



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: CA3-24-311

MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: West side of Elizabeth Street NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne, American Four Square

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

The Applicant proposes removal of an existing rear deck, retention of the supports and reconstruction of a new sunroom above. This new sunroom would slightly modify the existing deck foot print and slightly increase lot coverage, but remain fully behind the existing structure and the new hipped roof would sit below the existing roofline. Below the deck a small amount of site work is proposed, to create a concrete pad at the base of the steps access the porch for an outdoor grill area. Overall, the increase in proposed lot coverage is small, and the proposed work is within the allowable lot coverage per the underling zoning for the property. As part of the alterations, an existing non-historic pair of French doors and two sidelight windows accessing the deck would be removed and replaced with a sliding or accordion door. While Staff would strongly recommend retaining or replacing with another French door, which is more appropriate to the historic form and style of the house, this feature is not visible from the public right-of-way. Overall, the proposed alterations conform to the historic character of the house and are in compliance with the requirements of the zoning code. As such, Staff recommends approval of the proposed project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 209 Tye Street SE

APPLICATION: CA3-24-326

MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20A, SA3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West side of Tye Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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 proposes a second story addition to the existing structure. This addition would introduce two new roof planes to the rear and right elevation of the structure. The existing, non-original addition to the rear would be removed, and a gabled addition would square off the L-shaped structure. A secondary shed roof dormer would be added to the center of the rear elevation to increase the central height of the half story and create livable space. The addition would be clad in smooth-face cementitious siding. Staff has several concerns with the proposal.

Foundation & Rear Porch

Foundation materials for the new gabled addition are neither shown on the plans nor noted. Slab-on-grade construction is not permitted. Further it is not clear what the proposed rear porch foundation will be constructed of, nor how this will incorporate into the design in terms of materials. The Applicant will clarify the proposed addition foundation materials. The Applicant will clarify the proposed construction materials for the rear porch and how it will incorporate into the structure in terms of its foundation.

Dormer

The proposed shed dormer does not meet the requirements of the zoning code. Sec. 16-20A.006 (13)(d)(1-2) states, "Shall be gable or shed design as appropriate to the architectural style of the building and shall maintain the siding, roof materials, and trim consistent with the main portion of the building. Shall not engage the ridgeline of the main roof structure." The proposed dormer is shed roofed, but does fully engage the ridgeline, creating an upward extension of the ridgeline. Further this dormer has a different window style, inconsistent with the architecture of the house and utilizes metal roofing, which is not existing on the structure. This dormer portion of the addition must be significantly revised to meet the requirements of the zoning code in terms of engaging the roofline, windows, and roofing materials. The Applicant shall revise the proposed rear dormer to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006 (13)(d)(1-2).

Fenestration

The existing historic windows on the structure are two-over-two vertical in design. The window schedule included in the plans is not entirely clear as to what the proposal is for window replacement. Further the windows which are being added are different in style, massing, grouping, and orientation than the historic windows. Of particular concern are one-over-one windows, and what appear to be a grouping of three sliding windows on the proposed rear dormer. The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration to only utilize two-over-two vertical, double-hung, wood windows which match the existing historic windows present on the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed addition foundation materials.
- 2.) The Applicant will clarify the proposed construction materials for the rear porch and how it will incorporate into the structure in terms of its foundation.
- 3.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed rear dormer to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006 (13)(d)(1-2).
- 4.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration to only utilize two-over-two vertical, double-hung, wood windows which match the existing historic windows present on the structure.
- 5.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate issue final approval of plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 384 Woodward Way—Atlanta Memorial Park
APPLICATION: RC-24-284
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Sits between Howell Mills Road and Northside Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Park renovation

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Commission adopt the recommendations and deliver the comments at the UDC meeting.

RC-24-339 for 384 Woodward Way

August 14, 2024

Page 2 of 3

Proposed Work

The Applicant proposes improvement to the park by adding “ADA accessible concrete walkway with boulder retaining wall to accommodate hillside transition from Howell Mill to existing path.”

Staff have no concern about the proposed work. In fact, Staff applaud the improvement that will allow all to enjoy the park.

RC-24-339 for 384 Woodward Way
August 14, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1075 White Oak Avenue SW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-320

MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: North side of White Oak Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, 20CAP-00000439, CA3-23-223

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

Alterations were made to the property without proper permitting in 2020 for which the previous owner received a stop work order (20CAP-00000439). In July of 2023 a second owner came to the Urban Design Commission with a proposed project (CA3-23-223) at this address, which was approved with conditions on August 23, 2023. The previous Applicant never fulfilled the conditions as required for final approval, which has not been granted for CA3-23-223. Since that time the property has been sold. The current Applicant proposes to reverse the unpermitted work, restore missing windows and doors, re-roofing, a rear deck, and remove the non-historic vinyl siding and replace with cementitious siding.

Staff has no concerns with re-roofing of the existing structure, as the plans show retention of the historic chimney. Staff has no concerns with the proposed rear deck. The previous unpermitted work enclosed a stoop and relocated the front door, removing a historic window in the process. The Applicant proposes to reverse this unpermitted alteration and restore the street-facing façade to its original configuration. Staff is not concerned with the proposal. Further the porch flooring is proposed for replacement with tongue-in-groove flooring installed perpendicular to the façade, Staff is not concerned with this proposal. There are no intact windows on the structure. The Applicant proposes to install replacement windows in the original locations (including restoration of the opening on the street-facing façade. Staff finds that the specifications provided meet the requirements of the zoning code. The Applicant proposes installation of smooth face cementitious siding, with no greater than a 6-inch reveal. Beneath the non-historic siding Staff notes that there is asbestos siding, which appears to be original to the structure based on the level of deterioration but based on the existing contributing housing stock on the block face, Staff agrees that smooth-face cementitious lap siding is the most appropriate for the structure. Staff has no concerns with the proposal. As such, Staff recommends approval of the proposed project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE

Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

DOUG YOUNG

MAYOR

55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

Director, Office of Design

404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1012 Dimmock Street SW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-276

MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: South side of Dimmock 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. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: n/a

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a single-family home on the vacant lot. The proposed house would be a single-story house, with a gable-on-hop-roof with a 6/12 slope, cementitious siding over a brick foundation, and a partial with porch. The Applicant has submitted a compatibility study, but Staff would note that one of the structures used, 972 Dimmock is not eligible as it is a church, and compatibility data can only be drawn from contributing structures of like use.

Setbacks

The Applicant proposes a front yard setback of 30 feet, and side and rear yard setbacks of 7 feet. Staff is not concerned with the proposal for the side and rear setbacks; however, the only contributing structure on the block façade has a front yard setback of 21 feet. The proposed structure is set too far back. The Applicant shall revise the proposed front yard setback to meet the compatibility rule.

Roof Form and Pitch

Roof form and pitch are subject to the compatibility rule. The compatibility data would not support the proposed roof form and pitch. The compatibility data would require a fully hipped roof (not the proposed gable on hip) with a roof pitch of 10/12. The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof form and pitch to meet the compatibility rule.

Overall Height & Foundation Height

The overall height and proposed foundation height both meet the compatibility rule. Given the need for revision of the roof form and pitch, Staff does acknowledge that the overall height will likely change, but still be in the acceptable range.

Building Materials

The Applicant has not submitted specifications for any of the proposed building materials. The materials as proposed all appear to meet the compatibility rule; however, Staff must review the materials to ensure compliance with the zoning code. Of particular note are the proposed balustrades, which do not appear to be two-part, butt-joint construction, but rather a front-nailed deck railing based on the cross section included in the plans. The porch flooring is also not listed. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for siding, windows, and doors. The Applicant shall use two-part, butt-joint construction for all porch balustrades. The Applicant shall use tongue-in-groove flooring for the porch.

Massing

Staff has no concerns with the proposed massing of the structure, but would note that

CA3-24-276 1012 Dimmock Street SW

August 14, 2024

Page 3 of 3

modifications to the roof may change the proposed massing.

Fenestration

Staff has no concerns with the proposed fenestration, outside the lack of material specifications noted above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed front yard setback to meet the compatibility rule.
- 2.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof form and pitch to meet the compatibility rule.
- 3.) The Applicant shall submit material specifications for siding, windows, and doors.
- 4.) The Applicant shall use two-part, butt-joint construction for all porch balustrades.
- 5.) The Applicant shall use tongue-in-groove flooring for the porch.
- 6.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the proposed plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 970 Martin Street (Michelle and Barack Obama Academy)
APPLICATION: RC-24-340
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Sits between Howell Mills Road and Northside Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Park renovation

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Commission adopt the recommendations and deliver the comments at the UDC meeting.

Proposed Work

The Applicant proposes the installation of APS Community Schoolyard to include with will include 24' dia. wooden stage w/ amphitheater seating, ADA accessibility throughout with proposed concrete sidewalks and slate trail mix nature trail and fitness path. Site Improvements include an (84' X 50') sport court with basketball goals and proposed soccer goals at the existing field. Green Infrastructure includes a rain garden with no proposed tree removal.” After reviewing the existing photos of the site, Staff do believe the site needed the said improvements and additions especially for a school like this. Staff strongly support the proposal.

RC-24-340 for 970 Martin Street
August 14, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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: 140 Chastian Way
APPLICATION: RC-24-342
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location:

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** City of Atlanta Park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Renovation of a gymnasium

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Commission adopt the recommendations and deliver the comments at the UDC meeting.

RC-24-342 for 140 Chastian Way

August 14, 2024

Page 2 of 3

Proposed Work

The Applicant proposes a 46,000 SF renovation and expansion of an existing Gymnasium facility located in Chastain Park. The renovation scope includes a gymnasium and restroom spaces. The addition includes a second gymnasium, locker rooms, weight room, training spaces, administration spaces and a community meeting room. Staff have no concern about the proposed work.

RC-24-342 for 140 Chastian Way
August 14, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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: 1064 Lawton Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA2-24-194
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Southwest block face of Lawton Avenue SW, southeast of intersection of Peoples Street SW and Lawton Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Georgian Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Proposed rear roof addition, replacement of porch railing to allow for open porch, replacement of front door, installation of new windows, replacement of existing siding, and installation of rear deck railing

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred on June 12th UDC Hearing

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order, 23CAP-00001527, issued October 13th, 2023

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

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

The proposed project consists of a rear roof addition, replacement of porch railing to allow for open porch, replacement of front door, installation of new windows, replacement of existing siding, and installation of rear deck railing.

Located in the Oakland City Historic District, the Commission has purview over what is visible from the public right of way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for the proposed porch railing, balustrade, columns and trim.
2. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for the proposed replacement front door, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.
3. The Applicant shall submit material specifications and windows schedule for the proposed replacement windows, replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.
4. The Applicant shall revise existing plans to ensure that the porch railing is two-part butt jointed construction.
5. The Applicant shall revise existing plans to include measurements and dimensions of house elevations and fenestrations.
6. The Applicant shall revise the existing plans to ensure that the existing, original chimney will be retained and restored.
7. The Applicant shall revise the existing plans to include the total square footage of the rear roof addition and ensure that the square footage increase is within compliance of district code.
8. The Applicant shall retain and repair the existing smooth-finish cementitious lap siding. In-kind replacements of siding are permitted only if original siding is deemed irreparable by Historic Preservation Studio Staff.

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: 359 Milledge Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA2-24-332
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: South block-face of Milledge Avenue SE, southeast of intersection of Milledge Avenue SE and Grant Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance request to allow reduction of the side yard setback from the required 7 feet to 0 feet

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The subject property received a Stop Work Order (24CAP-00000320) in March 2024 for unpermitted work in the rear yard. In order to resolve the SWO, the Applicant submitted a retroactive staff review (CA2S-24-331) for the enclosure of an existing rear deck and installation of new fencing and a carport in the rear yard. The location of the carport currently exceeds the required 7-foot side yard setback, and now has a side yard setback of 0 feet. As a result, the Applicant submitted a Variance request (CA2-24-332) for the reduction of the side yard setback.

It should be noted that this Staff Report focuses exclusively on the Variance request to allow the side yard setback to be reduced from 7 feet to 0 feet. Any other project components are subject to the associated staff review, CA2S-24-331.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial

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

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow the reduction of the side yard setback from the required 7 feet to 0 feet.

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question (size, shape, or topography):

The Applicant states that granting of the variance request would allow the carport and existing outbuildings on the property to exist harmoniously, without having to grade or demolish any part of the property. Staff finds that this argument does not meet the criteria, as there appears to be considerable rear yard space within the required 7-foot setback for the carport. Staff would also like to note that based on the existing site plan, as well as the photographs submitted, the proposed carport is the only accessory structure on the lot that Staff is aware of. Additionally, the existing topography, size, and shape of the lot do not present extraordinary conditions that would hinder the construction of a carport within the required side yard setback.

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

The Applicant states that building within the required 7-foot side yard setback would hinder access to the property's outbuildings. Moving the setback from 7 feet to 0 feet ensures access to all outbuildings and negates the need to grade the property for access to the carport. Staff finds that this does not meet the criteria, as the existing topography of the property would not require additional grading to accommodate a carport. Based on an existing site plan and photographs submitted by the Applicant, Staff is unaware of any additional accessory structures on the lot.

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

The Applicant states that in order to access the property from the existing rear alley in a vehicle, clearance is needed to properly enter and exit from an angle. Granting of the variance request would ensure proper clearance, leaving the space needed to negate the need to demolish existing outbuildings or grade the property. Staff finds that this does not meet the criteria, as there are no existing conditions peculiar to the property that would hinder building the carport within the 7-foot side yard setback.

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 granting of the variance would negate any future need to potentially remove outbuildings or grade, where either would ultimately disrupt the use of the rear alley,

CA2-24-110 for 617 Terrace Avenue NE

April 24, 2024

Page 3 of 3

inconveniencing a minimum of 8 households. The Applicant notes that their neighbors in the adjacent rear yard are in support of the reduction of the side yard set back to 0 feet. Staff finds that this does not meet the criteria.

Staff finds that the request does not meet the variance criteria. Based on all documents and arguments submitted by the Applicant, Staff cannot determine why a variance would be necessary in this case, as a significant amount of rear yard space is available within the required 7-foot side yard setback to accommodate the relocation of the carport. Additionally, it appears that only one accessory structure, a shed, was demolished at some point before the construction of the non-compliant carport, and that the carport is the only accessory structure on the property. Staff finds there would be no need for additional grading or demolition of accessory structures.

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: 384 Woodward Way—Atlanta Memorial Park
APPLICATION: RC-24-284
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Sits between Howell Mills Road and Northside Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Park renovation

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Commission adopt the recommendations and deliver the comments at the UDC meeting.

RC-24-339 for 384 Woodward Way

August 14, 2024

Page 2 of 3

Proposed Work

The Applicant proposes improvement to the park by adding “ADA accessible concrete walkway with boulder retaining wall to accommodate hillside transition from Howell Mill to existing path.”

Staff have no concern about the proposed work. In fact, Staff applaud the improvement that will allow all to enjoy the park.

RC-24-339 for 384 Woodward Way
August 14, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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: 970 Martin Street (Michelle and Barack Obama Academy)
APPLICATION: RC-24-340
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Sits between Howell Mills Road and Northside Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Park renovation

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Commission adopt the recommendations and deliver the comments at the UDC meeting.

Proposed Work

The Applicant proposes the installation of APS Community Schoolyard to include with will include 24' dia. wooden stage w/ amphitheater seating, ADA accessibility throughout with proposed concrete sidewalks and slate trail mix nature trail and fitness path. Site Improvements include an (84' X 50') sport court with basketball goals and proposed soccer goals at the existing field. Green Infrastructure includes a rain garden with no proposed tree removal.” After reviewing the existing photos of the site, Staff do believe the site needed the said improvements and additions especially for a school like this. Staff strongly support the proposal.

RC-24-340 for 970 Martin Street
August 14, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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: 140 Chastian Way
APPLICATION: RC-24-342
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location:

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** City of Atlanta Park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Renovation of a gymnasium

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Commission adopt the recommendations and deliver the comments at the UDC meeting.

RC-24-342 for 140 Chastian Way

August 14, 2024

Page 2 of 3

Proposed Work

The Applicant proposes a 46,000 SF renovation and expansion of an existing Gymnasium facility located in Chastain Park. The renovation scope includes a gymnasium and restroom spaces. The addition includes a second gymnasium, locker rooms, weight room, training spaces, administration spaces and a community meeting room. Staff have no concern about the proposed work.

RC-24-342 for 140 Chastian Way
August 14, 2024
Page 3 of 3

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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: 3460 Jonesboro Rd
APPLICATION: RC-24-364
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: East block face of Jonesboro RRd, between the intersections of Hutchens Rd and i-285.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: site work and new structures

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.

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 improvements to the existing Southside Park and sports complex. Staff has no general concerns with the proposed additions but does find that the project would offer the opportunity for the pedestrian infrastructure to be updated. The site is in an area that is not well served by public transportation; however, MARTA bus stops do exist within 1 mile of the subject property. While it is outside of the scope of this project to fix the transportation issues in this area, Staff does find that the site would better accommodate pedestrians and alternate forms of transportation to ensure the site is equitable to all Atlantans, and not just those who can afford to drive to the site. The site lacks a critical pedestrian connection to the sidewalks along Jonesboro Rd. This creates a condition whereby a pedestrian would need to walk in the drive aisle or on the landscaped shoulder. Staff suggests that paved pedestrian pathways be added to both sides of the driveway and that those connections continue through the site and the parking lot to the athletic field.

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

Cc: File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 995 Sparks
APPLICATION: CA2-24-269
MEETING DATE: *August 14, 2024*

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lee Street and East of Peoples Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction (Exterior)

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)? Yes, deferred July 10 & 24. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: In 2023, the Commission approved a new construction for 995 Sparks. Upon completing the work, a SWO was placed on the property for not following the approved plans. This new review will be conducted on AS IS BUILD and use the previously submitted compatibility analysis.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial

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

Revision to previous approval

The Applicant is proposing several changes to the original approval. Since that time, Staff has noted several inconsistencies in the Compatibility information provided by the Applicant. The Applicant has two options for how to move forward: The structure may either be built as originally approved, or, the proposed changes will need to meet the District regulations. Staff would note that issues not currently proposed as changes to the plans, such as the porch foundation and step materials, are not subject to a re-review by the Commission as those aspects of the project have already received a review. Staff will only comment on aspects of the project that have changed and indicate whether the change meets the District regulations.

Staff would also note that a courtesy sketch prepared by the HP Studio was provided in advance of the May 24 meeting to illustrate that a compliant structure could be built on the lot using the setbacks provided by the Applicant, which Staff now understands are inaccurate. This was provided after the project was deferred 3 times without coming into compliance with the District regulations or the Commission's comments at the meeting. As such, the sketch shows a front yard setback of 12 feet, as an example of what could have been designed by the Applicant and potentially accepted by the Commission at that time. However, as Staff has made clear in conversations with the Applicant the Commission is the final authority on the approval of projects for new construction. As such, the final design submitted for review by the Commission, along with any specific conditions placed on the project by the Commission, represents the final design approved by the Commission. This sketch was provided to the Commission as part of Staff's analysis, and the setback shown by Staff was not adopted by the Commission at that time. As such, the setback shown on this sketch bears no legal authority and does not permit the changing of the project by-right.

Photographs from the inspections on the site have been provided to assist the Commission in their review of the project.

Compatibility Comparisons

The Staff is concerned with comparisons received for review. The information provided was revised such that it is substantially different than what was submitted for the original review and has been amended during the course of Staff's review. Additionally, portions of the compatibility analysis conflict internally. For instance, the height of the structures listed in the massing section conflicts with the information provided under the building height section. Further, the setback information provided is not differentiated between whether the setback was taken from the front porch or to the building façade. As the regulations would require an "apples-to-apples" comparison, this information is crucial to ensuring that the structure conforms to the letter of the District regulations. To ensure that the information provided is accurate and that all required information is provided, Staff recommends that the compatibility study be re-submitted using a form provided by the Office of Design Staff. Staff further recommends that the compatibility comparisons be performed by a an architect or engineer licensed by the State of Georgia, and that the resulting measurements bear their stamp as confirmation of the information presented.

The Applicant has provided a compatibility study, that has been stamped by an engineer with a date of July 29, 2024, with a notation that the measurements were taken on July 28, 2024. However, the information provided matches both the measurements and format of the compatibility study provided for the May 10, 2023 Public Hearing. This compatibility study does not include required measurements on the sample study supplied by Staff, and only contains three (3) of the five (5) contributing/comparable properties on the block face. Further, the report contains the same three (3) properties non-contributing, and therefore non-comparable, properties shown on the study supplied for the May 10, 2024, hearing with the inclusion of two (2) new non-comparable properties.

The information provided would not be concerning were it not for the internal inconsistencies and the inability of Staff to replicate the proportional measurements such as roof pitch. Regarding the inconsistencies, the heights shown in the Massing section, where the Applicant should detail the height and # of stories, the Applicant has instead provided the height of the structure, which does not match the height shown in the Building Height section. For instance, the height of 1013 Sparks is shown as 18.5 feet in the building height section but is shown as 23 feet in the massing section. The height of 1005 Sparks St is shown as 20 feet in the Building Height Section but is shown as 23 feet in the Massing Section. The height of 1003 Sparks St is shown as 18 feet in the Building Height section but is shown as 22 feet in the Massing section.

Regarding the proportional measurements that Staff are unable to replicate, the study shows the pitch of the houses at 1005 and 1003 Sparks Street as 4:12. This number has been consistent in all previous studies provided by the Applicant. Staff attempted to replicate this measurement, as a 4:12 roof pitch would be abnormally shallow for a Queen-Anne-inspired Folk-Victorian home such as those at 1005 and 1003 Sparks St. As roof pitches are proportional, meaning that the pitch would be approximately the same at any scale, Staff finds that this feature is a good candidate for a replication attempt to verify the information provided

Staff started by scaling a picture of the properties using a known measurement: the height of the front porch steps. Given that front porch steps can be generally assumed to be approximately 7", Staff scaled the photograph thusly and used this measurement to approximate the rise, run, and rafter length of the gables. Again, Staff finds that the exact field measurement of the rise, run, and rafter length would have only a negligible effect on the proportion of the feature using this method. For both 1005 and 1003 Sparks St, Staff found the approximate roof pitch was between 11:12 and 12:12. This is consistent with the generally accepted characteristics of Queen Anne structures, as noted by Virginia Savage-McAlester in A Field Guide to American Homes: "Over half of all Queen Anne houses have a steeply hipped roof with one or more lower cross gables."

Based on this analysis, Staff finds that the proposal again lacks sufficient information for a review of the proposed (but completed) changes from the Commission's original approval. As such, Staff recommends denial of the application to either require the structure to be reconstructed to the specifications approved by the Commission or that accurate and updated information can be provided for review in a future application submission.

However, Staff will detail the changes from the original approval as noted below for the benefit of the Commission and the Applicant:

Front yard setback (as measured to the front façade)

Commission approved: 16'

Proposed: 12

Allowable range: unknown

Staff finds that the site plans would need to be updated to show a compliant front yard setback as measured from the street to the front façade of the structure.

Rear yard setback

Commission approved: 15'

Proposed: 7'

Right side yard setback

Commission approved: 16.5'

Proposed: 12.25'

Left side yard setback

Commission approved: 21'

Proposed: 33.5'

Regarding the side yard setbacks, Staff would note that the rather large discrepancies between the approved plans and the proposed plans appear to be due to the plans that were submitted for final approval and permitting not being internally consistent in regard to the width of the home shown on the site plan versus the elevations. The site plan shows a home that is approximately 34.5' wide and the elevations show a home that is approximately 28.5' wide.

Roof form

Approved by the Commission: Nested Gable

Proposed: Front Gable (Does not meet the District regulations)

Staff finds that the front elevations, side elevations, and roof plan would need to be re-drawn to show a nested gable roof form as approved by the Commission under the previous approvals.

Window Sizes & Styles

Commission approved (as shown on approved elevations):

- *Single 31" x 66" one over one double-hung windows*
- *Double grouped 35" x 66" one over one double-hung windows (one set on front façade only)*

Proposed (as shown on as-built elevations) (Does not meet the District regulations)

- *Double grouped 70" x 66" Casement window*
- *Single 31" x 51" one-over-one double-hung windows (entire left side façade)*
- *Single 31" x 51" one-over-one double-hung windows (three on the right side façade)*

- *Single 31" x 66" one-over-one double-hung windows (three on the right side façade)*

Staff finds that the windows should either be revised to match the original approval, or, meet the requirements of the District regulations. Staff further finds that any window on the front or side facades of the structure, if not double-hung in function, should have the appearance of being double-hung through the use of simulated horizontal sash dividers a minimum of 3" thick. Staff further finds that the double-grouped double-hung windows on the front façade, if not true double-grouped double-hung windows in function, should have the appearance of being a double-grouped window through the installation of a simulated vertical muntin a minimum of 8" wide and the appearance of being double-hung through the use of simulated horizontal sash dividers a minimum of 3" thick.

Sidewalk

*Approved by the Commission: 7' wide inclusive of the planting strip
Proposed: 5' wide with no planting strip*

The District regulations require that the sidewalk be at least 6' wide if no sidewalk currently exists on the block. From the publicly available street view photographs, sidewalks were installed across the street and south of the property towards Lee Street. However, Staff cannot find evidence of their approval or the issuance of a variance for these sidewalks. Further, Staff finds that the existence of these sidewalks, whether installed without a permit or approved via a variance application, would not negate the need for the structure to comply with the requirements of the District regulations which require a minimum of a 6' wide sidewalk with a planting strip.

Walkway & Steps

The proposed walkway, which Staff would note has been greatly reduced from the original approval, is shown on the plans. However, Staff finds that the plans do not accurately reflect the final conditions of the property as the porch steps, which are shown on the elevations, have not been installed yet. Factoring in the average step riser length of 8 inches, staff finds that it would take approximately 6 steps to reach the height of the porch level from the front grade. The elevations accurately reflect this condition in the drawing. However, factoring in the minimum tread length of 11" for outdoor steps, Staff finds that 6 steps would require 5.5' of length. This condition is not shown on the site plan.

Retaining Wall

A retaining wall is proposed for installation due to the structure being constructed closer to the street than was approved by the Commission or shown in the permit drawings. Staff noted concerns with the accuracy of the grade shown in the elevation drawings in our previous reviews given that the site slopes up considerably several feet from the property line. However, Staff would note that retaining walls are not subject to a review by the Commission, and will be reviewed at a later date by Staff. The information provided below is to inform the Commission and the Applicant of Staff's intent.

The District regulations base the height of retaining walls in the front yard on the compatibility rule. While this information has not been provided for review, Staff would note that no retaining

walls appear on the subject block face. As such, Staff finds that the District regulations would present a standard that cannot be met. As per the Commission's previous rulings on situations such as this, Staff finds it appropriate to allow for the use of an alternate block face in the immediate vicinity for comparisons without the need for a variance. The closest block face with multiple retaining walls belonging to contributing properties of like use is the eastern block face of White Oak Ave. The allowable range based on this block face is a minimum of 18" (based on 1071 White Oak Ave.) and 30" (Based on 1075 & 1079 White Oak Ave.). As such, Staff has no concerns with the use of a 24" retaining wall. Staff would note, however, that a poured concrete retaining wall as proposed would not meet the District regulations. As such, Staff finds that the retaining wall should be faced with brick, stone, or smooth stucco as required by the District Regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood.
File

DRAFT