



# 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:** 1331 Metropolitan Parkway SW (Capitol View Masonic Lodge)

**APPLICATION:** CA2-24-409

**MEETING DATE:** September 11, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** n/a

**Other Zoning:** NC-9, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1922

**Property Location:** Northwest corner of the intersection of Metropolitan Parkway and Dill Avenue SW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Neoclassical Revival, Chicago School-skyscraper

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** CA2-23-165

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

**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 had a previous proposal for exterior alterations (CA2-23-165) approved on June 26, 2023. Since that time, new historic images of the Landmark Building have been discovered and the Applicant is proposing to restore the exterior to more accurately reflect the historic conditions. The alterations include enclosure of the walkthrough at the corner of Dill and Metropolitan, revision of the storefront design on Dill Avenue to be flat, versus recessed, and removal of a non-historic window on the right side elevation to allow a door for access. Staff does not have concerns about the revision to the Dill Avenue storefront, the submitted photographs support the design of this feature. Staff is also not concerned with the proposal to add the side access door on the right elevation. This window is clearly not original and the limited visibility makes this alteration minor in nature.

Staff does have concerns over the corner enclosure. While Staff is in support of restoring the original configuration, Staff is not in support of the proposed design, which proposed a full plate glass window with muntins. The historic storefront had a knee wall and framed storefront window. If the proposal is to restore it to the previous configuration, it must be completely redesigned to create a mating storefront with the knee wall and a greatly reduced window size. The Applicant will revise the proposed corner enclosure to match the historic conditions including a reduced window size which matches the historic design and a knee wall.

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

- 1.) The Applicant will revise the proposed corner enclosure to match the historic conditions including a reduced window size which matches the historic design and a knee wall.
- 2.) 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  
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:** September 11, 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)?:** Yes, deferred July 24 & August 28, 2024

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

**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 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: Approval with the following conditions:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall retain the historic windows and repair them.
- 2.) 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. **The proposed elevations still show removal and enclosure of openings, and significant reconfiguration of windows and must be corrected.**
- 3.) 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 porch should be shown as brick, as currently depicted it appears to be concrete block. The porch columns do not have caps and do not match the style of the existing and these details must be shown.**
- 4.) The Applicant shall retain the historic gable brackets.
- 5.) The Applicant shall not enclose the window on the porch gable but restore it to its original proportions.
- 6.) 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.
- 7.) 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:** 716 Oakland Avenue SE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-372  
**MEETING DATE:** September 11, 2024

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

**Other Zoning:** R-5, Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** Northeast corner of Oakland Avenue and Bass Street SE

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Georgian Cottage

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Addition and alterations

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, deferred August 28, 2024.

**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. 16-20K of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes a second addition to the front and right sides of the house (the property is located on a corner lot). Staff has significant concerns with the proposal. The proposal completely removes the existing side gabled roof in favor of adding three gables. While Staff acknowledges that there are existing gables on the rear of the house and this would continue them through, it completely alters the existing roof form and house type to the point it would be unrecognizable. The proposal must be completely restructured to retain the existing roofline on the front plane of the house, which is a character defining feature of the Georgian Cottage house type. Staff notes that the Applicant appears to be utilizing the underlying rear yard setback, versus the allowable rear yard setback of 7 feet as permitted by the zoning code for the Grant Park Historic District. Pushing the massing of the rear addition further back onto the property would allow the desired square footage without completely removing the roofline and altering the house beyond recognition.

Sec. 16-20K.007 (2)(15)(D) of the zoning code requires, “Alterations and additions shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction set forth in subsection 16-20K.007(2)(B) above;” And, “2.New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work may differentiate from the old. To protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, any new work will be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and environment.” Staff finds that the proposed addition does not meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.007 (2)(15)(D), and to design a compliant addition would require a complete re-design of the project, therefore Staff recommends denial of the application.

Staff initially recommended denial of the application, based on the incompatibility of the design. Since that time the Application has submitted an entirely new proposal.

The revised proposal shifts the proposed addition to a single level, with the massing shifted to the rear and left of the property away from the street facing elevation on the right side. Staff notes that the foundation materials for the addition are not noted; however, given that the existing structure utilizes CMU construction, it appears the addition will do the same. The Applicant shall denote the foundation materials on the plans. The exterior cladding shall be smooth faced cementitious siding; however, no material specifications have been submitted noting the reveal. The Applicant shall utilize a lap siding with a reveal no less than 4 inches and no greater than 6 inches, matching the historic materials present on the structure. Additional specifications are needed showing all proposed materials to be utilized on the addition. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials proposed to be used.

Staff has only minor concerns with certain aspects of the proposed addition. An enclosed, screened porch is proposed for the front elevation of the addition, and while Staff is in support of this, for cohesiveness of design the porch should be more in keeping with the existing design. Certain



elements, such as the cheek walls on the stairs already accomplish this, but Staff would recommend keeping elements like height and building materials consistent with the existing historic porch, and ensuring all materials are noted. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design of the new addition porch to be consistent with the features of the existing porch for consistency of design. There is also an incongruous gable vent above the entrance to this new porch. Its placement, shape, and design are not consistent with the existing structure. A more appropriately placed and designed vent may be utilized which is consistent in design. The Applicant shall remove the decorative gable vent from the proposed addition porch. Staff's only other concerns is with the proposed transom window on the right elevation of the addition. This window, clearly visible from the location on a street-facing elevation is inconsistent with the remaining windows on the house and must be removed, in favor of a double-hung window which matches the existing on the structure. The Applicant shall revise the proposed window on the rear addition elevation to be vertical in orientation and be identical in style to the remaining windows on the elevation.

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

- 1.) The Applicant shall denote the foundation materials on the plans.
- 2.) The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials proposed to be used.
- 3.) The Applicant shall utilize a lap siding with a reveal no less than 4 inches and no greater than 6 inches, matching the historic materials present on the structure.
- 4.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design of the new addition porch to be consistent with the features of the existing porch for consistency of design.
- 5.) The Applicant shall remove the decorative gable vent from the proposed addition porch.
- 6.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed window on the rear addition elevation to be vertical in orientation and be identical in style to the remaining windows on the elevation.
- 7.) 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:** 2569 Hightower Court NW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-406

**MEETING DATE:** September 11, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** HC-20Q Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1955

**Property Location:** North side of Hightower Court NW

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Linear Raised Ranch

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

**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 proposes a front porch addition to the existing structure. The Applicant also proposes full window replacement, enclosure of windows on the rear elevation, door replacement, garage door replacement, and a rear deck. Staff has significant concerns with a number of the proposed changes.

### **Porch Addition**

The Applicant proposes a porch addition and changing the orientation of the existing front steps accessing the stoop. Sec. 16-20Q.006 (10)(a) requires, "Original or historic porches or stoops, including their component features shall be retained." Linear Ranch Houses do not have porches, this architectural form, as an advent of the post-war, mid-20<sup>th</sup> century architecture was designed to have air conditioning. As such, porches, which historically were installed for increased air circulation were removed from the design of these houses, in favor of small entrance stoops. The proposed porch is not in keeping with the design of the structure. Further, the side steps which connect the garage and driveway with the front entrance are a key historic character defining feature. Staff is not in support of the proposal to reorient these steps in any way, nor adding a porch which is inappropriate to the historic design. Staff does note that a portion of the historic balustrade appears to be deteriorated; however, no materials have been submitted for the proposed repair and replacement. The Applicant shall not construct the porch addition. The Applicant shall retain the historic steps in their current position and orientation. The Applicant shall submit proposed replacement materials for the deteriorated balustrade.

### **Window Replacement and Enclosure**

The Applicant proposes full replacement of the existing windows on the structure due to termite damage. The submitted photographs do not illustrate this claimed damage. With the exception of several window, which show broken panes of glass in intact frames, no compelling argument has been submitted showing the need for repair. The broken pane of glass can easily be repaired while retaining the historic window. Staff finds no compelling argument for full replacement. In addition, on the rear elevation, the Applicant proposes full removal of two windows and infilling the openings with brick, while changing the size and style of another window to a fixed window. While the code allows for addition of openings on non-street facing elevations, it does not allow for their enclosure. The Applicant shall retain all historic windows in their existing location.

### **Door Replacement**

The Applicant has submitted a solid wooden door as a proposed replacement for the existing front door. No evidence has been submitted showing the need for replacement. Staff further notes that there is a distinctive sunburst security door extant on the house, which is a character defining feature. The Applicant will submit photographs establishing the need for replacement of the front door. The Applicant shall retain the historic security door.

### **Garage Door Replacement**

The historic garage door is no longer extant. The Applicant proposes installation of a modern steel garage door. Staff is concerned that the proposed replacement does not match the appearance of the garage door which previously existed and had a distinctive design including lights. The Applicant shall submit a garage door which replicates the historic materials which were present on the house.

### **Deck**

The Applicant proposes a rear deck addition. The deck would sit entirely behind the existing structure, and complies with the requirements of the zoning code. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

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

- 1.) The Applicant shall not construct the porch addition.
- 2.) The Applicant shall retain the historic steps in their current position and orientation.
- 3.) The Applicant shall submit proposed replacement materials for the deteriorated balustrade.
- 4.) The Applicant shall retain all historic windows in their existing location.
- 5.) The Applicant will submit photographs establishing the need for replacement of the front door.
- 6.) The Applicant shall retain the historic security door.
- 7.) The Applicant shall submit a garage door which replicates the historic materials which were present on the house.
- 8.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the project.

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:** 155 7<sup>th</sup> Street NE

**APPLICATION:** RC-24-401

**MEETING DATE:** September 11, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Sec. 16-20

**Other Zoning:** SPI-4, SA-1

**Date of Construction:** circa 1963

**Property Location:** Southwestern corner of the intersection of Fair Street SW and Agnes Jones Place SW

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Site work

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** V-24-131

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm delivery of comments at the September 11, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Committee

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

The Applicant proposes a variance to allow an increase in the allowable height of a parking structure on rear portion of the lot from 35 feet (allowed) to 64 feet (proposed) adjacent to residential use. This variance would be needed because of the size, existing topography of the lot, and existing underground MARTA tunnel beneath a portion of the property which limits the ability to move the proposed parking below grade, it also would allow for the required amount of parking, which the current surface lot does not meet.

Staff understands that the need for parking is driven by the adjacent student housing. Staff also notes that the Applicant makes a compelling argument for the proposed allowable height based on the variance criteria, which establish that there are exceptional or unusual conditions present on the site, as well as based on the surrounding conditions which contain numerous examples of parking structures of similar height and massing. This area is currently used for parking, and while the new parking structure would increase volume, the use would not fundamentally change. The proposed design would be submitted as a separate certificate of appropriateness. Overall, Staff is not concerned with the proposed height variance as outlined in the application materials.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the September 11, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1620 Delowe Drive SW (Adams Park)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-403  
**MEETING DATE:** September 11, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Sec. 16-20

**Other Zoning:** R-3

**Date of Construction:** circa 1936-1940

**Property Location:** North side of Delowe Drive SW

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Site work

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm delivery of comments at the September 11, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Committee

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

The Applicant proposes improvements to the existing park infrastructure at Adams Park. These improvements would increase accessibility, safety and access for ADA compliance, as well as add viewing spots and amenities for visitors. The improvements include:

- Installation of a new overlook landing above the existing pond
- Boulder stabilization
- Adding a concrete path to allow for ADA accessibility to the existing boardwalk

Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed improvements. The improvements would increase accessibility and functionality of the existing space, while making the improvements in a thoughtful way. Staff is strongly in support of amenities that increase both the safety and ADA accessibility of the space, and feel all proposed improvements are in keeping with the aesthetics of the existing infrastructure. The addition of the viewing platform, over the key feature of the park's design, the central lake, is a nice addition, which will enhance the public's ability to experience the space as originally designed, to embrace the natural landscape.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the September 11, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File





# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1040 Fair Street SW (M. Agnes Jones Elementary School)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-24-405  
**MEETING DATE:** September 11, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Sec. 16-20

**Other Zoning:** SPI-4, SA-1

**Date of Construction:** circa 1963

**Property Location:** Southwestern corner of the intersection of Fair Street SW and Agnes Jones Place SW

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Site work

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm delivery of comments at the September 11, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Committee

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

The Applicant proposes installation of a new recreational space, adding to the existing playground infrastructure at the M. Agnes Jones Elementary school. The proposed improvements would:

- Expand the existing playground equipment and area
- Relocate the existing outdoor stage and seating
- Redevelop the former stage location as active recreation fields
- Re-route and improve the existing trail system to meet ADA requirements
- Addition of new seating
- Addition of access from the recreation area to the adjacent Community School Park Arbor
- Landscape improvements

Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed improvements. The improvements would increase accessibility and functionality of the existing space, while making the improvements in a thoughtful way. Staff notes that in particular this will allow for increased functionality of the space, diversified uses, and accessibility for all in terms of both use and circulation through ADA compliant improvements. The landscape improvements will increase shade and further develop a healthy tree canopy in this public space. Staff does not that the existing crosswalk, located at the far end of the recreation space, connecting the elementary school to the recreation space at the existing parking lot will remain. No additional crosswalks are proposed. Staff recommends the addition of a second crosswalk for increased safety at the opposite side of the recreation area, close to Westview Drive SW to accommodate increased foot traffic that the improvements may make for members of the community seeking to use the space, versus just the elementary school students.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the September 11, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File