



# CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE  
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS  
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Matt Adams, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 557 West End Place SW

**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-260

**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Other Zoning:** R-4A

**Date of Construction:** 1920

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, deferred June 26, July 24, and 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. 16-20G of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

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

### **Addition**

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

### **Door Placement & Replacement**

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

### **Window Replacement & Reconfiguration**

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

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

The revised addition has no fenestration on the upper level. This does not match the historic fenestration patterning, and must be revised to add additional windows.

### **Site Plan**

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

The site plans was previously revised, but the current site plan still shows an inaccurate scale (1 inch = 10 feet). Based on the scale listed on the plans the lot would measure 37 feet 4 inches in width and 67 feet 1 inch in length, which does not match the cadastral dimensions for the lot of record with the city. If that were the case, the total lot square footage versus the coverage proposed would exceed the total of the lot. This needs to be resolved to accurately depict the lot and confirm that the allowable lot coverage would be permitted.

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

- 1.) The Applicant shall submit specifications for all materials proposed to be used on the rear addition. **Not fully addressed**
- 2.) **The Applicant will add additional windwos to the upper tory of the left elevation addition to replicate the hsitroic window patterning.**
- 3.) **The Applicant shall correct the existing and proposed site plan to accurately reflect the dimensions of the lot of record.**
- 4.) 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:** 214 Estoria Street SE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-362 (New Construction)  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** HC-20A, SA3

**Other Zoning:** Beltline

**Date of Construction:** n/a

**Property Location:** East side of Estoria Street SE

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Construction, Variance to allow placement of an accessory structure where it otherwise would be prohibited

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** CA3-24-362 (New Construction):  
Deferral until the October 23, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

### **CA3-24-362 (New Construction)**

The Applicant proposes new construction of a single family home, a swimming pool, and an accessory structure on the vacant lot. The proposed house would be a side-gabled, Gothic Revival cottage with a brick foundation, a partial width porch, and clapboard siding of unknown materiality. Staff has significant concerns with the proposed design. Overall, the massing and roof form are unlike any contributing structure on the block face. Per the code this subarea permits cottage and shotgun form housing. While the proposed design does exhibit some of the characteristics of cottage housing, its lack of adherence to the compatibility rule on the majority of features governed by the rule, means it does not comply. Staff strongly recommends looking to the contributing structures at 186 and 182 Estoria for guidance on massing and roof forms as this is what predominates on the block face. Further, Staff has concerns that the proposed design is a random amalgamation of incongruous historical elements including decorative trim, design features, window styles, and other elements which have not relation to the architectural forms and styles present on the block face, are not appropriate to the character or historical period of the district, and do not create a cohesive or appropriate design. The Cabbagetown Landmark District was a collection of worker housing, exhibiting strict economical house forms and minimum architectural styling for efficiency and the high style elements proposed in this design are completely incongruous with the character of the district. No material specifications have been provided for any exterior materials. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to utilize a form and massing compatible with the contributing structure on the block face. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to remove incongruous design elements. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials to be utilized on the structure.

### **Setbacks**

All setbacks in the Cabbagetown Landmark District are subject to the compatibility rule. The proposed side yard setbacks fall within the allowable range. The Front and rear do not. The proposed rear yard setback is 0 feet, based on the contributing structure at 218 Estoria Street SE. This 0-foot rear yard setback was only achieved there through a variance to allow expansion for the existing accessory structure, it did not exist historically. Based on the compatibility data submitted, the rear yard setback cannot be less than three feet. As a result, the proposed cannot be used for compatibility purposes because this setback did not exist historically. The proposed front yard setback also does not fall within the allowable range based on the compatibility data. Further, per Sec. 16-20A.009 (6) “ In addition to the setback requirements in section 16-20A.006(9), in no case shall any portion of a building be closer to a public sidewalk than any portion of any contributing building of like use on the block face. The proposed 21.89-foot front yard setback is closer than any contributing structure, and with the front porch places the structure only 14 feet from the front property line. The minimum permissible front yard setback is 24’. The Applicant shall revise the proposed front yard setback to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(9) and Sec. 16-20A.009 (6). The Applicant shall revise the proposed rear yard setback to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(9).

### **Foundation Height and Overall Height**

The height of the first floor above street level shall meet the compatibility rule. The proposed foundation height is 3'. Per the compatibility study submitted by the Applicant no contributing structure on the block face has a foundation height less than 3'2". The Applicant shall raise the proposed foundation height to meet the compatibility rule.

Overall height is also subject to the compatibility rule. The compatibility data shows the heights of the contributing structure on the block face to be 22', 22', 25', and 27.5'. Staff has concerned with the listed height of 218 Estoria Street, based on a physical examination of the structure, and requires additional documentation of how this height measurement was obtained to ensure it is consistent and does not include grading of the land from street level. Further, Sec. 16-20A.006 (6)(c) requires, "In any instance where one contributing building of the same architectural style and like use on a block face is higher or wider by more than ten percent than any other contributing building of like use on a block face, such structure shall be eliminated in the application of the compatibility rule." This item, if accurately measured falls at 10%, so accuracy is necessary to determine if it is even an allowable data point. A difference of almost three feet in height would require substantial redesign of the proposed structure. The Applicant shall supply documentation of how the height measurements were obtained. The Applicant shall revise the proposed height to meet the compatibility rule within the parameters of Sec. 16-20A.006 (6)(c).

### **Roof Form and Pitch**

Per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(c)(1) "The shape and pitch of roofs, as well as ridge, dormer, overhang, and soffit construction shall meet the compatibility rule." The proposed roof does not comply. All contributing structures on the block face have pyramidal roofs with a gabled front porch. The proposed house is side gabled with front and rear dormers. Further the pitch data given for the roofs appears to focus on the front porch gabled portions rather than the primary roof form. This design is completely incompatible with the existing contributing structures and must be completely revised. This coupled with Staff's concerns over overall height, massing, and façade organization will likely require extensive redesign. The proposed chimney does meet the requirements of the zoning code.

Further, the proposed structure would have dormers on the front and rear, which are also subject to the compatibility rule. One contributing structure on the block face does have a dormer. However, Sec. 16-20A.009 (10) requires, "(b)Dormers shall not be permitted on the front façade of cottage housing unless original to the structure." And (c)A "single dormer may be permitted on one secondary elevation of cottage housing if it is placed to minimize its visibility from the public rights-of-way." The proposed dormer configuration would not be permitted by the code. The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof design and pitch to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(c)(1). The Applicant shall revise the proposed dormer configuration to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.009 (10).

### **Fenestration**

The code requires that “windows shall be predominantly vertical in proportion, shall not be constructed in combination of more than two units, and shall be double-hung wood sash with true divided lights. Window organization and fenestration patterns shall meet the compatibility rule.” Staff has significant concerns with the proposed fenestration. The proposal is for a random assortment of window styles, sizes, and shapes. On the front façade a grouping of three windows is proposed, which is in direct violation of this code section. Based on the existing housing stock the predominant window style is a wood-framed, double-hung, one-over-one sash. The oriel, fanlight, and other forms of windows are all completely inappropriate and do not meet the requirements of the zoning code. The fenestration patterning on the side elevations has to be completely revised and simplified to match the existing fenestration patterning present on the block face. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to only utilize one-over-one, double-hung windows on the structure. The Applicant shall remove any window groupings larger than two units to meet the requirements of the code. The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration to more accurately reflect the historic fenestration patterning present on existing contributing structures.

### **Porch**

Porch design is subject to the compatibility rule. Staff notes that the proposed partial width does comply with the requirements, however, the integrated roof does not. As noted above the style which predominates is a gable on hip, with an independent porch roof. The proposed columns are too highly decorative, as are the intricate balustrades. The design should be revised to utilize simple turned porch supports which meet the compatibility rule, a balustrade of two-part, butt-joint construction, and tongue-in-groove flooring. The materiality of the porch steps is also not noted on the plans. The Applicant shall revise the proposed porch supports to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant shall revise the proposed balustrade design to utilize only a simple, two-part, butt-joint construction balustrade. The Applicant shall note the materiality of the porch steps on the elevations. The Applicant shall utilize tongue-in-groove wooden flooring for the porch.

### **Site Work, Accessory Structure, & Swimming Pool**

No clarity on what alterations to existing sidewalk, steps, and retaining walls will be made. No walkway has been provided, which is required by the code. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to existing hardscape features. The Applicant will add a walkway connecting the front porch and the sidewalk.

The Applicant proposes a free-standing garage. The proposed structure would be 19 feet in height, which does meet the requirements of the code for an accessory structure. The placement of the structure does not. Sec. 16-20A.006 (16) (a) requires, “Carriage houses, tool and garden sheds, greenhouses, private garages and similar structures shall be unattached, located to the rear of the

principal building within the buildable area of the lot, and shall not project beyond the front of the principal building. In addition, they shall be located in the least visible location within permissible areas. The commission may require screening with appropriate plant or fence materials if said structure is visible from the public right-of-way.” The placement of this structure is addressed in Variance CA3-24-363. Staff would note that the allowable structure is highly based on the proposed principal structure. Given the degree of changes required to the present design the accessory structure may necessitate a revised design as well.

The Applicant also proposes a swimming pool at the rear of the property. Sec. 16-20A.009 (4)(a) requires, “In-ground swimming pools and similar active recreation facilities subject to the following limitations. Such active recreation facilities in any yard, required or other, adjacent to a street shall require a special exception from the commission, which special exception shall be granted only upon finding that:1.The location will not be objectionable to occupants of neighboring property, or the neighborhood in general, by reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic, and the applicant shall contact the adjoining neighbors about the special exception and provide written letters to the commission from the adjoining neighbors regarding the propriety of the special exception.2.The area for such activity could not reasonably be located elsewhere on the lot.3.The commission may condition any special exception for such facilities based on concerns regarding visibility from public right-of-way, fencing, screening, or other buffering, existence and/or location of lighting, hours of use, and such other matters as are reasonably required to ameliorate any potential negative impacts of the proposed facility on adjoining property owners.: No special exception application has been filed for this swimming pool. As such, Staff cannot approve the proposal without adherence to the requirements of the code to file a separate application for a special exception. The Applicant shall file a special exception application to allow for active recreation use.

The Applicant has submitted a revised site plan and design. Given the denial of Variance CA3-24-363 the rear setback has been revised to meet the compatibility rule. The garage has been reduced to a single car garage with an office space above, which would be permitted by the code. Its proposed height of 19 feet is shorter than the principal structure, but unfortunately Condition #7 has not been addressed. Staff is not confident that the tallest structure on the block face is actually 27.5 feet in height as the compatibility study states, and the Applicant has not responded with data on how these heights were obtained. The driveway and walkway are in compliance, but the question of existing site conditions was not addressed. Overall, the structure is still of major concern. The roof form and massing do not meet the compatibility rule, which brings a number of other features also into question. Staff has enumerated the issue below in regards to each condition. The majority of comments still remain unaddressed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the October 23, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to Address the Following:**

- 1.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to utilize a form and massing compatible with the contributing structure on the block face. The form proposed utilizes a roof form and massing that is not found anywhere on the block face. As previously noted the



- cottage form of 186 and 182 Estoria is what predominates on the blockface, and should be used for guidance as to the appropriate design of new construction.
- 2.) The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials to be utilized on the structure. **No materials have been submitted.**
  - 3.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed front yard setback to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(9) and Sec. 16-20A.009 (6). **The front yard setback is 22.5 feet on the revised design, which still does not meet the compatibility rule.**
  - 4.) The Applicant shall raise the proposed foundation height to meet the compatibility rule. **Not continuous, less than a foot in some areas even if the porch height measures at 2.5 feet**
  - 5.) The Applicant shall supply documentation of how the height measurements were obtained. **No information has been submitted, as the height is still based on the tallest structure on the block face, Staff still has significant concerns that this height may not be permitted.**
  - 6.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed height to meet the compatibility rule within the parameters of Sec. 16-20A.006 (6)(c). **See note on Condition #7**
  - 7.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof design and pitch to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(c)(1). **The proposed design uses a front-gabled roof, the compatibility rule requires a pyramidal roof.**
  - 8.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed dormer configuration to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.009 (10). **While the front dormer has been revised, the roof form is incorrect so the dormer would still not be permitted as is. The side dormer added is on the left elevation, towards the front of the roof plane, facing the drive, Staff would recommend moving the dormer to the side of the structure away from the driveway to minimize visibility as the code requires.**
  - 9.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to only utilize one-over-one, double-hung windows on the structure.
  - 10.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration to more accurately reflect the historic fenestration patterning present on existing contributing structures. **The only issue Staff sees with the fenestration patterning is the use of a large fixed window on the right elevation and transom window on the rear elevation. These must be removed and replaced with a double-hung windows to match the remaining windows on the structure.**
  - 11.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to existing hardscape features. **No details have been given**
  - 12.) The Applicant shall submit all revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next scheduled hearing of the Urban Design Commission where the item is on the agenda.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File

**Variance CA3-24-263 Denial Confirmed August 28, 2024**

The Applicant requests a variance to allow the placement of an accessory structure in a location where it otherwise would be prohibited.

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

The Applicant cites that the property depth and required setbacks make the construction of an accessory structure (garage) in addition to a principal structure difficult.

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

The Applicant cites the required setbacks as an unnecessary hardship.

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

The Applicant cites the required setbacks (24 feet: front yard, 3 feet: left yard, 8 feet: right yard, and 3 feet: rear yard).

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 allowing an accessory structure (garage) to be built will be safer for the homeowners offering off street parking and maintain consistency of the streetscape.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request does not meet the criteria for granting a variance. Given the proposed design for the principal structure does not meet the requirements of the zoning code, and no accessory structure can be built until a compliant principal structure is constructed, Staff cannot support the proposed variance. The overall design does not use the allowable setbacks, and a design which does not comply with the setbacks, before a variance is even considered, should not be granted further relief. Staff does not find that the Applicant has established the existence of a hardship that is particular to the size, shape, and topography of the lot. The lot is no shallower than the adjacent lots, measuring 50 feet in width, and between 104 and 108 feet in depth. No element of non-conformity of the lot has been established and Staff does not find that an argument has been made for hardship. Further placement of the accessory structure is based largely on a desire for a swimming pool in the rear yard, which requires a special exception to the code which has neither been applied for, nor granted. The wide range of issues with the proposed design further complicate the variance, as in addition to not meeting the criteria as outlined above, the design will likely have to change substantially for the other proposed elements to meet the requirements of the zoning code. As such, Staff does not support the proposed variance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

Andre Dickens  
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince  
Commissioner

Doug Young  
Interim Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 987 Lawton  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-047  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024 Deferred on August 28, 2025

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Historic Oakland City **Other Zoning:** R-4Aand/ Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1947

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Applicant was denied without prejudiced from a previous application CA3-24-047. The Applicant should address all concerns pertaining from that review.

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

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

**EDITS in RED for June 12<sup>th</sup>**  
**Corrected REVISIONS in GREEN for September 25, 2024**

**SCOPE OF WORK**

The Applicant proposes to construct an addition, do front porch alteration, and build a rear deck addition.

**Staff have learned of the added work, reflecting it in this staff report, shown in RED.**

**PLANS**

While the setbacks are shown, the lot coverage and FAR are not. The FAR and lot coverage are important to ensure the addition complies. Staff recommend the Applicant show FAR and Lot Coverage on the final site plan.

Floor plans and Exterior elevations

The floor plans and exterior elevations do not match exactly. Staff recommend the Applicant.

**Chimney**

**The Applicant negated to show the chimney on both the existing and proposed. Staff recommend the chimney be shown in its respective locations and be retained in both locations.**

**The Applicant has made this correction.**

**ADDITION**

The Applicant had proposed an additional 950 sqft to the house for more livable space. The site plan and elevations show the addition will sit behind the existing house and roof ridge engages the existing roof ridge in a meaningful way to where it does not exceed it. The proposed roof material is shingle to match the existing. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

***Siding***

The proposed siding material is listed as cementitious siding. District regulations permit cementitious siding on new construction and additions; however, the cementitious siding must be smooth faced. Staff also recommend the siding has a reveal matches the existing siding; from 4 to 6 inches.

**Staff recommendation has changed somewhat. The cementitious siding for the addition does not bother Staff. The recommendation for the 4-to reveal, still stands. Staff would reason the original siding would be wood. Staff recommend if that original on the existing house need repair or replace in-kind to match the original siding after Staff review photos.**

**While the Applicant notes cementitious siding as the siding on the addition , it must be between 4 to 6 inches in reveal and that must be noted on the plans. Staff stand on the original wood siding to be repaired in-kind to match the original siding and note that on the plans.**

## **Windows**

The proposed window on the addition is shown as one-over-one on the left elevation and one single window on the right elevation. however, re not concerned with the proposed windows, while not exact windows as the existing house, the proposed are similar style of the one over one, however without the muntins or mullions.

**Research has shown that the full-size windows double hung wood windows not 1/1 as Staff originally thought. An unauthorize change happened some time back. On the left elevations, the 3/1 are not shown. Staff recommendations for windows have changed and are as follows: Staff recommend that all original shape, size and style should be retained.**

## **Trim**

**All original wood trim shall be retained or repaired in-kind.**

**Staff stand on the recommend of the windows in red and trim.**

## ***Foundation***

The proposed foundation on the addition is listed an 8-inches CMU. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

## ***Deck***

The proposed deck is not problematic. The deck will sit behind the house and will not exceed any setbacks.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### ***Front Porch***

The existing porch is a stoop with a gable roof. Research photos show construction not to be original to the house, so the reconstruction of the porch is not concerning particularly because the Applicant is proposing a stoop with a gable roof. Research indicates there are several gable roofs over stoops as well as shed roofs over stoops. The proposed stoop porch is consistent with an American Small house.

**The railing on the front porch shall be a two-part butt-joined construction with no higher than the bottom of the windowsill and noted on the plans.**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

## **SITE WORK**

### **Driveway**

**The Applicant has not indicated doing anything to the driveway, however, Staff does recommend if the Applicant decides to repair or replace the driveway, the comply with the District regulations which states, the Drive up to 10ft minus the flair and extend back 20 feet pass the front house.**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

### **Sidewalk**

**The Applicant is required to install a sidewalk according to District regulations. Staff recommend the sidewalk comply to the District regulation which states, “ The sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.”**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

### **Walkway**

**The Applicant has not indicated or shown on the plans. Staff recommend the Applicant show or provide a walkway from the front entry to the sidewalk.**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

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

1. FAR and lot coverage shall be listed on the site plan, per Sec.16-20M;
2. The interior elevations along with the exterior elevations shall match, per Sec.16-20M;
3. The cementitious siding reveal shall be between 4 to 6 inches, per Sec.16-20M.013(q);
4. The original wood siding shall be repaired or replaced in-kind and noted on the plans, per Sec.16-20M.013(q);
5. All windows shall be depicted accurately on the existing and proposed plans existing wood window (6/6) shall be placed on the plans, per Sec. 16-20M013(0);
6. The full-sized windows are double hung and wood and 6/6 or 1/1, the Applicant shall depict this on the plans and be retained, repaired or replaced in-kind after showing photographic evidence, per Sec.16-20M.013(o);
7. All original wood windows shall be retained their size and shape, per Sec.16-20M.13(o)(2);
8. All original trim shall be retained or repaired in-kind, per 16-20M;
9. The front porch railings shall be constructed with a two-part butt-joined, no higher than the bottom of windowsill, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
10. If the driveway is to be replaced or repaired, the driveway shall be 10ft wide minus the flair and extend 20ft beyond the front house, per Sec.16-20M.12(4)(c)
11. The Applicant shall install a sidewalk that follows the District regulations, which states, sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, which is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than 6-ft wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal, pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint or brick, per Sec16-20M.13(2)(c)
12. The Applicant shall install a walkway from the entry of the house to the sideway, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)
13. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA3-24-381 for 987 Lawton  
September 25, 2024  
Page 5 of 5

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  
Interim Director  
OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 987 Lawton  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-047  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024 Deferred on August 28, 2025

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Historic Oakland City **Other Zoning:** R-4Aand/ Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1947

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Applicant was denied without prejudiced from a previous application CA3-24-047. The Applicant should address all concerns pertaining from that review.

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

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



**EDITS in RED for June 12<sup>th</sup>**  
**Corrected REVISIONS in GREEN for September 25, 2024**

**SCOPE OF WORK**

The Applicant proposes to construct an addition, do front porch alteration, and build a rear deck addition.

**Staff have learned of the added work, reflecting it in this staff report, shown in RED.**

**PLANS**

While the setbacks are shown, the lot coverage and FAR are not. The FAR and lot coverage are important to ensure the addition complies. Staff recommend the Applicant show FAR and Lot Coverage on the final site plan.

Floor plans and Exterior elevations

The floor plans and exterior elevations do not match exactly. Staff recommend the Applicant.

**Chimney**

**The Applicant negated to show the chimney on both the existing and proposed. Staff recommend the chimney be shown in its respective locations and be retained in both locations.**

**The Applicant has made this correction.**

**ADDITION**

The Applicant had proposed an additional 950 sqft to the house for more livable space. The site plan and elevations show the addition will sit behind the existing house and roof ridge engages the existing roof ridge in a meaningful way to where it does not exceed it. The proposed roof material is shingle to match the existing. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

***Siding***

The proposed siding material is listed as cementitious siding. District regulations permit cementitious siding on new construction and additions; however, the cementitious siding must be smooth faced. Staff also recommend the siding has a reveal matches the existing siding; from 4 to 6 inches.

**Staff recommendation has changed somewhat. The cementitious siding for the addition does not bother Staff. The recommendation for the 4-to reveal, still stands. Staff would reason the original siding would be wood. Staff recommend if that original on the existing house need repair or replace in-kind to match the original siding after Staff review photos.**

**While the Applicant notes cementitious siding as the siding on the addition , it must be between 4 to 6 inches in reveal and that must be noted on the plans. Staff stand on the original wood siding to be repaired in-kind to match the original siding and note that on the plans.**

## **Windows**

The proposed window on the addition is shown as one-over-one on the left elevation and one single window on the right elevation. however, re not concerned with the proposed windows, while not exact windows as the existing house, the proposed are similar style of the one over one, however without the muntins or mullions.

**Research has shown that the full-size windows double hung wood windows not 1/1 as Staff originally thought. An unauthorize change happened some time back. On the left elevations, the 3/1 are not shown. Staff recommendations for windows have changed and are as follows: Staff recommend that all original shape, size and style should be retained.**

## **Trim**

**All original wood trim shall be retained or repaired in-kind.**

**Staff stand on the recommend of the windows in red and trim.**

## ***Foundation***

The proposed foundation on the addition is listed an 8-inches CMU. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

## ***Deck***

The proposed deck is not problematic. The deck will sit behind the house and will not exceed any setbacks.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### ***Front Porch***

The existing porch is a stoop with a gable roof. Research photos show construction not to be original to the house, so the reconstruction of the porch is not concerning particularly because the Applicant is proposing a stoop with a gable roof. Research indicates there are several gable roofs over stoops as well as shed roofs over stoops. The proposed stoop porch is consistent with an American Small house.

**The railing on the front porch shall be a two-part butt-joined construction with no higher than the bottom of the windowsill and noted on the plans.**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

## **SITE WORK**

### **Driveway**

**The Applicant has not indicated doing anything to the driveway, however, Staff does recommend if the Applicant decides to repair or replace the driveway, the comply with the District regulations which states, the Drive up to 10ft minus the flair and extend back 20 feet pass the front house.**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

### **Sidewalk**

**The Applicant is required to install a sidewalk according to District regulations. Staff recommend the sidewalk comply to the District regulation which states, “ The sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.”**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

### **Walkway**

**The Applicant has not indicated or shown on the plans. Staff recommend the Applicant show or provide a walkway from the front entry to the sidewalk.**

**Staff stand on the recommendation shown in red.**

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

1. FAR and lot coverage shall be listed on the site plan, per Sec.16-20M;
2. The interior elevations along with the exterior elevations shall match, per Sec.16-20M;
3. The cementitious siding reveal shall be between 4 to 6 inches, per Sec.16-20M.013(q);
4. The original wood siding shall be repaired or replaced in-kind and noted on the plans, per Sec.16-20M.013(q);
5. All windows shall be depicted accurately on the existing and proposed plans existing wood window (6/6) shall be placed on the plans, per Sec. 16-20M013(0);
6. The full-sized windows are double hung and wood and 6/6 or 1/1, the Applicant shall depict this on the plans and be retained, repaired or replaced in-kind after showing photographic evidence, per Sec.16-20M.013(o);
7. All original wood windows shall be retained their size and shape, per Sec.16-20M.13(o)(2);
8. All original trim shall be retained or repaired in-kind, per 16-20M;
9. The front porch railings shall be constructed with a two-part butt-joined, no higher than the bottom of windowsill, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
10. If the driveway is to be replaced or repaired, the driveway shall be 10ft wide minus the flair and extend 20ft beyond the front house, per Sec.16-20M.12(4)(c)
11. The Applicant shall install a sidewalk that follows the District regulations, which states, sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, which is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than 6-ft wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal, pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint or brick, per Sec16-20M.13(2)(c)
12. The Applicant shall install a walkway from the entry of the house to the sideway, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)
13. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA3-24-381 for 987 Lawton  
September 25, 2024  
Page 5 of 5

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:** 677 Gaskill  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-422  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Cabbagetown Landmark District (subarea 3)      **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West of Tye Street and East of Powell Street

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations to Structure and Building of Accessory Structure

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** No Interior.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None, known.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** Approval

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

### **Sitting Room and Sunroom**

The proposal is to remove an existing deck to allow for a sitting room/sunroom. The 284 sf will meet the required FAR max of .50 at .47.40. The roofline tucks under the continuous hip roofline on the existing house with an 8:12 pitch that matches the existing pitches. A proposed skylight will sit on top of the roof that should not be seen from the street because it sits in the rear. Staff are not concerned with the proposed sitting room and sunroom.

### **Guesthouse**

The proposed 480 guest house also meets the FAR requirements. It proposes to be in the rear, detached, does not project beyond the front of the principal structure nor from reading the site plan can be established in the buildable area somewhere else on the property. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

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

### **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:** 391 Park Avenue SE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-382 & CA3-24-383  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** Vacant lot

**Property Location:** West block face of Park Avenue SE, directly north of Interstate 20

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** N/A

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New construction of a principal structure on an existing vacant lot (CA3-24-382); Variance request for front yard setback (CA3-24-383)

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, subject case was deferred at the August 28<sup>th</sup> UDC Hearing and placed on the agenda for the September 25<sup>th</sup> UDC Hearing.

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** CA3-24-382: Approval;  
CA3-24-383: Approval with Conditions

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

**Variance (CA3-24-383)**

The Applicant is requesting a Variance to defer from the Grant Park Historic District regulations for Front Yard setbacks, *Sec. 16-20K.007.(1)(A)ii*. Front yard setbacks shall either: ~~i) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use;~~ or ii) shall be no closer to the street than the closest and no farther from the street than the farthest contributing structure of like use on that side of the block.

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

The Applicant cites the irregular shape of the lot; narrow towards the east and significantly wider towards the west.

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 the lot is unbuildable if front yard setback requirements fall within those of contributing structures on the same block face.

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

The Applicant points out that the lot has approximate frontages of 19 feet at the street, 39 feet at the rear alley, and a length of 198 feet. The Applicant claims that in order to achieve a building width of 16 feet and 6 inches, the proposed front yard setback must be approximately 101 feet, 35 feet at the rear yard, and 7 feet at side yards.

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 indicates that Park Avenue does not reach the highway wall, and the lot slopes downward toward the rear, preventing street visibility of the proposed building.

Due to the shape and topography of the lot, it appears that the Applicant has attempted to place the new construction in a location that will cause the least amount of disturbance to neighboring properties. As a result of the existing lot and the district code, the homeowner is constrained in what they may construct on the lot. As such, Staff finds the request for a Variance to be appropriate for this proposal and is in support of the request.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**



**New Construction (CA3-24-382)**

The Applicant is proposing a new construction on the vacant lot at 391 Park Avenue SE. New construction would consist of a three-story residential home on a two-foot CMU foundation covered with stucco. In addition to the horizontal lap siding, there will be a gabled asphalt shingle roof, a single front porch, and a two-story rear deck. The proposed principal structure appears to comply with the Design Standards and Criteria for New Principal Structures in the Grant Park Historic District Code. Staff has reviewed the submitted plans and verified that they comply with the requirements of the Design Standards and Criteria for New Principal Structures. However, Staff finds it worth noting to point out the absence of an in-kind sidewalk consistent with the existing sidewalk on the block face. Staff recommends that the Applicant revise the site plan for the project to include brick herringbone sidewalks consistent with those on the rest of the district's sidewalks.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall revise site plan to include brick herringbone pattern sidewalk consistent with the rest of the district's sidewalks.

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:** 837 Metropolitan Parkway SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-407  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Adair Park Historic District

**Other Zoning:** C-1

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West block-face of US Interstate-19 and south of Gillette Avenue SW

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations to front facade and driveway

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Subject property received a Stop Work Order (23CAP-00000169) in February 2023 for unpermitted work being done.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** Deferral to October 23<sup>rd</sup> UDC Hearing

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

In February 2023, a Stop Work Order (23CAP-00000169) was issued for unpermitted work on the property at 837 Metropolitan Parkway SW.

The Applicant's plans do not accurately depict the house as it appears today. Consequently, Staff believes that one final deferral should be granted to the Applicant in order to bring the plans into compliance. The property's existing conditions are not in compliance, including an unpermitted parking pad located in the front yard, the removal of character-defining architectural elements, such as the front door archway, and the enclosure of an existing front corner porch.

**Discrepancies in Plans**

As shown in the submitted elevation drawings, the existing gable roof form is not included; instead, a hipped roof form is shown. This is inaccurate and the plans need to be revised in order to show the accurate roof style.

There is a discrepancy in the location of the fenestrations on the façade. Revisions must be made to the plans to ensure that all windows and doors are accurately positioned.

The drawings fail to include the existing porch at the corner of the front façade. The plans should be revised to include the character-defining front corner porch.

The site plan does not accurately depict the location and dimensions of the driveway and walkway, nor does the plan include a proposal to eliminate the unpermitted and noncompliant parking pad. Existing plans must be revised to accurately depict the location and measurements of the driveway and walkway, and proposed plans must include the removal of the non-compliant parking pad. The plans submitted appear to propose increasing the width of the driveway, which is not permitted.

In the plans, the existing historic chimney is missing. This needs to be added and it must be demonstrated that it will remain.

**Staff Conclusion**

To provide the Applicant with additional time to provide revisions, Staff recommends one final deferral to the October 23rd UDC Hearing. As the existing elevations are not accurate, Staff is unable to review this application as it stands. Since the elevations do not correspond to the actual conditions, it would be unfeasible to make any recommendations on the basis of the submitted elevations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to October 23<sup>rd</sup> UDC Hearing**

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:** 858 Oakdale Road NE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-391  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1915

**Property Location:** Northwest block face of Oakdale Road NE, southwest of The By Way NE

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations to existing accessory structure, rear corner addition to principal structure, proposed covered porch attaching the principal structure to accessory structure

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** Approval with Conditions

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

The proposed project includes renovating an accessory structure located in the rear yard of 858 Oakdale Road NE, and constructing an open porch roof over the existing concrete slab to connect the accessory structure with the main structure. Among the modifications that would be made to the accessory structure is the addition of a garden/mud room, the creation of a new entryway, the installation of a brick chimney, the installation of new siding, the addition of new dormers, and the replacement of the roofing material. Since the proposed modifications are made to an accessory structure that is not historically significant, and do not alter the historical character or integrity of the contributing principal structure, they are considered in compliance with the Druid Hills Landmark District Code.

An open porch roof is proposed over the existing concrete slab that connects the principal and accessory structures. The porch roof is proposed to be supported by columns that match the height of those located outside the family room window of the principal structure. As this area would not be enclosed to become an air-conditioned space, it would not be considered an addition. The total increase in impervious surface area would be 424 square feet, increasing the existing impervious surface area to 13,569 square feet, or 23% of the lot area. Staff has no issues or concerns with this proposal.

Overall, Staff has no concerns with these plans, since the historical character and integrity of the contributing principal structure remain unaffected. One concern Staff found was on page L.1.1 of the project plan set, where it mentions the widening of the existing driveway. Staff suggests that the applicant revise the plans to address the concerns raised in this note, as parking and driveways shall not exceed 35 percent of the lot area.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. Applicant shall revise page L-1.1 of the plans to clarify how much the driveway is to be widened and ensure that it does not exceed 35 percent of the lot area, per Sec. 16-20B.006.(4).

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:** 1081 Peoples Street SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-24-376  
**MEETING DATE:** September 25, 2024

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District      **Other Zoning:** R-4A

**Date of Construction:** 1943

**Property Location:** Northwest block face of Peoples Street SW, southwest of the White Oak Avenue intersection

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Rebuild of contributing structure

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes, deferred at August 28<sup>th</sup> and September 11<sup>th</sup> UDC Hearings

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The parcel at 1081 Peoples Street SW was subject to a Stop Work Order (21CAP-00001718) in November 2021 due to an unpermitted demolition of a contributing residential home. An application was filed (CA3-21-628) for a new construction with a rear addition. This case was heard at the January 12, 2022, UDC Hearing and was denied, as the Applicant did not have a demolition permit.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:** Denial without Prejudice

CA3-24-376 for 1081 Peebles Street SW  
September 25, 2024  
Page 2 of 2

**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.

The Application (CA3-24-376) proposes new construction on the now vacant lot at 1081 Peebles Street SW. As the demolition of the previous contributing historic home was not permitted, the Applicant will be required to obtain a demolition permit in addition to a permit for the new construction. No work can take place until these are obtained.

The unpermitted demolition of a contributing home necessitates that any new construction be as similar as possible to the previous historic structure. A revised set of plans from the Applicant shows in-kind components but does not sufficiently resemble the home previously there. There have been two deferrals given due to revisions that need to be made to the plans. The existing plans are still missing crucial components, for example, a site plan of the previous residence on the lot is missing, which is necessary in order to verify the exact position of the residence. As a result of the two previous deferrals and the incompatibility of the proposed plans, Staff recommends that the Application be denied without prejudice.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice**

Cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File