



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: Arizona St. Bridge
APPLICATION: RC-24-284
MEETING DATE: May 22, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Arizona St. Bridge Railroad Underpass

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Deaccessioning of Public Art

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

Relevant Code Sections: 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?

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 & Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Application before the Commission at this time for Review and Comment is the deaccessioning of public art, more specifically the Arizona St. Railroad Bridge mural. The Commission is charged in Part 6 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta with providing comments on projects involving capital expenditures by the City or public agencies required to submit permits to the City of Atlanta, as well as for projects occurring on property owned by the City. Given that the property in question is jointly owned or maintained by the City and MARTA, a public agency required to submit permits to the City, Staff finds that this proposal requires a review by the Commission so that their comments can be delivered.

The mural, designed and installed by artist Alex Brewer, has been in place since 2012 and has experienced a high degree of degradation due to vandalism and natural causes since that time. The painting is a part of the Office of Cultural Affairs' "Limited Lifespan Collection" which has a typical expected lifespan of no more than 5 years. Given the costs associated with the restoration of the piece, the decision was made to de-access and replace the murals. Staff would note that, to-date, neither the work done to de-access or replace the murals has been reviewed by the Commission as is required under Part 6 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

However, given the degree of degradation of the original piece and the cost for restoration, Staff would have had no concern with the de-accession of the piece had the correct procedures outlined by the City's Code of Ordinances been followed. Staff would suggest that the new work that was installed in place of the mural be submitted for review by the Commission at a later date.

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

Cc: 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: 875 W Peachtree St.
APPLICATION: RC-24-163
MEETING DATE: May 22, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Academy of Medicine Landmark Building-Site **Other Zoning:** SPI-16

Date of Construction: 1941

Property Location: Southeast corner of Peachtree St. and 7th St.

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Neo-Classical

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Amendment to District regulations.

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

Relevant Code Sections: 6-4043 & Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter of support to the Applicant and the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043 & Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Application before the Commission at this time for Review and Comment is the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) which would sever 215,858 square feet of residential development rights from the sending property at 875 West Peachtree St (Academy of Medicine Landmark Building-Site) Parcel A, to the receiving property at 875 West Peachtree St REAR.

The Applicant has submitted detailed calculations that indicate the sending property holds 215,858 square feet of residential development rights. The proposed transfer would leave the sending property with 0 square feet of residential development rights remaining for future transfers. The site has previously transferred 190,400 square feet of non-residential development rights through applications submitted in 2016 & 2008, and 42,462 square feet of residential development rights in 2015.

Staff would add that the proposed TDR will not result in any physical alteration to the existing building located on the sending property and will decrease the development pressure on the site. Staff finds that the proposed TDR would provide additional benefit to the sending property in that the residential development rights which would otherwise be unused given the limitations regarding development on the sending property would be sold to the receiving property providing income to the sending property and additional density to the receiving property. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed TDR.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the Applicant and the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

Cc: File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 923 Springdale Road NE
APPLICATION: CA2-24-167
MEETING DATE: May 22, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District **Other Zoning:** n/a

Date of Construction: 1918

Property Location: East side of Springdale Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Spanish Colonial Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved plans

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: CA3-23-212 & 213

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

The Applicant is proposing alterations to previously approved plans (CA3-23-212 & 213). These alterations include a pole shed addition to the proposed garage, window replacement on the enclosed porches of the historic house, door replacement, and a change in the scope of the proposed patio. Staff finds that the proposed window replacement will be far more in character with the existing fenestration patterns on the house than the plywood in-fill presently occupying much of the windows. The proposed replacement windows more appropriately match the style of the original windows present on the structure. Staff is in support of the proposed window replacement. Likewise, the proposed doors will be custom to the existing masonry openings and will stylistically match those which existed originally. Staff is not concerned with the proposal. The alterations to the proposed patio do not concern Staff, as it is merely a refinement of the previously approved proposal and does not impact lot coverage. The pole shed extension of the left elevation of the new garage would integrate brick, which was the previously approved foundation material and match the overall style replicating the non-contributing garage, which was demolished. Staff finds that the scale and overall style of this proposed alteration to the previously approved garage meets the requirements of the zoning code. As such, Staff recommends approval of the proposed alterations to the previously approved plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

Doug Young
Interim Director
OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 500 Hopkins
APPLICATION: CA3-24-061
MEETING DATE: May 22nd deferred, April 24, 2024, deferred since March 27, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1912

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The property was approved for an addition and alterations in 2023 from a pre-approval in 2021. In the process of renovation, the Applicant removed the entire front and the house collapsed. This is now considered a new build.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

EDITS IN RED for April 24th
EDITS IN BLUE for May 22nd

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This house was reviewed and approved in 2021 and 2023. Essentially, this is a new build to what was approved in 2021 and 2023.

PLANS

While the setbacks are shown, the lot coverage and FAR are not spelled out. This is especially important to see if the covered parking pad will comply. Staff recommend the Applicant spell out and show FAR and Lot Coverage preferably on the final site plan.

The Applicant has provided a different set of plans. It was advised the Applicant produced a new set of plans so that the new build can be specific to this work. The Applicant has not produced a new set of plans, but instead used the existing plans from 2021 and 2023; keeping language as “existing house to remain” Being that this is a new build, the language such as existing doesn’t need to remain As problematic is some the descriptives relies on what was stated on the prior 2021/2023 approvals such as “the railings will match with old railings.” Wording as this is confusing, this why a new set of plans was requested. There are of this throughout plans. Staff recommend the Applicant produced new plans and clearly identify what is proposed and remove any language that is not pertaining to what will happen on this work.

Additionally, the Applicant has shown the lot coverage and spelled it out and has shown FAR but has not spelled it out. As before, Staff recommend on the final site plan, the Applicant break out FAR especially since there is added space.

Lastly, the Applicant only need to provide the proposed set of elevation not the existing, because it is a new build.

Staff met with the Applicant to go over the expectation of new plans. The following will be a review of the conversation.

Staff notes, the required FAR and Lot Coverage for R4-A. Staff recommends this information be placed on the site plan as well as be met.

ADDITION

The Applicant had proposed an additional 986 sqft of livable space in the basement in 2021 and 2023. This is still the Applicant intentions. As before, Staff are not concerned with this proposal if lot coverage and FAR are met.

The new set of plans indicates the proposed addition has been reduced to 145s.f. Staff is not concerned with the reduction. However, the FAR is still a need to account for the addition. Additionally, since this is a new building, the addition is no longer the new addition, but just a part of the house. It still must be accounted for in the lot coverage and FAR.

The original foundation remained, and the Applicant’s intent is to use the original foundation while adding additional space, so this proposal is for 1,131 sq ft.

Roof

The original roof line on the house was a double gable front and ending gable in the rear with 8/12 pitch. The ridge of the addition tucks under the existing roofline 6 inches. It appears the Applicant plans to implement the same roof form. Staff are not concerned with this proposal as it was approved prior.

The Applicant proposes a double gable with an ending gable roofline in the rear; two dormers one each side of the house. The pitches are 8:12 and 3:12 on the slopes. The proposed roof material is asphalt shingles. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The siding material in the gables is shake or some form of shake. The Applicant is indicating shake shingle for the new build. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant proposes shake shingles. It appears as if the material in the gables might be cedar shingles, which often is mistaken with shake shingles. Staff recommend the Applicant install the cedar shingles to replicate that was there and correct the labeling on elevations.

There were two brick masonry chimneys on the house. The Applicant has indicated the two chimneys will be retained. Staff are not concerned with the proposal. However, recommends, the notation on the new plans read, “new masonry chimneys are proposed” and those new chimneys must be in the location of the previous chimneys. Since the existing chimneys have been removed it will be essential that the contractors understand new chimneys are to be constructed. The notation should help eliminate any confusion in the field.

The Applicant has once again, removed the chimneys from the plans. Staff recommend the Applicant build the chimneys in their original location, the same as the original chimney and note and show these chimneys on the elevations.

Roof Brackets and exposed rafters

In the gables, wood brackets are shown, and the exposed rafters are shown on the plans. This is not problematic for Staff; the brackets were approved in the 2021-2123 plans.

Wood brackets are being proposed on the elevations as before. And the count is correct. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The roof rafters were exposed. The Applicant has also shown this on the plans. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The original siding on the house was wood. The Applicant indicates the siding will be replaced with wood to match with the same reveal. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The demarcation to separate the existing house from the addition is still recommended, however, may be a moot point, since this is now considered a new build.

Demarcation is not needed because of the new build. The Application has indicated horizontal siding as proposed siding material. The siding on the house must be wood to comply with the District regulations. Staff recommend the siding be horizontal wood siding with a reveal to

match the original reveal, which is between 4-6 inches. Staff also recommend the Applicant note this in the legend and on the elevation.

Front Porch

The Applicant proposes porch orientation approved in 2021 and 2023 with the brick columns shall be installed. The porch railings with the two-part construction, no higher than the lower sill of the front window also shall be installed; and what appears to be concrete porch flooring and steps. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The porch is proposed to have brick columns and railings with a two-part construction. From the elevations, Staff cannot determine what material of the porch steps, which does have closed riser and ends. Research shows the steps were concrete. Staff recommend the steps be concrete and the Applicant label this on the elevation. As well, Staff recommend the railing be wood and note this on the elevation.

Staff recommend the porch flooring should be tongue and groove and perpendicular in orientation.

Staff recommend the porch roof be bead board.

Windows

On the front elevation, the Applicant proposes a four-box pattern over one with wood trim. Staff believe this to be double hang. Research shows that windows on the house were the four-box over one, with wood trim. The same research shows, the large middle window on the left side was not this pattern and had a different style and wider trim and a transom window. Staff recommend the Applicant refer to the 2011, photo and replicate that window on the final plans.

The windows on the gable roofs and side elevations are not concerning to Staff.

While the Applicant has noted the trim to be wood, Staff recommend the Applicant also note all windows will be wood. This is important and must be noted on the final elevations.

Front door

As before the original front door configuration had side lights. The Applicant is showing the door with side lights. Additionally, the Applicant shows the door has a rectangular light configuration and has a written note indicating a new wood door. Staff are not concerned about this proposal.

The proposed front door complies with the District regulations with the rectangular light opening. However, the Applicant has not noted what material of the door will be. Staff recommend the door be made of wood and note this on the final elevations.

SITE WORK

Deck

The Applicant proposes a 315-sf deck in the rear of the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

The rear deck is now proposed for 442 sf. And sit directly behind the house. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Sidewalk, Walkway, Driveway, Fence,

The existing sidewalk, walkway, driveway, and fence are still intact, and the Applicant indicated that to retain them as such. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. On the final site plan, the FAR and lot coverage shall be listed per Sec.16-20.009;
2. The siding material in the gables shall be cedar shingle, not shake shingle and the Applicant shall note this on the elevations, per Sec.16-20G.006(2)(d);
3. The Applicant shall install chimneys in the exact locations as the previous chimneys on the original house and note and show this on the elevations, per Sec.16-20G.006(6);
4. The porch railings shall be wood to match the original porch railings, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(9)(d);
5. The porch floor shall be perpendicular orientation and tongue and groove, per Sec.16-20G.006;
6. The porch ceiling shall be board and batten, per Sec.16-20G.006;
7. The siding shall be wood to match the original siding and be horizontal in direction with a reveal to match the original reveal between 4-6 inches and note this on the elevation and legend, per Sec.16-20G.006(2)(d);
8. The middle window on the front façade is not a four square-over one window but has a transom window, the Applicant shall confer to the 2011 with shows the window configuration, replicate the window and show it on the elevation, per Sec.16-20G.006 (3)(c);
9. All trim shall be wood and replicate the trim on the original house, per Sec.16-20G.006(16);
10. The front door shall be wood and noted, on the elevations, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(k);
11. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 15 Skyline Way NE

APPLICATION: CA3-24-136

MEETING DATE: May 22, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District, Subarea 3 **Other Zoning:** I-2/ Beltline

Date of Construction: 2013

Property Location: East side of Skyline Way NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Townhouse

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA3-24-136 15 Skyline Way NE

May 22, 2024

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant proposes two additions to the existing non-contributing property at 15 Skyline Way NE. The first would be an enclosure of the covered entry to add 90 square feet of livable space. Staff has no concerns with the proposed enclosure, which meets the requirements of the zoning code.

The second would be an expansion of an existing rooftop stair access to add 180 square feet of livable space. The rooftop addition would have an open deck atop it accessed by a circular metal stair. Staff finds that the expansion meets the requirements of Sec. 16-20L.008 (8) in terms of height and Sec. 16-20L.008 (22) in regards to alterations to structures which fall under the I-2 zoning classification. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed project.

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
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 664 Gillette Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-144
MEETING DATE: May 22, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Southwestern corner of the intersection of Gillette and Oak Hill Avenues SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 24-CAP00000154

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 22, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant received a stop work order on February 9, 2024, for unpermitted interior, exterior, and site work. The house is located on a corner, and all alterations will be visible from the public right-of-way.

The Applicant proposes to reconstruct the rear wall of the house extending the property slightly, construct a new deck, total window replacement, and other alterations. Staff has several concerns related specifically to the submitted elevations and site plan. In regards to the elevations, it appears several details have been omitted, specifically in relation to the entrances. There are two doors on the street-facing elevation, which are not shown on the existing or proposed elevations. There is also a gabled overhang over a side entrance on the left elevation, which is not shown. The Applicant shall update the existing elevations to accurately depict the existing structure. Further, the site plan only shows the proposed, not existing. The submitted site plan also does not show existing or proposed lot coverage. This is of particular concern because it appears that existing elements, including fencing are being removed, paving is being replaced, and that the property already has a substantial lot coverage. The Applicant must establish that the lot coverage is within the allowable percentage to meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant shall submit an existing and proposed site plan, showing all features, with lot coverage calculated.

Rear Addition

The Applicant has stated that the rear wall of the building must be reconstructed due to structural failure. No evidence has been supplied regarding the need for total reconstruction of the rear wall, versus repair. The Applicant shall supply documentation regarding the need for total reconstruction of the rear wall, including proposed demolition plans. Further, it is not clear to Staff if any other improvements are proposed. This is of particular concern as it appears portions of siding have been replaced. There have also been no materials submitted for the proposed rear elevation reconstruction. The Applicant shall clarify if any additional exterior alterations are proposed. The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be used on the house. The Applicant shall retain the historic chimney and leave the masonry unpainted.

Window Replacement

The Applicant proposes full window replacement on the structure. No evidence has been provided for the need for window replacement. The Applicant shall supply a window schedule, keyed to interior and exterior photos establishing the condition of all windows proposed for replacement.

Deck

There is an existing rear deck which the Applicant proposes to demolish and reconstruct in a different design. While Staff is not concerned with the proposed demolition of the non-historic deck, the proposed deck would be wider than the existing house. Per Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(1) the deck cannot extend past the house. The Applicant shall revise the proposed deck design to sit fully behind the house.

Site Work

There is an existing brick fence atop an original stone retaining wall. It appears that prior to the stop work order one corner of this fence was destroyed. The site plan further suggests that the remainder will be demolished and replaced with a wooden fence, as will the chain link fence enclosing the rear of the property. The retaining wall is original to the property, and the fence, while possibly not original is visible in aerial photography as far back as the 1930s. This feature cannot be removed and replaced. The chain link fence in the rear is non-historic and can be replaced with wood as proposed. No details are given regarding the existing paving. As noted above, Staff has concerns regarding the proposed plan exceeding the allowable lot coverage. There are currently two curb cuts on the property, a 21-foot-wide parking pad on Gillette Avenue and a 12-foot-wide secondary entrance on the Oak Hill Avenue side. While the Applicant is allowed to keep the two entrances to maintain the historic paving configuration, it is not clear if any additional paving is proposed, and if the degree of existing paving means the property is already exceeding allowable lot coverage. The sidewalk is also not accurately depicted. The existing sidewalk on both Oak Hill and Gillette Avenues is hexagonal pavers and must be retained. The Applicant shall update the site plan to accurately depict the sidewalks. The Applicant shall not demolish the historic brick fence. The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work regarding paving.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 26, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant shall update the existing elevations to accurately depict the existing structure.
- 2.) The Applicant shall submit an existing and proposed site plan, showing all features, with lot coverage calculated.
- 3.) The Applicant shall supply documentation regarding the need for total reconstruction of the rear wall, including proposed demolition plans.
- 4.) The Applicant shall clarify if any additional exterior alterations are proposed.
- 5.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be used on the house.
- 6.) The Applicant shall retain the historic chimney and leave the masonry unpainted.
- 7.) The Applicant shall supply a window schedule, keyed to interior and exterior photos establishing the condition of all windows proposed for replacement.
- 8.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed deck design to sit fully behind the house.
- 9.) The Applicant shall update the site plan to accurately depict the sidewalks.
- 10.) The Applicant shall not demolish the historic brick fence.
- 11.) The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work regarding paving.
- 12.) The Applicant shall submit all outstanding materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to their next scheduled hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1233 Oak Street SW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-185

MEETING DATE: May 22, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District/Beltline

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1900

Property Location: North side of Oak Street SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA3-23-013

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 26, 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 applied for a certificate of appropriateness to subdivide the lot in February of 2023 (CA3-23-013), while the application notes that this application is an alteration to the previously approved plan, Staff would note that the previous application was simply for subdivision of the lot, no improvements to the existing structure were proposed.

The Applicant proposes two dormer additions, one to the right and left elevations of the existing structure. A third full height addition is proposed to the rear. These dormer additions would remove the historic masonry chimneys, and install new chimneys covered in siding. The Applicant also proposes complete reconfiguration of windows on the left, right, and rear elevation. Staff has considerable concerns with all proposed alterations. Staff would further note that no specifications have been provided for any proposed materials to be used in the alterations. The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials to be used on the exterior alterations.

Dormer Additions

The Applicant states that they will be adding dormer additions to the left and right elevations. Staff would note that given the proposed degree of alteration, these would not qualify as dormers, and are in reality a complete reframing of the front gabled roof to create a cross gable. The proposed alteration is a major alteration that changes the building form and the historic character of the resource. The dormers would also significantly encompass the existing chimneys, which are further addressed below. Staff cannot support the proposed degree of alteration. Staff would recommend a smaller dormer, with either a shed or gabled roofline that does not engage the existing walls. The Applicant shall reduce the size of the dormers and style to make them subordinate to the historic roof form, not engage with the wall structure, and move them towards the rear to sit entirely behind the historic chimneys.

Rear Addition

There is an existing shed-roofed addition to the rear of the main house. The Applicant proposes to remove the roof of this existing portion of the historic home and add a full second story addition, extending the primary gabled roofline out into a rear dormer. Two windows would be added on the upper level of the proposed addition. The proposed windows are all out of character with the historic structure and should be consistent in style per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(g) "new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors." The large, fixed window and proposed one-over-one windows do not match the historic size or scale of windows. The two rear doors do not appear compatible with the style of the house, though no specifications have been provided, as noted above. The style of the proposed access to the rear door likewise appears to have horizontal railings, which are not compatible with the structure, and should be revised to two-part, butt-joint construction as it comes to the corner of the house and would be visible on the side elevation. There is also a notation about an optional deck; however, none is shown. Overall Staff supports this rear addition, but details need refinement to clarify the scope and appropriateness. The Applicant shall revise the

fenestration on the rear elevations to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(g). The Applicant shall revise the access stair to use railings of two-part, butt-joint construction. The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work in regards to a deck.

Window Reconfiguration

Staff has significant concerns regarding the complete proposed reconfiguration of windows. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(a & b) states, “Architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained. Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed, in whole or in part.” While reconfiguration of windows on side elevations to accommodate bathrooms and kitchens is permitted per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c), this is not in any way the case for the reconfiguration of windows. Only one existing window that is proposed for removal would be located in the proposed kitchen and is not being replaced. The interior is going to be gutted, and completely redesigned with no attempt to retain the exterior conditions and completely removing the historic character and fenestration patterning. Further, Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(j), “new windows or doors added to existing structures shall be located façades that don't face a public street.” Windows also appear to be changing sizes, which is not permitted per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(g). The proposed plan is in no way complying with the ordinance and must be significantly revised to bring it into compliance. The Applicant shall revise the proposed window configuration to retain all existing historic windows on the side elevations and remove any new windows from these elevations.

Chimneys

The Applicant proposes reframing the chimneys within the cross gables and covering them with siding, which is strictly prohibited. As noted above, the proposed dormers must be reduced in size and be placed to the rear of the chimneys. The chimneys themselves must remain intact and note be altered. The Applicant shall not enclose the chimneys in siding nor alter them in any way.

Garage & ADU

The Applicant proposes demolition of an existing garage. The Applicant proposes construction of a new two-story accessory structure with a garage on the ground level and a 250 square foot accessory dwelling unit above. Staff has concerns with the proposed placement of the structure, as it does not appear to meet the setback requirements per Sec. 16-20G.006 (10), which requires accessory structures to be placed within the buildable area of the lot. Further the code requires that the accessory structure be placed in the least visible location behind the principal structure. The driveway would be extended to reach this garage. The proposed driveway plan would likely need to be altered based on the required revision of the placement of the accessory structure. The Applicant shall revise the proposed site plan to place the accessory structure within the buildable area of the lot in the least visible location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the June 26, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:

- 1.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials to be used on the exterior alterations.
- 2.) The Applicant shall reduce the size of the dormers and style to make them subordinate to the historic roof form, not engage with the wall structure, and move them towards the rear to sit entirely behind the historic chimneys.
- 3.) The Applicant shall revise the fenestration on the rear elevations to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(g).
- 4.) The Applicant shall revise the access stair to use railings of two-part, butt-joint construction.
- 5.) The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work in regards to a deck.
- 6.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed window configuration to retain all existing historic windows on the side elevations and remove any new windows from these elevations.
- 7.) The Applicant shall not enclose the chimneys in siding nor alter them in any way.
- 8.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed site plan to place the accessory structure within the buildable area of the lot in the least visible location.
- 9.) The Applicant shall submit revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to their next scheduled hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 175 Huntington Road NE
APPLICATION: RC-24-180
MEETING DATE: November 20, 2023

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: East side of Camden Road NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Linear Ranch House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition of existing structures, New Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Z-23-062

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments at the May 22, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes demolition of the existing ranch house on the property, and subdivision into two lots. The Applicant further proposes construction of two new residences on the subdivided lot which are more in keeping with the historic character of the Brookwood Hills neighborhood. The subdivided lots were rezoned from R-4 to R4-A in February of 2024.

Staff understands that the existing house, a mid-century ranch post-dates the development of the Brookwood Hills neighborhood, the portion of which Huntington Road lies in was developed in approximately 1924. Staff would comment that if the intention of the proposed design is to meet the character of the neighborhood, the proposed design does not at all match the historic character of the neighborhood. The proposed 3-story home, with a full basement, making it almost a complete 4-stories, is a proposed 37 feet in height, a full story taller than any single-family residence present on the street. The proposed architectural style, a Second Empire house with a mansard roof is a style typical of the mid-19th century, corresponding to the era of 1852-1870, a full 70 years before the development of the Brookwood Hills neighborhood. The aesthetics and scale of the proposed structures are entirely inappropriate for the setting, and feel like a random amalgamation of pseudo-historical elements (such as the three-story Palladian window on the side elevation) rather than an attempt to actually match the character of the historic neighborhood, while building at a scale preferred by modern homebuyers, that would not have been present historically. The predominant house designs present in the neighborhood are Tudor Revival, Craftsman, and Colonial Revival and the predominant scale is no more than two stories. Staff recognizes that the elevations show a grade change, which allows for the partially exposed basement, but the presenting street facing façade is still out of scale with the character of the neighborhood. Staff recommends a full redesign to achieve the Applicant's desired goal of matching the historic character of the neighborhood with the proposed new construction.

Staff would have further concerns regarding the proposed floor area ratio, which based on the rezoning would be limited to a maximum of 55%. Given the proposed floorplan it appears that the structures would exceed the allowable FAR. Lot coverage has also not been calculated on the proposed site plan, so Staff is unable to determine if it meet the requirements of the zoning code. Staff does note the proposed size and lot coverage of the structures creates a limited portion of developable land for landscape design, a key element of the historic character of the neighborhood, focusing on sweeping lawns, ornamental plantings, and shade trees. Staff also recommends putting a driveway easement in place to legally acknowledge the proposed, shared drive.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments at the May 22, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1247 Parkland
APPLICATION: RC-24-181
MEETING DATE: May 22nd, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Atlanta Park **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: Unknown

Property Location: Sit between Brookwood and Glenham Ave, SE

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: None

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20.004

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None, known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deliver Comments to the Commission at the meeting.

PROPOSAL

Renovation of Brownwood Park

The proposal for renovation and expansion of Brownwood park are noted in three phases. In the three phases, much of the proposed work is for an expansion of the playground with the existing plastic border to be removed, replacement of the current pavilion and an installation of a fitness area: replacing the existing. The entry of the park will receive a beautification. There is also a proposal to expand the 18-inch height perimeter wall, and to add progressive drainage systems.

Staff deem all the proposed work to be complimentary to the existing park and much needed and there seems to be enough shading, which will be extremely important in the summer months.

Staff add that a cool system such as a sprinkler system for kids would also be a welcoming element and perhaps add an area for ice skating work in winter to allow for an engaging community experience all year.

Staff note that there is no mention of restrooms being installed, which Staff highly recommend restrooms installation for consideration.

Staff note there is no mention of receptacle bins, which will be essential for any park. While these are some suggestions, the expansion set so far is very needed, and the Staff support them.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deliver Comments to the Commission 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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 62 Camden Road
APPLICATION: RC-24-188
MEETING DATE: May 22nd, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Conservation District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1927

Property Location: East of Montclair Drive and West of Wakefield Drive.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Review and Comment on Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: None

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20.004

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None, known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deliver Comments to the Commission at the meeting.

PROPOSAL

The Applicant is proposing upgrade for the existing house by imploring the following:

House

The proposed changes are a new expanded front porch, new half round metal gutters; timber tudoring with brick infill and matching barrel tile to the existing tile; timber rake rafter added; shallow pitch cooper roof next to the new proposed chimney; new brick window and brick stack arch; new leaded awning; new pediment and pilasters; new shutters; new front steps; new iron handrails; remove the existing handrails in the front and extend the existing clay tile roof over the barge rafters. The proposed changes do not affect the Tudor style of the original house, in fact, many of them are routine upgrades that must happen. Staff are not concerned with this front façade proposal.

Site

The Applicant proposes to remove the block wall; remove the existing deck; remove the stone terrace; remove steps; removed the patio in the rear; remove existing driveway; remove the walk in the front and terrace; remove the planter. All of this is done for upgrade to the site. While this is extensive work, as stated most of this is upgraded to update the aesthetics of the house, Staff are not concerned.

Staff comments

Staff are not concerned with the proposed work, as stated, many of the changes are routine, and many are cosmetics that can be changed later in the future. None of the proposals will change the Tudor Style of the house.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deliver Comments to the Commission at the meeting.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File