



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE

Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS

MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

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

DOUG YOUNG

Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 141 Pearl Street SE

APPLICATION: CA3-24-436

MEETING DATE: October 9, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: HC-20A, SA3

Other Zoning: Beltline

Date of Construction: 1991

Property Location: West side of Pearl Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: variance to permit a poured concrete driveway that does not consist of two tire track ribbons

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 23CAP-00000489, 23CAP-00001049, CA2S-23-266, CA2-23-325, CA3-24-253

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

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

Variance CA3-24-436

The Applicant requests a variance to permit a poured concrete driveway that does not consist of two tire track ribbons as required by the District zoning regulations;

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

The Applicant cites the non-conforming dimensions of the lot, which create a narrower lot. This limits the options for placement and design of a driveway.

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

The Applicant cites the existing topography, which limits the placement of a drive, as well as the non-conformity of the lot, particularly the placement of the house on the lot.

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

The Applicant cites the non-contributing nature of the house, which was built in the contemporary era as contributing to the non-conformity of the lot, making compliance impossible in terms of driveway design.

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

The Applicant states that the project will not negatively impact the public good or impair the purposes or intent of the zoning ordinance, as the features are already existing and the alterations would bring the driveway width, if not design into compliance.

IN general, Staff finds that the Applicant's request meets the criteria for granting a variance.

While there is no underlying zoning in the Cabbagetown Landmark District, and the Applicant's claims of non-conformity are incorrect (the lot is 55 feet in width, wider than an average residential lot), Staff finds that the proposal, which reduces the width of the driveway to 10 feet by separating the walkway from the driveway addresses major concerns. Given the topography of the lot, and the placement of the principle structure the driveway placement is limited, resulting in a drive on

CA3-24-436 141 Pearl Street SE

October 9, 2024

Page 3 of 3

the steepest topography on the lot. To convert the design to paved strips as the zoning code requires, does limit the ability to have a functional drive due to the existing conditions present on the lot. As such, Staff recommends approval of the proposed variance with the site plan, as proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 557 West End Place SW

APPLICATION: CA3-24-260

MEETING DATE: October 9, 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, August 28, and September 25, 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.

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 plan has been revised, and Staff is satisfied that the scale has been corrected to be accurate. However, the proposed lot coverage of 3,522 square feet far exceeds the allowable lot coverage at 64%. While the FAR is still acceptable at 42%, the overall coverage is not and must be reduced to not exceed 55% or 3,025 square feet.

Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(g) requires, “New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.” There is one new window proposed on the right elevation addition that is significantly smaller than the existing windows. The Applicant shall revise the proposed window on the right elevation to all be of the same size. Further, on the upper level no windows have been added. The Applicant shall revise the proposed addition design to add fenestration on the upper level, right elevation.

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 shall reduce the allowable lot coverage to not exceed 55%.
- 3.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed window on the right elevation to all be of the same size.
- 4.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed addition design to add fenestration on the upper level, right elevation.
- 5.) 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

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: October 9, 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)?: Yes, deferred September 11, 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. 16-20Q 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-20th 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.

The Applicant has submitted a revised plan which further expands the front stoop, while it maintains the step orientation, it is still an addition. Staff fails to see how this is an improvement over simply repairing the existing steps as the number of steps has actually increased with the proposal. None of the requested topographic information addressing why egress could not be provided in the rear was included, and a new proposed walkway is not included in the proposed lot coverage. No materials have been submitted for the railing or steps, and Staff does not consider the proposed addition to be appropriate.

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. **No new**

materials addressing the need for replacement or an evaluation of the windows by a profession has been supplied.

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. Staff is comfortable with the replacement of the front 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. **The proposed garage door replacement is appropriate.**

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 shall retain the historic security door.
- 6.) 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: 214 Estoria Street SE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-362 (New Construction) & 363 (Variance)
MEETING DATE: August 28, 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)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: CA3-24-362 (New Construction):
Deferral until the September 25, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission
CA3-24-363 (Variance): Denial

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

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 not comply with these 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the September 25, 2024, hearing of the Ruban 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.
- 2.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to remove incongruous design elements.
- 3.) The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials to be utilized on the structure.
- 4.) 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).
- 5.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed rear yard setback to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(9).
- 6.) The Applicant shall raise the proposed foundation height to meet the compatibility rule.
- 7.) The Applicant shall supply documentation of how the height measurements were obtained.
- 8.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed height to meet the compatibility rule within the parameters of Sec. 16-20A.006 (6)(c).
- 9.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof design and pitch to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(c)(1).

- 10.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed dormer configuration to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20A.009 (10).
- 11.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to only utilize one-over-one, double-hung windows on the structure.
- 12.) The Applicant shall remove any window groupings larger than two units to meet the requirements of the code.
- 13.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed fenestration to more accurately reflect the historic fenestration patterning present on existing contributing structures.
- 14.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed porch supports to meet the compatibility rule.
- 15.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed balustrade design to utilize only a simple, two-part, butt-joint construction balustrade.
- 16.) The Applicant shall note the materiality of the porch steps on the elevations.
- 17.) The Applicant shall utilize tongue-in-groove wooden flooring for the porch.
- 18.) The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in relation to existing hardscape features.
- 19.) The Applicant will add a walkway connecting the front porch and the sidewalk.
- 20.) The Applicant shall file a special exception application to allow for active recreation use.
- 21.) 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

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 57 Waverly Way
APPLICATION: CA3-24-437
MEETING DATE: October 9, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1904

Property Location: West of Dekalb Avenue and East of Edgewood Ave.

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20L

Deferred Application (Y/N)? NO

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop work placed on the property 12/12/23 for work taking place without a permit.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions.

ADDITION

Roofline

A new gable roofline with exposed rafters and new shingles is being proposed, extending to the rear. The new roofline does not exceed the existing roofline. The exposed are not necessary however, Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Dormer

The Applicant proposes to add a double gable dormer to the house. Staff are not concerned with the dormer being on the house because the ridge does not exceed the existing roof line. However, the double gable dormer is a bit ornate for a simple Craftsman style house. Staff would recommend the dormer not be a double gable but instead the Applicant install a single dormer that would match a Craftsman house.

Siding

The existing siding will remain and the new siding on the addition is proposed at 6 inches lap siding to match the existing. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Porch and Stairs

The Applicant proposes to install a new open rear porch with a roof; new wood columns with 5 width steel posts and steel stairs. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

SITE WORK

The Applicant proposes to continue the look of the exiting tile terrace as a walkway to the driveway at the rear of the structure. Staff are not concerned with the proposal because this site work will be at the rear of the property and cannot be seen from the public-right-away. The Applicant has not shown this on a site plan or survey. Staff recommend that the Applicant submit a site plan that shows the extended walkway.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall employ a single gable dormer to be consistent with a Craftsman style house, per Sec.16-20L.006(q)(vi):
2. The Applicant shall submit a site plan that shows the extended walkway as proposed, Sec.16-20L and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 821 Oakdale Road
APPLICATION: CA3-24-448
MEETING DATE: October 9, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Carriage built in 1990s.

Property Location: East of Ponce De Leon

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: The secondary house (Carriage House) alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Applicant has shown the current carriage house is not original, therefore is not contributing.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions.

Carriage House

The Applicant proposes to change the exterior stair railings to a new design; enclosure of an open porch on the rear for storage; the siding material match the existing lap siding. The Applicant has shown the existing carriage house is not original and has renovated in 1990 prior to the District's Landmark Designation.

The stair railings depart from a traditional two-part construction employing wood slats with ½ inches air space between the stairs with IPE handrail and treads and risers. Staff reason because the carriage house is not original to the property and has been altered, it has no historical significance and the proposal is not creating any addition, this work is fine. As well, being that the carriage house is at the rear of the property and cannot be seen from the public-right-away, Staff are not concerned.

Windows

The plans also show the Applicant proposes to replace windows at the upper level that will allow for better insulation and meet egress requirements. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Garage Doors

The current garage doors are aluminum, and the Applicant proposes to replace them with Craftsman style doors. Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Site Work

The Applicant proposes to continue the look of the exiting tile terrace as a walkway to the driveway at the rear of the structure. While Staff are not concerned with the proposal because this site work will be at the rear of the property and cannot be seen from the public-right-away, the Applicant has not shown this on a site plan or survey. Staff recommend that Applicant submit a site plan that show the extended walkway.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall turn in a site plan that show the tile walkway to the driveway, per Sec.16-20B and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 966 Tennyson
APPLICATION: RC-24-435
MEETING DATE: October 9, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Located in the interior of Tennyson Dr and Brookview Drive, NW

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Playground

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Playground equipment and site improvements.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections:

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Comments delivered and adopted at the Urban Design Commission.

Proposal

The Applicant proposes to upgrade the park's playground and walkways. The work will include addressing stormwater problems; installation of new playground materials; improve drainage issues;

RC-24-435 for 966 Tennyson Drive

October 9, 2024

Page 2 of 2

and installation of ADA access to the park and other park amenities. Staff applaud the playground material the Applicant has chosen with smooth edges and plastic surfaces and coverage for shade, a climbing wall and many other amenities that could delight kids.

The improvement in drainage and stormwater issues is much needed work that cannot be ignored. ADA accessibility allows for everyone to enjoy the park.

Staff support the renovations.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Comments delivered and adopted at 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: 801 Sherwood Circle NE (Sidney Marcus Park)
APPLICATION: RC-24-445
MEETING DATE: October 9, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Sec. 16-20

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: circa 1981-82

Property Location: South side of Sherwood Circle NE

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 October 9, 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 Sidney Marcus Park. These improvements would increase accessibility, safety and access for ADA compliance, stabilize and improve the playground equipment, as well as installing infrastructure to improve stormwater management. The improvements include:

- Installation of a new patio with seating
- Removal of curbing to facilitate ADA accessibility
- Adding pervious pavers at entrances
- Installation of stormwater management features
- Regrading and enhancement of the existing playground facilities

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. Improving stormwater management and installation of more pervious surfaces will both benefit the overall environment surrounding the park, as well as enhance visitor experience.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the October 9, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 651 & 652 Green St. (aka 653 Green St)
APPLICATION: RC-24-529
MEETING DATE: 10/09/2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** I-2

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North and south block face of Green St, between the intersections of Reservoir Rd. and Northside Dr.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Installation of new multi-family affordable housing

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043 & Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

RC-24-529 for 651 & 652 Green St.

October 9, 2024

Page 2 of 2

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta & Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Application before the Commission is for the installation of new multi-family housing on City-Owned property that is currently used by the Department of Watershed Management near Northside Drive. The current project is similar in many respects to the previously reviewed project at 184 Forsyth St. (RC-23-359) for rapid installation of affordable housing units and support services. The proposal contains one hundred (100) units of permanently affordable units, along with community space and future plans for the installation of a clinic to serve unhoused individuals recently released from the hospital.

Staff has no general concerns with the design of the vertical construction. However, given the demographic being served by the proposed units, Staff finds that special attention should be paid to the site planning and that coordination of transit services may be necessary to ensure that residents' needs are fully met. The site plan shows the installation of new sidewalks on all street frontages along with a crosswalk and ADA ramps. The closest Marta bus stops are .1 miles and .3 miles from the site. For some trips, residents may need to cross at the intersection of 17th St. and Northside Drive, which would include crossing the westbound slip lane from 17th St. onto Northside Dr. Because of this, Staff finds that there may be a need for coordination with GDOT on crossing improvements, and possibly with MARTA to ensure that residents have safe access to transportation. Further, Staff would suggest that the project team coordinate with the Upper Westside CID if they have not already done so.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the Delivery of Comments at the meeting.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File