the porch features. The Applicant will install balustrades of two-part, butt-joint construction, no taller than the bottom of the window sills, a plane extension may be added to meet code. The Applicant will utilize tongue-in-groove porch flooring, installed perpendicular to the facade.

No New Materials Have been Submitted Regarding this Application, Staff Recommends further Deferral.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until June 12, 2024.

- 1.) The Applicant will add additional windows to the left elevation to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(h).
- 2.) The Applicant will install balustrades of two-part, butt-joint construction, no taller than the bottom of the window sills, a plane extension may be added to meet code.
- 3.) The Applicant will utilize tongue-in-groove porch flooring, installed perpendicular to the facade.
- 4.) 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: 566 Hamilton E. Holmes
APPLICATION: CA3-24-082
MEETING DATE: April 24, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: Northeast of Baker Ridge Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Demolition was granted for the existing house due to extensive damage. The house was built in 1941.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

COMPATIBILITY RULE

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

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

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

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

COMPATIBILITY COMPARISONS

The Compatibility comparison sent is not correct. Comparable houses shall be gathered from the blockface that runs between Oldknow Road and Baker Ridge. This will be a total of 5 properties. The ones shown in red will be omitted from the review.

602 Hamilton
596 Hamilton
592 Hamilton
588 Hamilton
582 Hamilton
576 Hamilton
595 Hamilton
601 Hamilton
566 Hamilton

PLANS

On the site plan, the Applicant has provided the lot coverage and setback has not provided FAR. The setbacks and lot coverage complies. FAR is still needed. Staff recommend the FAR be provided.

On the site plan, the "proposed front porch" needs to be labelled "proposed stoop" so not to confuse anyone in the field.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct an 828 sqft house on a crawl space and stoop, this will be like the demolished house that was there prior.

Setbacks

The Applicant proposes to use the same setbacks as the prior house: 35 feet at the front setback, both sides at 7 feet and the rear at 15 feet. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Height

The proposed height is 15 ft for the new construction. Staff are not concerned with this proposal, the predominate height on the blockface is 15ft.

Roof Type and Pitch

While the Applicant has used the compatibility analysis for the new construction, the Applicant is building the roof and pitch back to original house, which was a side gable with a small gable over the stoop and 8/12 pitch and a non-original addition with a side gable roof with an 8/12 pitch. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The proposed windows will be 2-over-2 with no specification of material. The compatibility analysis indicates the predominate windows are to have a 6 lites pattern and wood. Staff recommend the Applicant install windows that adhere to the compatibility which will be wood and have a 6 lites pattern.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to install cementitious siding. Siding material is governed by the compatibility standard. The predominate siding on the block face is vinyl siding. Staff recommend the siding be vinyl to comply. However, Staff would not be opposed to smooth-faced cementitious siding with a reveal between 4-to 6 inches.

Door

The Applicant proposes as door with a four panel lites. No material is specified. District regulations state, "doors shall be compatible with the architectural style of the house or be subject to the compatibility rule" Staff recommend the Applicant select a door that would be reflective of the period of the development which would have been 50's and 60's.

Foundation:

The proposed foundation will be concrete with a stucco finish. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

SITE WORK

Fence

The Applicant has proposed a fence in the rear and side yard. However, has not provided any specifications. Fences shall not exceed six feet in height and can be made of metal chain link, metal picket, or wood picket. By no means can a fence be built between the principal structure and street.

Walkway

The proposed walkway is not problematic to Staff.

Deck

The 241 sqft deck will be in the rear of the property and will not extend beyond the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. FAR shall be provided on the final site plan, per Sec.16-06A.008(5)(b)(2);
2. On the site plan, the “proposed front porch” shall be labelled “proposed stoop” so not to confuse anyone in the field per Sec.16-20Q.006;
3. The windows shall be wood with 6 lites pattern, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c);
4. The siding shall be vinyl to comply. However, Staff would not be opposed to smooth-faced cementitious siding with a reveal between 4-to 6 inches, per Sec.16-20Q.006(1)(h);
5. Applicant shall select a door that would be reflective of the period of the development which would have been 50’s and 60’s.per,Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(d);
6. Fences shall not exceed six feet in height and can be made of metal chain link, metal picket, or wood picket. By no means can a fence be built between the principal structure and street, per Sec.16-20Q.006(16)(a)(b) and
7. 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: 1177 Lucile Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-24-093
MEETING DATE: April 10, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Westend Historic District **Other Zoning:** R4-A

Date of Construction: 1966

Property Location: East of Holderness Street and West of Lawton Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance Request

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Unauthorized painting of brick foundation, unauthorized signage, unauthorized and non-compliant mailbox; two front decks.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial

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

VARIANCE REQUEST: To allow the paint to remain on brick foundation.

VARIANCE QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. What are the extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the piece of property?

The Applicant reply, “The exceptional condition is that the building structure is too heavy to compromise the foundation.”

2. Application of the Zoning Ordinance creates an unnecessary hardship?

The Applicant states, “The hardships will be that the foundation will become unable to support the weight if the process of the paint removal is executed.”

3. What peculiar conditions pertain to this property?

The Applicant did not answer.

4. If granted how would this not cause substantial detriment to the public good or the intent of the Zoning Ordinance?

Applicant answers, “The paint is a professional grade and color enhances the building and surrounding view.”

STAFF RESPONSE:

The Applicant has not provided information to support the variance proposal allowing the paint to remain on the foundation. One, the Applicant has not answer one of the questions. This is required to consider the variance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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: 1197 Avon Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-24-119
MEETING DATE: April 24, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1905

Property Location: Corner of Oakland Drive and Avon Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Special Exception for increasing fence /wall height.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20M; Sec.16-28.008(5)(e)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial

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

SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUEST: The installation of a 6ft wrought iron fence on the right side when only a 4 ft fence or wall is permitted; the installation of a new 4ft wrought iron fence on top of a 2ft stone retaining wall in the front yard, when only a 4ft fence/retaining wall is permitted of the front yard and half depth yard.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Such a wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining properties and is not incompatible with the character of the neighborhood.
2. Such greater height is justified by requirements for security of persons or property in the area.
3. Such greater height is justified for topographic reasons; or
4. Such greater height, in the yard or yards involved, is not incompatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Applicant writes:

“The Installation of a new 4’ high wrought iron fence on top of an existing 2’ high stone (retaining) wall in front yard to total 6’ high (finished height) wrought iron fence on left and right elevation. The wrought iron fence and gates will replace the existing 5’ 10” chain-link fence and existing gates in the same location. (Drawing provided) The 6 ft. fence is necessary for the safety and integrity of the property. The wrought iron fence and gates will provide security and also is a part of the overall improvement of the property (functional and aesthetics) to the benefit of the community. It is not opaque and therefore will not duly prevent the passage of light and air to adjoining properties. It is not incompatible with the character of the neighborhood, as several other homes, including one that is adjacent to the property. This property is the Madea House, now named Thee Historic House on Avon, is a circa 1900 Victorian era home that features 13 rooms, 8 original fireplaces, hardwood floors, stained-glass windows, a wrap-around porch and copper-colored turret. The “Madea House” was used for filming iconic movies by Tyler Perry. It is seen as a “landmark” or historic destination by several commercial websites and as a top search response on google. It is also a “stop” on a tour conducted by unrelated third parties. As a result, countless people access the property to try to look inside the windows, sit on the porch and take pictures. It is an additional safety risk as some people knock on the door and have tried to gain access to the house.”

Staff Assessment:

While Staff appreciate the Applicant understanding the value of this house, Staff believe the Applicant has not provided any evidence that there is a safety risk to justify not complying with the District regulations regarding fence construction.

It might be an irritant to have people stop by and take photos, fame can do that, there is no real evidence that anyone has caused bodily harm here or any potential of harm. Also, if the existing fences can’t keep people

CA3-24-119 for 1197 Avon Avenue

April 24, 2024

Page 3 of 3

off the property, there is no evidence to suggest 2 additional fts will do so. Maybe a sign that states this isn't Madea house, but a private home, will stop some of this; or perhaps the tour guide can tell tourists they are not permitted to access the property; locks on the existing fences or the 4ft fence could also stop the foot traffic.

Either way, Staff feel there may be other ways to deter the annoyance, but the Applicant has not proven a security risk is here at present.

Staff would not support the Special Exception.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2534 Santa Barbara Drive NW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-128

MEETING DATE: May 8, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20Q Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: South side of Santa Barbara Drive NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Compact Ranch

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 24CAP-00000074

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 12, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order, 24CAP-00000074, on January 22, 2024, for unpermitted enclosure of a carport, a porch addition, window replacement, door replacement, and painting of unpainted brick.

Carport Enclosure

Per Sec. 16-20Q.006 (11) (d), “Existing attached garages or carports may be fully enclosed into conditioned space provided the original character defining features visible from the public street are retained and are identifiable.” The carport enclosure, as-is, does not retain any semblance of the original carport dimensions and has been completed as to suggest that the front façade has always been a continuous plane, and the decorative open brick wall on the right side completely removed. This is of major concern to Staff. The carport portion of the façade must be clearly delineated with trim to frame and highlight this portion of the façade to comply with Sec. 16-20Q.006 (11) (d). The Applicant shall re-frame the exterior of the carport enclosure, adding trim to clearly delineate the portion of the front façade which was enclosed and an open decorative brick wall to the right-side elevation to match the one which was destroyed. The Applicant shall provide updated plans showing this restoration of the features which were removed.

Porch Addition

A front-gabled porch has been added to the façade, with square wooden supports. This porch addition is completely inappropriate for the housing style and must be removed. Sec. 16-20Q.006 (10)(d) requires, “Porches or stoops shall be a part of new principal structures or additions based on the compatibility rule and if present the front or side façade shall contain railings and decorative features consistent with the architectural style of the principal structure or shall be subject to the compatibility rule.” This porch is Craftsman in style and completely changes the character of the structure. This house did not originally have a porch and was not designed with a façade to incorporate one. The Applicant shall remove the unpermitted porch addition, including the new concrete pad beneath.

Window Replacement

The Applicant has undertaken full window replacement on the house with one-over-one vinyl windows, including several windows, which appear to be sliding style. Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c) requires, “If original or historic windows or exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated, replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size.” The original windows present on the structure were wood-framed, two-over-two horizontal in design. One window, on the street-facing façade, to the right of the front door was originally full-length. All windows must be restored to their original size, style, and materials. Staff is not concerned with the one window which was added on the enclosed carport addition, but it also must be replaced to comply with Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c). It is not clear from the submitted

materials which windows are proposed, as both Fibrex and vinyl windows were shared. Neither of these meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant shall provide specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c). The Applicant shall provide a window schedule which clearly delaminates the location, size, and manufacturers specifications for all windows which will be replaced, illustrating they comply with Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).

Door Replacement

All doors on the structure have been replaced with non-compliant materials. The front door is fiberglass and Craftsman-style, a design and material which do not meet the requirements of the code. The rear doors appear to be gliding patio doors, but given the massive amount of literature not keyed to any plans, it is not clear to Staff which materials were used. The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door. The Applicant shall provide specifications for the front door. The Applicant shall provide photographs of the rear elevation and clarify which doors have been replaced and with which materials.

Siding Replacement

It appears that full siding replacement has occurred on the structure. It is not clear to Staff what materials have been used, and Staff is unable to determine whether these materials meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to siding replacement.

Painted Brick

The historically unpainted brick has been painted, with the exception of the brick wall on the right elevation which was removed. The Applicant shall remove the paint from all masonry surfaces using the gentlest methods possible.

Site Work

The porch addition added a raised concrete step outside the front which previously did not exist, removing a simple step and brick cheek wall. The Applicant shall remove this stoop, along with the unpermitted porch ,and restore the original steps and cheek walls.

Staff finds that the driveway has also been repaved, while this driveway widens into a larger area, Staff finds that this is the historic pavement configuration which was present on the lot and is not concerned with its retention.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until June 12, 2024, to allow the Applicant to Address the Following:

- 1.) The Applicant shall re-frame the exterior of the carport enclosure, adding trim to clearly delineate the portion of the front façade which was enclosed and an open decorative brick wall to the right-side elevation to match the one which was destroyed.
- 2.) The Applicant shall provide updated plans showing this restoration of the features which were removed.
- 3.) The Applicant shall provide specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).
- 4.) The Applicant shall provide a window schedule which clearly delaminates the location, size, and manufacturers specifications for all windows which will be replaced, illustrating they comply with Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).
- 5.) The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door.
- 6.) The Applicant shall provide photographs of the rear elevation and clarify which doors have been replaced and with which materials.
- 7.) The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door.
- 8.) The Applicant shall provide specifications for the front door.
- 9.) The Applicant shall provide photographs of the rear elevation and clarify which doors have been replaced and with which materials.
- 10.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to siding replacement.
- 11.) The Applicant shall remove the paint from all masonry surfaces using the gentlest methods possible.
- 12.) The Applicant shall remove this stoop, along with the unpermitted porch ,and restore the original steps and cheek walls.
- 13.) The Applicant shall provide all outstanding materials to Staff eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File