



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: 822 Lullwater
APPLICATION: CA2-24-193
MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: West of Lullwater Parkway and East of E. Ponce de Leon

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No, none known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval

CA3-24-069 for 103 Pearl Street
April 10, 2024
Page 2 of 2

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

SCOPE OF WORK

The Applicant proposes to install three new windows on the front façade that will match in-kind the existing windows in size, shape, location, and appearance. Leaning on the District Regulations, “where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, texture, and, where possible, materials,” Staff are not concerned with the 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: 474 Sinclair Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-117
MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location: North side of Sinclair Avenue NE.

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. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred April 24 & May 22, 2024

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 23CAP-00001606

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant received a stop-work order, 23CAP-00001606, on November 20, 2023, for unpermitted alterations and site work. The alterations included full siding replacement and replacement of siding with shingle, new doors, the addition of faux stacked stone around the entrance and porch foundation, construction of a fence and trash can enclosure, addition of extensive gravel, removal of the front walkway, a retaining wall, addition of new concrete walkways, a rear parking pad, and a front fence.

At the time of the inspection for the stop-work order additional issues beyond exterior changes were noted including the presence of an additional (sixth) unit, and interior alterations which may have increased the degree of non-conformity. Both the existing non-conformity, and increase in non-conformity must be addressed to be in adherence with the zoning code. While this nonconformity is outside the purview of the Urban Design Commission, these inconsistencies which are tied to the stop work order, must be addressed with the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The Applicant shall confer and provide evidence of communication with the Office of Zoning and Development to resolve the issue of nonconformity.

Siding Replacement

There has been total siding replacement on the house with cementitious siding. The previous cladding was vinyl, no evidence has been supplied as to whether or not earlier wooden siding was present underneath this non-historic vinyl. Staff does note; however, that the gable was most definitely horizontal siding, and has been replaced with shingle. The Applicant shall restore the street-facing gable to horizontal lap siding.

Door Replacement

The Applicant has replaced both front doors present on the structure. No specification have been provided for these replacement features. Based on photographs alone, these doors do not appear to meet the regulations. Staff would further note that the previous doors, which were removed without proper permitting were solid six-panel doors. Sec. 16-20L.006 (q)(v)(1) requires, "exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame." Given that the replacement was not authorized, the previous conditions would need to be restored to come into compliance. The Applicant shall install doors which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20L.006 (q)(v)(1) and match those removed without proper permitting. Further the proposal is to remove the unpermitted stacked stone and separate the doors with siding. This does not repair the unpermitted work to the previous conditions, with the doors in a double frame. The Applicant shall restore the previous door configuration, including replication of the historic trim profile.

Window Replacement

At the time of the stop-work order it was noted that windows had been replaced on the structure.

Though this work is not included in the scope submitted by the Applicant, Staff must ensure all alterations are properly documented and meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant shall clarify the extent of window replacement through submission of photographs and a window schedule, as well as specifications for all windows which were replaced.

Site Work

The Applicant in their application materials has agreed to come into compliance in terms of restoring the front walkway, removal of the front fence, a significant reduction of the amount of gravel on the site, and reduction of the front parking pad created by gravel. The trash enclosures, and new horizontal fencing has not been addressed, and Staff would like clarification if new fencing is proposed as this is unclear on the proposed site plan. The Applicant shall clarify if any additional fencing is proposed. The existing conditions (77%) of lot coverage far exceed the allowable lot coverage of 55% allowed by the zoning code. While the proposed site plan shows a significant reduction to 65.7% lot coverage, it is still exceeding the allowable coverage. The Applicant has not sufficiently established that there was an existing non-conformity in terms of lot coverage present on the lot prior to the unpermitted alterations, which absolutely increased the degree of non-conformity. Therefore, the new features, specifically the large rear parking pad consisting of 1,960 square feet of concrete (49 x 40) and 808.5 square feet of gravel to access the pad, still exceeding allowable lot coverage by 881.9 square feet. The Applicant has stated that they wish to retain all new features they installed as shown on the proposed site plan. Given that the property is still exceeding the allowable lot coverage, a variance to the code would be required to retain the existing features. The Applicant shall confer and provide evidence of communication with the Office of Zoning and Development to resolve the issue of exceeding allowable lot coverage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions

- 1.) The Applicant shall confer and provide evidence of communication with the Office of Zoning and Development to resolve the issue of nonconformity.
- 2.) The Applicant shall restore the street-facing gable to horizontal lap siding.
- 3.) The Applicant shall restore the previous door configuration, including replication of the historic trim profile.
- 4.) The Applicant shall clarify the extent of window replacement through submission of photographs and a window schedule, as well as specifications for all windows which were replaced.
- 5.) The Applicant shall clarify if any additional fencing is proposed.
- 6.) The Applicant shall confer and provide evidence of communication with the Office of Zoning and Development to resolve the issue of exceeding allowable lot coverage.
- 7.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the proposed project.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CA3-24-117 474 Sinclair Avenue NE

June 26, 2024

Page 4 of 4



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: June 24, 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: 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 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.

New plans have been submitted. Staff still has concerns over the following items:

- Windows, right elevation. The plans show that three original windows will change in style, type, and placement. Windows on the existing rear portion of the elevation also must remain. The notes on the plans contradict this. Further the two new windows that are proposed on the dormer do not match the original style (diamond patterned over one). The plans also note that all new windows will be one-over-one. All these inconsistencies must be corrected, and specifications provided for the proposed new windows.
- Butt joint construction of all railings must be noted on the plans (currently just notes material P.T. for pressure treated wood)
- Staff finds that the items in **red below have already been satisfied**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 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 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

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: 345 Kendricks Street
APPLICATION: CA3-24-245
MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1938

Property Location: Corner of Kendrick Street and Grant Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No, none known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval

SCOPE OF WORK

ADDITION

With the removal of an existing rear porch, the Applicant proposes 466 S.F. addition for added space in the interior.

Roofing

The roof and framing will be replaced with a larger gable framing to accommodate the changes and install asphalt shingles.

Windows

In removing the rear porch, the Applicant proposes to remove the existing 6 over 6 window and one single window and replace them with double 6 over 6 windows double hung windows to match the existing windows on the house.

The proposed addition is not problematic for Staff. All the proposed changes are in line with the District regulations.

ALTERATIONS

Roofing

The continuum of the replacement of the roof and reframing is manifested on the left elevation. This roof and reframing will not displace the overall roofing.

Windows

In addition to the addition's windows, the Applicant proposes to change windows for a new window grouping on the left elevation and right elevations, installing 6 over 6 double hung windows that will match the existing.

Siding

On the right elevation, the existing siding will be replaced with cementitious siding and painted.

Front Entry

The Applicant proposes to extend the front gable entry to a 12/12 pitch.

Shutters

On the front elevation, the Applicant proposes to add shutters.

The proposed alterations are not problematic for Staff. All the proposed changes are in line with the District regulations.

CA3-24-245 for 345 Kendricks Street
June 26, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

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: 141 Pearl Street SE

APPLICATION: CA3-24-253

MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20A, SA3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1991

Property Location: West side of Pearl Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: variance to reduce the north side yard setback from 6 feet (required) to 0 feet proposed, to permit a rear deck that is wider than the existing principal structure, and to permit a poured concrete driveway that does not consist of two tire track ribbons as required by the District regulations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00000489 & 23CAP-00001049, CA2S-23-266, CA2-23-325

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

The Applicant received a stop work order 23CAP-00000489 on May 13, 2023, this case was closed when they found that the features were previously existing. A second stop-work order 23CAP-00001049 was issued when the work was determined to have not been properly permitted. Application CA2-23-325 was submitted to remedy the lack of proper permitting. The application was approved with conditions on October 25, 2023; however, since that time final approval has not been issued by Staff. The Applicant has decided that they prefer to submit a variance application to not be required to comply with the conditions set on the previous application.

Variance CA3-24-253

The Applicant requests a variance to:

- reduce the north side yard setback from 6 feet (required) to 0 feet proposed,
- to permit a rear deck that is wider than the existing principal structure,
- to permit a poured concrete driveway that does not consist of two tire track ribbons as required by the District zoning regulations;

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography;

The Applicant cites the topography of the lot which slopes upward as a limiting factor for the extension of the deck, the presence of a mature tree (located in the rear of the property), safety concerns over the destabilization of materials on the driveway.

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship;

The Applicant cites the existing topography, which limits the placement of an extension of the deck, existence of a mature tree at the rear of the lot, and safety concerns over instability of materials at the reduction of the driveway width as unnecessary hardships. The Applicant further cites the fact that a building permit was approved for this property.

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

The Applicant cites the approval of a previous building permit, topography, the as-built conditions, as well as safety concerns over destabilization of the driveway as issue particular to the piece of property.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that the project will not negatively impact the public good or impair the purposes or intent of the zoning ordinance, as the features are already existing and cannot be seen from the street. Further the Applicant states that retention of the existing drive would increase safety for the resident of the property and their visitors.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request does not meet the criteria for granting a variance.

- The argument for a reduction in the side yard setback has not been established by the Applicant's responses. Their responses lean heavily on the previous approval of the building inspection and on the topography of the lot. The Applicant acknowledges that the hot tub may be moved to the main portion of the deck (which meets the requirements of the zoning code in terms of setbacks and alignment behind the existing house). As such, Staff does not find that the other cited issues, including the mature tree are relevant, as the existing conditions may be easily brought into compliance. A compelling argument has not been made for the retention of the existing deck, which requires a setback reduction.
- The argument to allow a fence that is wider than the house has not been established. The visibility of the deck is not a relevant concern, as in the Cabbagetown Landmark District all elevations are reviewable by the zoning code, regardless of visibility. Further, as noted above the deck on which the hot tub sits, which is on the property line is a separate and distinct deck, a secondary feature. It is a major concern as it not only extends beyond the house, but to the property line occupying the entire setback. The argument regarding topography is also not relevant, as the Applicant has successfully constructed a full, separate, separate from this secondary hot tub deck, which is functional and meets the requirements of the zoning code. The secondary deck must be removed to bring the property into compliance. There are no factors limiting the moving of the hot tub to the primary deck which is in compliance with the zoning code, as such, Staff recommends denial of the variance.
- The third variance request is requesting relief from the requirements that the drive be paved strips with a planting strip. This was not the requirement that was placed on the previous application CA2-23-266, which stated, *"The Applicant has repaved a drive that was previously paved with a planting strip with solid concrete. As previously noted the site plan submitted does not show the dimensions of this driveway, but Staff can see that the drive as constructed does not appear to extend 20 feet past the front facade of the structure and appears to exceed 10 feet in width. Sec. 16-20A.006 (19)(f) requires, "The driveway of a lot used for residential purposes shall extend at least 20 feet behind the front facade of the house." The Applicant will submit a proposal to bring the driveway into compliance."* The Applicant was required to bring the driveway into compliance with the zoning code, not restore it to its previous appearance. Sec. 16-20A.006 (19)(f) requires, "The driveway of a lot used for residential purposes shall extend at least 20 feet behind the front facade of the house." Further, Sec. 16-20A.006 (19)(j) states, "Mesh paver blocks (including the installation of durable ground cover plantings), **poured concrete**, concrete pavers, decorative stone or brick are permitted paving materials for driveways and surface parking. Asphalt is not permitted." To bring the driveway into compliance it must be reduced to a width of 10 feet, and the length extended by 11 feet (to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20A.006 (19)(f) which requires the drive to extend 20 feet past the front facade). There is no requirement that the design of the drive be changed to concrete strips. Further Staff would not that the proposal is to remove concrete and infill with gravel, this design should be changed to turf/grass, as gravel, and impervious surface would extend the width

of the drive to the same proportions and create a two-surface parking pad. No evidence has been submitted supporting the Applicant's argument that adjusting the width of the driveway would destabilize the existing materials. Further no evidence has been submitted that bringing the driveway into compliance would cause unsafe conditions, as is stated in the Applicant's responses. There is no requirements that the drive be paved strips, or that the Applicant has supplied compelling evidence why the requirements of the zoning code cannot be met. As such, Staff does not support the proposed 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: 880 Springdale Road

APPLICATION: CA3-24-255

MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1915

Property Location: Northeast of BriarCliff

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior, Alterations, site work and accessory structure alterations.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No, none known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval

LAND DEVELOPMENT

All the proposed work the Applicant has stated, the lot coverage remains below the required lot coverage of 35 percent at 28 percent. Staff is satisfied with the land development proposal.

SCOPE OF WORK

Enclosure

Front Façade (powder room)

On the front façade on the left corner, the side porch is screened. The Applicant proposes to remove the screen and install double hung wood windows with muntins and 6-inch wood mullions. The proposed windows will match the existing windows on the existing house. The door is proposed as wood with transom with a side rear entry. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

Additions

Room (cloakroom)

The Applicant seeks to add space and proposes to add a closet by the existing porch on the left corner. This proposed addition will continue the brick matching the existing brick, tying the roofline into the existing roofline. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Screened rear porch.

The Applicant proposes a new screened porch with a fireplace at the rear of the property. The columns will match the existing brick columns. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Window

The Applicant proposes a small wood window at the upper rear elevation. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Garage

The garage is proposed to be divided internally to allow for desired use. In conducting the interior work, the Applicant proposes to add a rear exterior stair and gable dormer and roof; add a grouping of small wood windows; extend the porch over 4ft; a pair of barn doors that were on the porch and repair the wood siding. Leaning on the District regulation which states, “new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment,” Staff are not concerned with the proposal. Additionally, the accessory structure remains secondary to the original house.

Site Work

The proposed site work is installation of a picket metal fence along the sides of the front yard, 6 feet in height to meet the existing 6 ft wood fence along the sides of the house. Staff is not concerned with the proposed fence.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

880 Springdale
June 26, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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: 557 West End Place SW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-260

MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District/Beltline

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Northwestern corner of the intersection of West End Place and Eggleston Street SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Gabled-El Cottage

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the July 24, 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 a second story addition to the rear elevation of the house, it would create a full secondary roof plane, hipped, with an 8/12 pitch. The Applicant also proposes moving the location, and replacement of the front door, full window replacement, and extensive window reconfiguration. Staff would not that this property is on a corner lot, and as such all four sides of the property are visible from the public right of way. Staff has significant concerns with the proposal as presented, which are outlined below.

Addition

The proposed addition would be placed above an existing rear shed roof portion of the house. It would completely encompass an existing gabled projection that is a distinctive element of the New South Cottage. The proposed rear hip addition would not only remove this distinctive element, but also create a secondary roofline visible from all directions. Staff finds that the removal of this rear gabled dormer would remove significant and character defining element of the structure. The design of the proposed addition must be modified to retain the rear gable and place it behind the existing roofline to minimize the appearance of a secondary separate roofline. The Applicant has also submitted no materials proposed for use on the addition. The Applicant shall revise the design of the proposed addition to retain the distinctive rear gable and sit behind the existing roofline. The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be used on the rear addition.

Door Placement & Replacement

The Applicant proposes moving the location of the front door. No reason is given for the need for this modification, but the code is clear, Sec. 16-20G.006 (3) (b), states, "Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed, in whole or in part." The Applicant shall keep the front door in the existing location. The Applicant further proposes replacement of the front door, while no further details have been outlined in the application, Staff notes from publicly available photography of the house that the door is not original and is not concerned with its replacement. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c) requires, "Replacement 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 Applicant shall replace the front door with materials which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).

Window Replacement & Reconfiguration

The Applicant propose total window replacement on the structure. No evidence has been submitted for the need for replacement. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(a) states, "Architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained." The Applicant shall submit photos of the interior and exterior of all windows proposed for replacement, keyed to a window schedule establishing the need for replacement. Further, the Applicant shows total reconfiguration of the windows on the left elevation facing Eggleston Place SW. Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(j) states, "New windows or doors added to existing structures shall be located façades that don't face a

public street.” While the reconfiguration of windows on side elevations is permitted to accommodate bathrooms and kitchens, that is not the intent of this reconfiguration. The Applicant shall retain the existing window configuration on the left elevation.

Site Plan

The submitted site plans are also of significant concern. The scale (1 in = 10 ft) makes the dimensions of the lot 37 Ft in width x 67 feet in length, for a total of 2,479 square feet. The city’s records list the property as having a width of 55 feet x 100 feet in depth. The lot coverage is listed on both the existing and proposed site plans as 3,046 square feet, which both makes the lot coverage greater than the total lot size (as shown) and further shows no change is show in coverage, even though presumably the driveway will be removed (based on the proposed plan). Further, not all features are shown on the plan, for example a shed is visible on the property and included in the lot coverage, but not shown on the plan. There are numerous issues with the existing and proposed site plan. The Applicant will submit an updated site plan, to scale, with all features present or proposed on the lot shown and lot coverage calculated.

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

- 1.) The Applicant shall revise the design of the proposed addition to retain the distinctive rear gable and sit behind the existing roofline.
- 2.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be used on the rear addition.
- 3.) The Applicant shall keep the front door in the exiting location.
- 4.) The Applicant shall replace the front door with materials which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c).
- 5.) The Applicant shall retain the existing window configuration on the left elevation.
- 6.) The Applicant will submit an updated site plan, to scale, with all features present or proposed on the lot shown and lot coverage calculated.
- 7.) 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: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 995 Oakland Drive SW

APPLICATION: CA4PH-24-244

MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1935

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Oakland Drive and Plaza Avenue SW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

Type IV and In-Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a threat to public health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the Application. In this case, the property has gone through the In-Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta's Office of Code Compliance. Notices were sent via registered mail to the owner (s) on record June 30, 2023, regarding the public hearing that was held on July 27, 2023. At the July 27, 2023, hearing, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property 6-0. The property owner did appear at the hearing. Since that time, the property owner, Rolf Barker, has applied for a certificate of appropriateness, CA2-23-343, for retroactive approval of window replacement. This application was approved with conditions on October 25, 2023. Staff issued final approval of the plans on October 30, 2023. It does not appear that the Applicant ever proceeded with obtaining a building permit for the window replacement; however, Staff would note that attempts were made to secure and improve the property, even after the approval of the demolition by the In-Rem Board in July.

The Applicant is not the owner of the property, and the In-Rem process does not allow for the City or a third-party, to repair, renovate, or sell the property. Staff finds that the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values do not apply in In-Rem cases where the City is the Applicant but can be useful for informational purposes. Staff finds that the most relevant questions in In-Rem cases are as follows:

- **Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists;** and, While the Applicant did not specifically answer this question, they have provided documentation regarding their analysis of the property. The inspection of the property noted that the cost to repair the structure would be \$59,767 and the value of the home based on Tax records was \$51,600.

- **Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.** The Applicant has not directly addressed this question in their application. The Applicant has illustrated that the owner was present at the In-Rem demolition hearing. Further, as Staff noted above, the Applicant has since applied for a certificate of appropriateness to remedy and close the property. While this does not constitute a full undertaking to rectify the deterioration, as a building permit was not obtained, the approval was retroactive, and attempts have been made by the property owner to secure the house.

Photographs and Documentation

Photographs of the property indicate an advanced state of deterioration on the interior, including collapse of some interior flooring into the crawl space due to water damage from roof leaks. These photos also show a high level of overgrowth surrounding the structure. The Applicant has also submitted a great deal of documentation regarding the presence of building materials which

contain asbestos, and the need for remediation, which Staff does not find relevant to the proposed demolition. Though deterioration of interior features is extensive, overall Staff finds that the house is not open to the elements except in the case of a few broken panes of glass and possible water damage due to failing roofing. The openings can be secured without full demolition.

Staff Findings

Staff finds that the evidence presented is not sufficient to support a demolition due to a threat to public health and safety. Demolishing a historic house should be the absolute last course of action; however, the deterioration on the interior does warrant securing the property against the elements to prevent further deterioration. Further, the overgrowth on the property is likely promoting further moisture retention and other damage. Given that the property owner has applied for a certificate of appropriateness since the time the demolition was approved by the In-Rem board last summer, this illustrates attempts to improve conditions and bring the structure into a state of good repair. Given the property owner's attempts, even though not fully completed. Staff feels that there is a compelling argument to retain the structure and allow the owner to complete repairs as proposed. As such, Staff finds that the house does not pose a significant threat to public health and safety and recommends denial of the proposal to demolish, to allow the property owner the opportunity to continue with repairs and securing of the structure.

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: 1701 & 1707 Metropolitan Pkwy
APPLICATION: RC-24-327
MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: MRC-3-C

Date of Construction: 1966

Property Location: Northwest corner of Metropolitan Pkwy and Casplan St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

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 CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments.

RC-24-327
June 26, 2024
Page 2 of 2

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 project involves the demolition of two buildings for a planned future expansion of the bus facilities adjacent to the site. Staff has no concerns with the project as currently proposed, but would suggest that any future development adhere to urban design best-practices, such as avoiding parking or fencing between a building and any public right of way.

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

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2852 Cascade Road SW

APPLICATION: RC-24-245

MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Sec. 16-20

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: circa 1979 (park)

Property Location: South side of Cascade Road SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm delivery of comments at the June 26, 2024 hearing of the Urban Design Committee

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 improvements to the existing park infrastructure at the Cascade Nature Preserve. These improvements would increase accessibility, safety for navigating trails, as well as add viewing spots and amenities for visitors. The improvements include:

- Installation of new trash receptacles and benches
- Trail improvements
- Adding steps to portions of the trail, these steps would be stone slab and match the existing trail materials in-kind
- Addition of an overlook landing
- Addition of boulder retaining wall around existing trail nodes

Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed improvements. The improvements would increase accessibility and functionality of the existing space, while making the improvements in a thoughtful way. Staff encourages the use of sympathetic materials in the improvements which are outlined, but for which materials are not given (stone, benches, trash receptacles) to create a cohesive and consistent design for the space, melding the improvements with the existing aesthetics of the preserve.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the June 26, 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: 49 Huntington
APPLICATION: RC-24-246
MEETING DATE: June 26, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1999

Property Location: West of Woodcrest and East of Peachtree Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Comment on Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Send a letter with comments from Commission to the Applicant.

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.

SCOPE OF WORK

The Applicant proposes window alterations on the left side elevation and rear elevations.

Left Elevation

On the left side elevation, the Applicant proposes to remove the bay window with the patch brick as well as remove the double six-over-six double hung window. The proposed window for the bay window are two round windows and a new casement window and headers for the six- over six double hung window.

Rear Elevation

On the rear, the Applicant proposes to remove the two 9-over-9 over windows and replace with a new triple window and header and sill to match.

Staff have no concern with the proposed work listed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments from Commission to the Applicant.

Rc-24-246 49 Huntington

June 26, 2024

Page 3 of 3

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File