



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 617 Terrace Avenue NE  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-24-298  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Candler Park District

**Other Zoning:** SPI-7, Subarea 2A

**Date of Construction:** 1930's

**Property Location:** East block-face of Terrace Avenue NE, south of intersection of Terrace Avenue NE and Clifton Terrace NE

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Early 20<sup>th</sup> century two-story Bungalow

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** The proposal includes the replacement of a portion of the existing driveway, the construction of an accessory structure/garage, the addition of a new patio and outdoor kitchen, the extension of the roof line to include the new patio area, and the addition of new stone steps leading up to the front door

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-18G.

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-18G. of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

The proposal includes the replacement of a portion of the existing driveway, the construction of an accessory structure/garage, the addition of a new patio and outdoor kitchen, the extension of the roof line to include the new patio area, and the replacement of new stone steps leading up to the front door.

Several components of the project have been proposed as in-kind, including the replacement of the existing driveway, the extension of the roof line, and the replacement of the existing stone steps leading to the front door. Accordingly, Staff has no concerns about these components.

Total land area of the lot is approximately 13,016 square feet, with an existing lot coverage of 5,089 square feet (39.10%). There is an increase in the proposed lot coverage by 1,332 square feet, totaling 6,421 square feet, or 49.33%, which is compliant.

In accordance with *Sec. 16-18G.008.(2)*, “Garages, when detached from the main residential structure, shall be located to the rear of the main structure within the buildable area of the lot and, on corner lots, shall be subject to side yard setbacks.” The construction of the new accessory structure/garage and the addition of the new patio and outdoor kitchen are all located at the rear of the main structure and remain within the buildable area of the lot.

As such, Staff does not have any concerns regarding this component, nor does Staff have any concerns regarding the project as a whole.

**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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2925 Lakewood Avenue SW  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-306  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Northeast corner block-face at the intersection of Brewer Boulevard SW and Lakewood Avenue SW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Demolition of existing public school building that is no longer in active use, and site modifications including improvements to sidewalks, paving, and curbing

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

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

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

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

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

RC-24-306 for 2925 Lakewood Avenue SW  
July 24, 2024  
Page 2 of 2

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

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

Cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 539 Hopkins Street SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-053

**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** n/a

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

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** n/a

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, deferred March 27, April 10, May8, and June 12, 2024.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Denial without Prejudice

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a single-family home at 539 Hopkins Street SW. The home would have a hip-on-gable roof, and the exterior would have CMU foundation and be clad in wooden siding.

### **Site Plan**

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

### **Height & Massing**

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

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

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

**No New Materials Have been Submitted Regarding this Application the Applicant has expressed their desire to legally close the application through a ruling of denial without prejudice.**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice**

- 1.) The Applicant will add additional windows to the left elevation to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(h).
- 2.) The Applicant will install balustrades of two-part, butt-joint construction, no taller than the bottom of the window sills, a plane extension may be added to meet code.
- 3.) The Applicant will utilize tongue-in-groove porch flooring, installed perpendicular to the facade.
- 4.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner  
  
DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2534 Santa Barbara Drive NW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-128 (addition/alterations) & CA3-24-302 (financial hardship)  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** HC-20Q Collier Heights Historic District      **Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** South side of Santa Barbara Drive NW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Compact Ranch

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Financial Hardship Exemption

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, CA3-24-128 deferred May 8, 2024

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

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



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

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

**CA3-24-128 (Approval of an unpermitted addition and alterations)**

**Financial Hardship Exemption**

Given the extensive nature of the required alterations to come into compliance on the property, the Applicant has elected to apply for a financial hardship exemption as outlined in Sec. 16-20Q.005 (5) of the zoning code.

**(b) In order to qualify for a financial hardship exemption, the applicant(s) must first make a showing that the alteration(s) requested is necessary in order to continue utilizing the structure for its intended purposes.**

The property is not the Applicant's primary residence, but rather a rental property used for supplemental income. In this case the intended purpose is a rental property used for income, and consideration given to if compliance would require the structure to no longer be usable for that purpose. Staff has included the conditions for approval of CA3-24-128. Exterior alterations, including window replacement, door replacement, detail framing and reconstruction of the brick curtain wall around the carport, and paint removal from the brick all could be accomplished with the house still functioning as an active rental property. Due to the degree of alteration required to remove the new porch, which was added, which would open the roof, this appears to be the only alteration which would render the structure unable to be used for habitation while it occurred.

- 1.) The Applicant shall re-frame the exterior of the carport enclosure, adding trim to clearly delineate the portion of the front façade which was enclosed and an open decorative brick wall to the right-side elevation to match the one which was destroyed.
- 2.) ~~The Applicant shall provide updated plans showing this restoration of the features which were removed.~~
- 3.) The Applicant shall provide specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).
- 4.) The Applicant shall provide a window schedule which clearly delineates the location, size, and manufacturers specifications for all windows which will be replaced, illustrating they comply with Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).
- 5.) The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door.
- 7.) The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door.
- 8.) The Applicant shall provide specifications for the front door.
- 10.) ~~The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to siding replacement.~~

~~11.) The Applicant shall remove the paint from all masonry surfaces using the gentlest methods possible.~~

~~12.) The Applicant shall remove this stoop, along with the unpermitted porch, and restore the original steps and cheek walls.~~

**(c) The burden of proof that the regulations pose such a hardship shall be on the property owner. If the commission finds that the requirement of subsection (5) herein is satisfied, they may grant an exemption, in whole or in part, only in accordance with the following factors, standards and criteria:**

**i. The present and future income of the property owner(s) and those occupying the property;**

The Applicant has submitted data for 2024 (current) and projected income (2025) with the caveat that the property owner's company is going through a major restructuring, and future employment is not guaranteed due to this restructuring. It is not clear if the submitted data is just for the property owner (Jonathan D. Flig) or for his spouse as well. Staff notes that his spouse Kali B. Gatlin is listed on the tax forms for the property, which were submitted as part of the application package. Further the submitted household expenses are all for a family of 3, presumable Mr. Flig, his spouse, and a dependent child. As such, data for her income should be included to provide a clear picture of the true financial state, particularly as she is included in the calculation of taxes on the property

The data submitted shows a current income of \$181,300, and household expenses of \$176,182, for a remaining net of \$5,118. It is not fully clear from this if the expenses for the property, including the mortgage payment are part of this calculation. The current income of the property is \$19,200, with annual expenses in 2023 totaling \$29,042, indicating that the property is operating at a \$ 9,842 loss. It is not clear, however, if this loss is accounted for in the financials provided by Mr. Flig.

**ii. The availability, at present or in the future, of other sources of income or revenue, including loans, grants, and tax abatements;**

No data has been provided as evidence of availability of additional sources of income or revenue.

**iii. The costs associated with adherence to the district regulations;**

The overall estimate for compliance provided is listed as \$111, 063, but Staff has significant questions as to how this quote was arrived at based on the submitted materials.

The data here is currently incomplete. Mr. Flig has included emails indicating that he has reached out to various contractors requesting estimates. The only items of compliance which are fully covered by the submitted materials are the removal of the porch and bringing the windows into compliance.

The roofing quotes are of concern to Staff as it appears that all of the quotes are for full roofing replacement, not just the removal of the porch. While Staff understands that removal will require reconstruction of the front portion of the roof plane, the quotes also must accurately depict only

those portions of the project which are directly impacted by the zoning code to accurately reflect the cost of compliance. Likewise, the estimates which include full gutter replacement may not be accurately reflecting the required work. The three quotes provided range from \$7,370-\$10,588.

There was one estimate submitted for bringing the windows into compliance. The estimate is not entirely clear as it lists two separate numbers, \$26,908 and \$35,405 and there is no indication as to which of these numbers is being used for calculation.

There is a third estimate for \$24,340 for siding, door, and window replacement, which Staff is confused by as none of the information seems to match the requirements placed by CA3-24-128.

Staff is extremely concerned that the estimates acquired are not actually for the work that would be required to come into compliance with the zoning doe. Only the window estimate from Anderson appears to actually match a required element of approval, and even that is limited because it only quotes the amount for two-over-two horizontal double-hung windows, the full length window on the front elevation which was removed has not been accounted for. Staff feels that the estimates provided do not accurately capture the cost associated with compliance. There are items included which are not required, which may be inflating the estimated costs, and other items which would not be compliant with the zoning code, which should not even be included.

Specific quotes were required for:

- Window replacement
- Door replacement
- Porch removal
- Paint removal from brick
- Delineation of the carport
- Siding quotes have been included, but no clarification on the actual scope of siding replacement has been clarified

**iv. The degree of existing architectural importance and integrity of the structure; and**

Prior to the alterations undertaken in 2018, the structure had a high degree of integrity, retaining its original layout, roof profile, siding, windows, doors, and carport with brick curtain wall. The only prior alterations appeared to be widening of the driveway with a side parking pad along a portion of it. The alterations have greatly impacted the architectural integrity of the structure, removing many of the distinctive mid-20<sup>th</sup> century elements from the structure and adding non-conforming elements. In addition, reconfiguring the street-facing façade, including removal and changing of the size of windows, and addition of a porch where none existed historically. While some of the alterations, such as the enclosure of the carport would have been permitted by the zoning code, they were not undertaken in a compliant manner.

Based on the submitted materials Staff feels that the Applicant has submitted a compelling argument for the hardship created by the need to come into compliance. The extreme length of time (6 years) between the work, which received building permits, if not a certificate of appropriateness, and was fully inspected and the issuance of the correction notice is out of the ordinary. While Staff feels that updated, more detailed quotes are needed, Staff feels that bringing the structure into partial compliance would ameliorate the impact of the items which are outside the scope of the zoning code.

In examining the submitted quotes, it appears that the two most expensive items would be the removal of the porch, reconstruction of the brick curtain wall, and siding. The brick curtain wall would not provide any structural support to the carport, and would be freestanding, given this reconstruction of the feature would likely cause more deterioration of the siding and not provide a true interpretation of the original structure. Given that a metal overhang was present previously, Staff would be in support of simply modifying the porch to make it more compatible with the historic character. Staff recommends painting of the siding in the gable and supports to a uniform color, to make it less prominent and contrasting with the façade. The brick cheek wall appears to have been painted red prior to the work completed in 2018, given the length of time the feature has been painted, Staff is in support of the masonry being allowed to remain.

Staff would be in support of a partial financial hardship exemption, which would require compliance on the following items:

- Restoring the original window style on the front and side elevations to the original size, shape, material, and configuration. The new window, which was added on the carport enclosure may remain and be updated to match the other window in style (two-over-two horizontal, double-hung window).
- Replace the front door with one which matches the historic door which was removed.
- Delineation of the location of the former carport using trim.
- Removal of the non-historic shutters which are incompatible with the architecture of the structure. The Applicant may install historically appropriate louvered shutters if they so desire.

**CA3-24-128**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall re-frame the exterior of the carport enclosure, adding trim to clearly delineate the portion of the front façade which was enclosed and an open decorative brick wall to the right-side elevation to match the one which was destroyed.
- 3.) The Applicant shall provide specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).
- 4.) The Applicant shall provide a window schedule which clearly delineates the location, size, and manufacturers specifications for all windows which will be replaced, illustrating they comply with Sec. 16-20Q.006 (2)(c).

- 5.) The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door.
- 7.) The Applicant shall remove the non-compliant front door and replace it with one which matches the original removed from the structure, a six-panel wood door.
- 8.) The Applicant shall provide specifications for the front door.
- 9.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the proposed plans.

**CA3-24-302**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall submit revised estimates for the specific scope of work in regards to the restoration of the original windows, front door, and delineation of the carport with trim.
- 2.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the proposed work.



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 664 Gillette Avenue SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-144  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 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)?:** Yes, Deferred May 22 and June 26, 2024

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Yes, 24-CAP00000154

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

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

The Applicant 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. [Staff finds that the newly revised plans satisfy all conditions.](#)

### **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. [The Applicant has updated the proposal to clarify only the windows on the rear elevation \(which will be demolished\) would be replaced. Unfortunately, Staff cannot approve of replacement what does not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20I.006 \(2\)\(b\) 3. "Replacement windows and windows on new construction shall be a wood or wood fiber composite product. Vinyl, PVC, aluminum, or clad windows are not permitted." While the existing windows are fiberglass, any replacements would need to be wood to match the original windows used on the house. The Applicant shall submit specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20I.006 \(2\)\(b\) 3.](#)

### **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. [The deck design has been updated and is now in compliance.](#)

### **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. [The updated site plan has been submitted and the Applicant is exceeding the allowable lot coverage with a total coverage of 55.8%. The Applicant shall submit an updated site plan with total coverage limited to 55% or less.](#)

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be used on the house.
- 2.) [The Applicant shall submit specifications for windows which meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20I.006 \(2\)\(b\) 3.](#)
- 3.) The Applicant shall retain the historic chimney and leave the masonry unpainted.
- 4.) The Applicant shall not demolish the historic brick fence.
- 5.) [The Applicant shall submit an updated site plan with total coverage limited to 55% or less.](#)
- 6.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File





# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1265 Oak Street SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-211  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District/Beltline

**Other Zoning:** R-4A

**Date of Construction:** New construction

**Property Location:** North side of Oak Street SW

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** n/a

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** n/a

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** n/a

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral until the August 28, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a single-family residence on the vacant parcel at 1265 Oak Street SW.

### **Height**

The Applicant proposes an overall height of 29 feet, which falls within the range of allowable height based on the submitted compatibility data.

### **Roof**

The Applicant proposes a front-gabled roof with a pitch of 8/12. While the submitted compatibility data shows that the roof forms are equally divided between front gabled and hipped roofs on the block face, none of these roofs have a pitch this steep. The predominant roof pitch on the block face is 6/12 and the proposed structure must be altered to utilize that pitch. Staff would further note, that the massing and form of the structure, specifically overall height, is based on an existing contributing building at 1293 Oak Street SW that has a hipped roof not a gabled roof. In terms of compatibility the proposed structure must revise its overall roof form. Further the porch roof and upper dormer roof are proposed as standing seam metal. Sec. 16-20G.006(1)(c) states, "All building materials, which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, are subject to the compatibility rule." Standing seam metal roofing is not present anywhere on the block face. This feature must be removed, and all roofing changed to be consistent and compliant. The Applicant shall revise all roofing materials to be consistent throughout the structure and comply with Sec. 16-20G.006(1)(c). The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof form and pitch to meet the compatibility rule.

### **Foundation**

Foundation height is subject to the compatibility rule, and no data has been supplied. The zoning code strictly prohibits slab on grade construction, which appears to be what is proposed based on the elevations. Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(f) states, "Height of the first floor of the front façade above grade shall be subject to the compatibility rule. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, the first floor of the principal structure shall be on foundations and shall be elevated above grade at the front façade a minimum of two entrance risers each of which shall be not less than seven inches in height. Slab-on-grade construction is not permitted." The Applicant shall submit compatibility data for foundation height and materials. The Applicant shall redesign the structure to utilize a compliant foundation height.

### **Porch**

The Applicant proposes a full width porch, at grade, with no foundation, no balustrade, and square wooden columns. As stated above Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(f) prohibits slab-on-grade construction, so a porch at grade would be prohibited by the zoning code. As no compatibility data has been submitted, the required height of the porch is unknown. Staff would note; however, that no porch

lacks steps and a balustrade so those would at minimum be required. Further, the predominant porch foundation materials on the block face is brick, and that must be utilized. The proposed square columns would be permitted, though Staff would not that they should at least be capped, as none of the existing columns are as plain as what is proposed, in use with a balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction. The porch flooring material is not clear based on the submitted elevations, but as the design cannot be slab on grade a concrete floor would not be appropriate. The Applicant will redesign the porch in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006.

### **Massing**

Staff has significant concerns with the massing of the structure. The proposed two-story form differs significantly from other examples from this historic period, including the two-story example on the block face due to the massing and roof form. While the zoning code does not specifically address building form, the massing of a structure must be compatible with the existing historic housing stock. The complete lack of foundation and altered porch proportions are also of major concern. Given the revisions needed to these two prominent features, the massing of the proposed house will have to also be significantly altered.

### **Materials**

No material specifications have been provided for any features present on the proposed structure. Sec. 16-20G.006(1)(c) states, “All building materials, which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, are subject to the compatibility rule.” The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be utilized on the exterior of the structure.

### **Fenestration**

The proposed fenestration on the street-facing façade does meet the compatibility rule. The window style does not, while Staff noted that there is no predominant window style, the proposed style must be one of those present on the block face. Two-over-one windows do not exist anywhere on the block face. The proposed fenestration on the side elevations is completely unacceptable. Only a single window is proposed on the ground floor of the left elevation and no windows at all are proposed on the right. The Applicant shall revised the proposed window style to match one of the styles present on the block face. The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration on the side elevation to increase the number of windows to a minimum of 6 windows per elevation.

### **Setbacks**

The proposed setbacks all fall within what is allowable by the zoning code. Staff has no concerns with the proposed setbacks.

### **Site Work**

Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(c) states, “New driveways shall not exceed a width of ten feet not including the flare at the street.” Further Sec. 16-20G.006 (13)(a) states, “Off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard or half-depth front yard.” The current site plan shows a 10.7 foot wide

drive that terminates before the house. The proposed drive must be revised to be no more than 10 feet in width, and extend at least 20 feet past the front façade of the house. Sec. 16-20G.006 (13) (b) states, “The design and material of new paved surfaces areas, other than those specified in subsection (a) above, including driveways, walkways, and patios, or portions thereof, shall be subject to the compatibility rule.” All of the contributing structures on the block face have a walkway extending from the front porch to the sidewalk. A walkway must be added to the proposed site plan. The sidewalk is not clearly depicted on the site plan. The adjoining sidewalk on wither side is composed of hexagonal pavers, and the contiguous sidewalk must match in materials and width. The Applicant shall revise the proposed driveway to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(c) and (13)(a). The Applicant shall add a walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch to comply with Sec. 16-20G.006 (13) (b). The Applicant shall clearly depict a sidewalk of hexagonal pavers, to match the contiguous sidewalk in width and materials.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the August 28, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to address the following:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall revise all roofing materials to be consistent throughout the structure and comply with Sec. 16-20G.006(1)(c).
- 2.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof form and pitch to meet the compatibility rule.
- 3.) The Applicant shall submit compatibility data for foundation height and materials.
- 4.) The Applicant shall redesign the structure to utilize a compliant foundation height.
- 5.) The Applicant will redesign the porch in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006.
- 6.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be utilized on the exterior of the structure.
- 7.) The Applicant shall revised the proposed window style to match one of the styles present on the block face.
- 8.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration on the side elevation to increase the number of windows to a minimum of 6 windows per elevation.
- 9.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed driveway to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(c) and (13)(a).
- 10.) The Applicant shall add a walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch to comply with Sec. 16-20G.006 (13) (b).
- 11.) The Applicant shall clearly depict a sidewalk of hexagonal pavers, to match the contiguous sidewalk in width and materials.
- 12.) The Applicant shall submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.



# CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 737 Ponce de Leon  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-303 (Variance) & CA3-24-304 (Addition)  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Poncey Highland Historic District (subarea 5) **Other Zoning:**

**Date of Construction:** 1937

**Property Location:** Outside of Kroger on the corner of Ponce de Leon and Ponce de Leon Place

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Variances, Addition, and site work

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No, none known.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA3-24-303: Denial Without Prejudice**  
**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS CA3-24-304: Approval With Conditions**

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

**Variance CA3-24-303**

The Applicant has requested a variance to allow a 10-foot-tall wall between the addition and the street. However, the project has since been revised to only include a 6 foot tall fence screening the loading area as required by the District regulations. Staff would note, however, that the site-plan has not been updated to reflect this change. However, given the Staff's recommendations related to this matter in CA3-24-304, Staff finds that the variance request is no longer needed, and recommends a denial without prejudice to allow the matter to be removed from the Commission's consideration.

**Addition CA3-24-304**

**Jurisdiction**

The property is located within subarea 5 of the Poncey Highland Historic District and is also within the Beltline overlay. Given that the two sets of regulations have overlapping, and sometimes conflicting, regulations, along with various administrative reviews, City implemented zoning and design reviews, as well as non-City review processes associated with them, Staff finds that a discussion of the jurisdiction over the design of this project is necessary. Per Sec. 16-20.011(c), when any conflict between the Poncey Highland Historic District zoning regulations and any other adopted ordinances and regulations occurs the more restrictive regulations, or those imposing the higher standard, will govern. As the Beltline regulations address all commercial structures within the overlay generally, and the subarea 5 regulations of the Poncey Highland Historic District regulations are specifically focused on those falling within the specific geographic area of Subarea 5 of the District, Staff finds that the Historic District regulations are more restrictive in terms of their scope. Further, Staff finds that the Historic District regulations constitute the higher standard as they are designed to ensure that new construction conforms to the form and character of the Historic District. As such, Staff finds that the Historic District regulations will govern in the event of any conflict with the Beltline zoning overlay. Further, Staff finds that the requirements of the Historic District would govern the totality of the design of the structure and any site features, whereas the Beltline regulations would govern the pedestrian infrastructure on the site and public right of way.

**Building Type Standards**

In subarea 5 of the historic district, several building types are permitted. The three commercial building types permitted in subarea 5 are the commercial block, the tower, and the civic building types. Staff finds that the proposal does not meet the criteria for the commercial block, tower, or civic building types given that it is a commercial structure that only contains a single story. However, per Sec. 16-20V.015(5) any lot of record that contained legal building types other than those specified by Table 5 before January 1, 2020, the existing building type is permitted for any addition, alteration, or new construction. As the existing structure was constructed in 1968 with alterations and additions in 1981 and 1991 according to the Fulton County Tax Assessor's records, Staff finds that the structure meets this provision for buildings constructed legally before January 1, 2020.

### Specific regulations

Unlike other subareas of the Historic District, the requirements for adding to a non-historic building in Subarea 5 do not reference the Lot Compatibility Zone, which limits the application of the Commission's review authority. As such, Staff finds that the Commission has full purview over the proposed addition and site work.

### Building Materials

Per the District regulations, the proposed building materials, architectural elements, and ornamentation are internally consistent with the architectural style of the existing building and with the addition.

### Windows and Doors

Per the District regulations, the ratio of window and door openings to wall area on the proposed addition is internally consistent with the existing building, relative to each façade, and with the addition. As such, Staff finds these requirements have been met.

Further the scale, size, proportion, and location of the windows and doors on the proposed addition are internally consistent with both the existing structure, relative to each façade, and with the proposed addition. As such, Staff finds these requirements have been met.

### Siding and Façade Sheathing

Staff finds that the proposed addition contains façade sheathing consistent with the architectural style of both the existing building and the proposed addition. As such, Staff finds these requirements have been met.

### Foundation materials

Staff finds that the foundation materials on the proposed addition are internally consistent with both the existing structure and the proposed addition. As such, Staff finds these requirements have been met.

### Roofs and Roof Materials

Staff finds that the form and pitch of the proposed addition is internally consistent with the existing structure and the proposed addition. Further, Staff finds that the materials used meet the District regulations. As such, Staff finds these requirements have been met.

### Development Controls

Per the District regulations, the front yard setbacks for the site are a minimum of 5 feet, the side yard setbacks are a minimum of 0 feet, and the and the rear yard setback is 5 feet. Staff finds that the proposed addition comes no closer to the street than the existing structure, would contain a north side yard setback of 0 feet, a south side yard setback of 2.5 feet, and a rear yard setback of 26.5 feet. As such, Staff finds these requirements have been met.

Per the District regulations, the lot coverage for the subject property is 85%. Per the site plan, the project would have a final lot coverage of 84.3% which meets the requirements of the District regulations.

Per the District regulations, the site is limited to a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 8.5. The site plan notes this, but does not specify the existing or proposed FAR. Given the footprint of the addition, Staff finds that it would be unlikely for the structure to have a floor area anywhere near the maximum. However, given that the usable open space requirements (USOR) are based on the floor area, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide the existing and proposed FAR of the project.

Per the District regulations, the usable open space requirements (USOR) are based on Table I: Land Use Intensity Ratios found in Sec. 16-08.007. As the USOR is calculated as a percentage of the FAR, Staff is unable to determine whether the proposal meets the requirements. As such, Staff recommends that the USOR meet the requirements of Table I "Land Use Intensity Ratios" found in Sec.16-08.007.

*Site Work*

The Applicant proposes a 6-foot-tall fence screening the loading area as required by the District regulations. However, updated plans that show this change have not been received by Staff. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide updated site plans showing a compliant 6 foot tall fence screening the loading area.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION for CA3-24-303 (Variance):** Denial Without Prejudice.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: for CA3-24-304 (Addition):** Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant provide the existing and proposed FAR of the project;
2. The USOR meet the requirements of Table I "Land Use Intensity Ratios" found in Sec.16-08.007;
3. The Applicant provided updated site plans showing a compliant 6 foot tall fence screening the loading area, per Sec. 16-20V.018(2)(a) and (c); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File





# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 661 Brookline Street SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-305

**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Adair Park Historic District, Subarea 1    **Other Zoning:** R-4A, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** North side of Brookline Street SW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Front-Gabled Bungalow

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

**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:** No

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

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

The Applicant proposes an addition, alterations, including reopening a previously enclosed front porch, site work, and construction of an accessory structure on the property. Staff does have concerns with the site plan as submitted. Only existing site plans, not proposed have been submitted, and the submitted survey does not calculate lot coverage. The Applicant shall submit an existing and proposed site plans showing all existing and proposed features on the lot, with lot coverage calculated. The Applicant shall clarify the extent of the proposed site work which would be completed.

### **Windows**

The Applicant proposes full window replacement on the structure. Staff cannot support this proposal. Based on the submitted photographs Staff only sees one window which appears to be damaged heavily. There is not sufficient evidence that the windows are beyond repair to warrant replacement. No specifications for the proposed new windows to be added on the addition have been included in the application package. , Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(6-7). requires, “New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be placed on the side and rear of the structure and be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.” The Applicant shall retain the historic windows and repair them. The Applicant shall submit specifications for all new doors and windows to be utilized on the addition.

The Applicant proposes significant reconfiguration of the fenestration on the left elevation, including enclosure of a door, and adding a door in a different location. Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(1) requires, “Architecturally significant windows and doors including details, trim, and framing shall be retained. Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed in whole or in part.” Further, Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(6-7). requires, “New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be placed on the side and rear of the structure and be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.” The new door proposed would access the kitchen. Which reconfiguration of windows to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted, enclosure and removal of openings is not. The historic door on the left elevation must remain, but does not need to be operable. The secondary door on that elevation would not be permitted. . Likewise the reconfiguration of windows is not happening in a true reconfiguration, but rather window placement, size, and style are all proposed. The windows may be reconfigured in terms of placement to accommodate kitchen and bathrooms, but they may not be totally removed or regrouped and the size and style must be retained, per Further, Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)(b)(7), “The replacement and reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted.” The Applicant will revise the proposed elevations to retain all windows and doors on the side elevations with minor reconfiguration and retaining all groupings and styles.



### **Porch & Façade Reconfiguration**

The house has a previously enclosed porch. Part of the proposal is to pen this porch and restore it to the previous configuration and in doing so completely reconfigure the façade. While Staff is in support of the proposal, Staff does have concerns that the submitted elevations do not show sufficient detail to clearly depict the proposal of the reconstruction of elements of the porch and the façade, including the fenestration, siding, brick piers, columns, and balustrades. The proposal would remove what appears to be an original door, oriented on the right side of the porch to the center of the elevation, and flank it with two pairs of windows. No justification for this reconfiguration has been provided.

The Applicant has not submitted evidence that this was the original façade configuration in the form of historic photographs or elevations. Staff is reluctant to approve this level of reconfiguration without evidence that it was restoring a historic configuration. Staff is in support of retaining the original door in the current location (the fact that this has always been the entrance is supported by the placement of stairs to the right), as a look at the contributing structures on the block face shows this was a common configuration. The attempt to make the entrance at the center of the façade, does not reflect the historic massing and structure of the house. The Applicant shall retain the historic door in its present location. The Applicant shall submit evidence for the proposed window configuration on the street-facing façade.

In terms of porch elements, the piers appear to have been truncated at the time the porch was enclosed and will have to be reconstructed, Staff needs to understand how this will be accomplished. Likewise, the columns must match the one remaining column present on the porch. The proposed balustrades are too tall and must be lowered to no taller than the bottom of the window sills, a plane extension may be installed to meet the requirements of the building code. There are existing historic brackets along the roofline of the gable, which appear to be removed according to the submitted elevations and must be retained. There is also what appears to be a

historic window which was infilled in the gable above the porch and must be restored. It also appears that the metal handrail on the stairs is proposed for removal. This feature must be retained. The Applicant shall not remove the metal handrail on the side porch steps. The Applicant shall submit updated elevations clearly depicting all feature of the porch proposed for repair and restoration. The Applicant shall reconstruct the porch supports to exactly match the one remaining intact support in design and dimensions. The Applicant shall retain the historic gable brackets. The Applicant shall not enclose the window on the porch gable but restore it to its original proportions. The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work in terms of siding repair or replacement. The Applicant shall install a balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction, no taller than the bottom of the window sills, a plane extension may be added to bring the balustrades up to code.

### **Accessory Structure**

The Applicant appears to be proposing an accessory structure. The structure is shown to the right of the principal structure in the elevations, but no detailed plans, including a site plan have been included. The Applicant shall supply elevations for the proposed accessory structure.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until August 28, 2024, to allow the Applicant to address the following conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall submit an existing and proposed site plans showing all existing and proposed features on the lot, with lot coverage calculated.
- 2.) The Applicant shall clarify the extent of the proposed site work which would be completed.
- 3.) The Applicant shall retain the historic windows and repair them.
- 4.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all new doors and windows to be utilized on the addition.
- 5.) The Applicant will revise the proposed elevations to retain all windows and doors on the side elevations with minor reconfiguration and retaining all groupings and styles.
- 6.) The Applicant shall retain the historic door in its present location.
- 7.) The Applicant shall submit evidence for the proposed window configuration on the street-facing façade.
- 8.) The Applicant shall not remove the metal handrail on the side porch steps.
- 9.) The Applicant shall submit updated elevations clearly depicting all feature of the porch proposed for repair and restoration. The Applicant shall reconstruct the porch supports to exactly match the one remaining intact support in design and dimensions.
- 10.) The Applicant shall retain the historic gable brackets.
- 11.) The Applicant shall not enclose the window on the porch gable but restore it to its original proportions.
- 12.) The Applicant shall clarify the scope of work in terms of siding repair or replacement.

- 13.) The Applicant shall install a balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction, no taller than the bottom of the window sills, a plane extension may be added to bring the balustrades up to code.
- 14.) The Applicant shall supply elevations for the proposed accessory structure.
- 15.) The Applicant shall submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next hearing of the Urban Design Commission.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 26 Woodcrest Avenue NE  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-367  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Brookwood Hills Conservation District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1925

**Property Location:** West side of Woodcrest Avenue NE.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** n/a

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Tudor Revival

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Door Replacement

**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 July 24, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

RC-24-367 26 Woodcrest Avenue NE

July 24, 2024

Page 2 of 2

**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 replacement of the existing front door with an example that is more historically accurate to the style of the house. The house is constructed in the Tudor Revival style, popular throughout the United States in the 1920s. One of the defining characteristics of this architectural style is prominently placed doorways, featuring heavy wooden doors as an homage to those traditionally used in the Tudor period of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Staff feels that the proposed door is a great improvement as it captures the spirit of the historical style, and restores the character, as originally designed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments at the July 24, 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matthew Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2656 Loghaven Drive NW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-287  
**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** South block face of Loghaven Drive NW, one lot to the left of intersection of Loghaven Drive NW and Hutton Place NW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Rear addition, in-kind windows, doors, and siding replacement, general maintenance and repair of driveway apron

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Deferred on July 10, 2024 UDC Hearing

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



**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval**

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

Project scope includes construction of a rear addition to the property at 2656 Loghaven Drive NW, in-kind repair and replacement of existing doors, windows, and siding, as well as general repair and maintenance of the existing driveway and apron.

In accordance with *Sec. 16-20Q.005.(1)b*, “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. Distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall not be removed.” Bricks and concrete masonry units are the predominant materials on the block face of the subject property. A non-historic addition was placed on the left facade of the subject property some time prior to the establishment of the historic district. The original siding of the house was concrete masonry units. As part of the proposed siding replacement, the stucco coat would be reapplied over the concrete masonry unit facade, and the existing siding would be replaced in kind. As such, Staff finds no concerns with the siding repair and replacement.

This project consists of replacing non-original windows and doors with in-kind replacements. In compliance with *Sec. 16-20Q.006.(2)(c)*, “If original or historic windows or exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated, replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size.” Considering that the proposed materials for the in-kind window and door replacements are more in-keeping with those that were originally installed on the home, they appear to be in compliance. As part of the proposal, no changes will be made to the existing fenestration of the subject property, except along the rear elevation, which is not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds no concerns with the replacement of non-original windows and doors.

For rear additions, the Collier Heights Historic District code 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,” per *Sec. 16-20Q.005.(1)b.ix*. Based on the analysis of the proposed rear addition, Staff finds that it is in compliance with the above regulation, since it is distinctive from the original building and is compatible with its historic elements. Staff finds no issues with the overall project proposal and recommends approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File