



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
Interim Director, Office of Design

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 896 Marion Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA4PH-24-434
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: Southeast of intersection of Marion Avenue SE and Atlanta Avenue SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional Craftsman

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition due to a threat to public health and safety

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, Application was deferred during the October 9th UDC Hearing to the October 23rd UDC Hearing. Following the October 9th hearing, the Applicant had a meeting with Staff to discuss alternative options, as well as request a deferral to the November 13th UDC Hearing. Staff found a deferral to the next UDC Hearing date to be appropriate, in order to give the Applicant sufficient time to find an architect who specializes in historic preservation.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: ~~Deferral to the November 13th, 2024 UDC Hearing.~~ REVISION FOR NOV. 13th UDC HEARING: Approval

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

CA4PH-24-434

Staff Response to the Application Submitted

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists.

The Applicant provides a photographic report along with analysis from licensed professionals documenting the condition of the structure and site. See *Attachment 1*, *Attachment 3*, and *Attachment 4*.

2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.

The Applicant states that there are no reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat, and did not submit an analysis of alternatives. The Applicant states that it is not feasible to renovate the house based on existing conditions and points to an analysis provided by the project architect as evidence of the infeasibility of any alternative to demolition.

3. Demonstrate that the costs associated with rectifying the threat would create a condition whereby the investments in the project are incapable of earning a reasonable economic return. This finding shall be made by considering, and the applicant shall submit to the Commission evidence establishing, each of the following factors:

a) The applicant's knowledge of the landmark designation at the time of acquisition, or whether the property was designated subsequent to acquisition.

The Applicant states that the owners were aware that the home is in a historic district at the time of purchase.

b) The current level of economic return on the property as considered in relation to the following:

(1) The amount paid for the property, the date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased.

The Applicant states the property was purchased on June 21, 2024, for \$295,000 from the previous owner, Ashley Ann Garland. The Applicant states that there was no relationship between them and the seller other than the purchase of the property. The Applicant included all additional information regarding the purchase of the home in *Attachment 2*.

(2) The annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and

depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.

The Applicant states that, to their knowledge, there has been no annual gross or net income from the property in the last 3 years. The Applicant states that operating and maintenance expenses are unknown, and depreciation is unknown as well.

(3) Remaining balance on any mortgage of other financing secured by the property and annual debt service, if any, during the prior three (3) years.

The Applicant has stated there is no remaining balance on any mortgage for the property.

4. Real estate taxes for the previous four (4) years and assessed value of the property according to the two (2) most recent assessed valuations.

The Applicant has provided city and county tax history for the past 4 years (*see Attachment 6*) and has provided valuations from tax years 2022, 2023, and 2024.

5. All appraisals obtained within the previous two (2) years by the owner or applicant in connection with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property.

The Applicant states there have been no appraisals obtained within the previous 2 years in connection with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property.

6. The fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation and the fair market value of the property (in its protected status as a designated building or site) at the time the application is filed.

The Applicant states that the fair market value of the property is currently \$330,000. Given that this property was part of the original District designation in 1999, Staff finds that the criterion requiring the value of the property prior to its designation is not applicable.

7. Form of ownership or operation of the property, whether sole proprietorship, for-profit or not-for-profit corporation, limited partnership, joint venture, or both.

The Applicant states that the property is privately owned by Mark Vickers and Sophia Yun with the intended use as a primary residence.

8. Any state or federal tax returns on or relating to the property for the past two (2) years.

The Applicant states there have been no tax returns on or relating to the property for the past two years.

9. That the property is not marketable or able to be sold, considered in relation to any listing of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any, within the previous two (2) years. Including testimony and relevant documents regarding:

a) Any real estate broker or firm engaged to sell or lease the property.

The Applicant has not stated whether a real estate professional has been secured by the project team. However, given that the stated intent of the Applicant is to use the site as their primary residence, Staff

finds it unlikely that a real estate professional would have been secured. However, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm whether or not a real estate professional has been secured.

REVISION FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING (Condition #1):

The Applicant states that real estate agent, Farley Sirockman, has been retained. The Applicant states, “Based on comps in the area and the size of the lot, she (Sirockman) recommended a sale price of \$450,000 for the 2br 1ba home if we were to renovate it.”

b) Reasonableness of the price or rent sought by the applicant.

The Applicant states they are not selling or renting the property.

c) Any advertisement placed for the sale or rent of the property.

While the Applicant has stated they are not selling the property, they do state that the property is able to be sold for lot value since the home is uninhabitable.

10. The infeasibility of alternative uses that can earn a reasonable economic return for the property as considered in relation to the following:

a) A report from a licensed engineer or architect with experience in rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures on the property and their suitability for rehabilitation.

The Applicant has provided reports from their structural engineer and architect, see *Attachment 3 – Structural Engineer Assessment* and *Attachment 4 – Architect Assessment*. Staff would note that the engineer assessment states that the assessment was “visual only and limited to the exposed portions of the structure.” Staff recommends that the Applicant provide a more comprehensive engineer’s analysis that includes an inspection of the interior of the structure, the crawlspace, and the existing foundation in greater detail. Staff recommends that the Applicant obtain an analysis of structural soundness and suitability for rehabilitation from a third-party architect who is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans.

REVISION FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING (Condition #2):

The Applicant submitted a more in-depth addendum confirming that the inspection of the foundations and conclusive findings. See attachment “Updated Engineer Addendum.”

b) Estimate of the cost of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal, and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendation and decision of the commission concerning the appropriateness of the proposed alterations.

The Applicant has provided an estimate of the cost for demolition and new construction at \$420,000, and states that additional costs are unknown, see *Attachment 5*. A thorough cost analysis and estimate for the proposed restoration and rehabilitation of the property was not received. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide a valuation of the total restoration costs for the property to facilitate a fair comparison of all alternative options.

c) Estimated market value of the property in the current condition; after completion of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal; and, in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing property for continued use.

The Applicant states that the value of the property in the current condition is \$300,00, the estimated market value of the property after demolition is \$300,000, and the estimated market value after construction of the new structure would be \$720,000. No estimate of the market value after renovation of the existing property for continued use was received. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide an estimated market value after the structure has been renovated in the manner considered under criterion 10(a).

REVISION FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING (Conditions #4 & 5):

The Applicant provided a total cost analysis to renovate the structure as well as the estimated market value after restoration. See Attachment “Cost Analysis of Full Restoration” in the case folder. The Applicant stated, “The final number was \$472,640. With a purchase price + fees equaling \$300,000 for the property, this represents a \$772,640 dollar investment with an estimated return of \$450,000 for a total loss of \$322,640.”

- d) **In the case of a proposed demolition, the testimony of an architect, developer, real estate consultant, appraiser, or other real estate professional experienced in rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure on the property.**

The Applicant has submitted a statement from their architect, see *Attachment 4*. The Applicants architect assessment summarizes, “*the house was poorly sited and cheaply built from day one... Almost every single component and every system will require extensive repair, modification, or replacement. It is my opinion the house should be demolished.*” Staff recommends that the Applicant obtain an analysis of structural soundness and suitability for rehabilitation from a third-party architect who specializes in historic preservation and is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans.

REVISION FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING (Condition #6):

The Applicant has obtained a comprehensive analysis determining the feasibility for rehabilitation and restoration from a third-party architect who specializes in historic preservation and is not directly involved in the proposed new construction. Mr. John Sitton has provided this analysis, see “Inspection Letter from HP Specialized Architect.”

- e) **The infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer of development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances.**

The Applicant states that, due to the hazardous condition of the foundation and the undersized floor system, any new construction around, above, or below the existing building would be inadvisable.

11. Economic incentives and/or funding available to the applicant through federal, state, city, or private programs.

The Applicant states that there are currently no economic incentives and/or funding available to the Applicant through federal, state, city, or private programs. However, due to the structure’s location in the Grant Park National Register Historic District, it is possible that renovation and rehabilitation of the structure and site would qualify for the 20% tax credit managed by the State Historic Preservation Officer and the National Park Service. Staff recommends the Applicant provide an analysis of any funding, tax credits, or grants that the subject property may qualify for due to its location within the Grant Park National Register Historic District.

REVISION FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING (Condition #7):

The Applicant stated:

“a. The Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit does not apply as this is not an income generating property, but our primary residence.

b. According to the GA Community Affairs website, the state income tax credit program for rehabilitated historic properties as primary residences is being sunsetted at the end of 2024 and we would not be eligible for that. Even if it weren't and we were able to get the maximum write off of \$100,000, that would give us a one time savings of about \$3600 in state income tax based on our taxes from last year.

c. The Preferential Property Tax Assessment Program could potentially freeze our county property taxes at ~\$700 for the next 8.5 years.”

12. Also, please provide photographs of the existing conditions of the building, both exterior and interior.

The Applicant has provided photographs and a narrative depicting the existing conditions, see *Attachment I*.

Comment on Application Materials by the Bureau of Buildings

One of the requirements of the Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness process is for the Office of Buildings to comment on the application materials via a written report. Staff has submitted a request to the Office of Buildings to inspect the property and produce a report regarding this property. When the inspection and report are complete, Staff will include the report in the file for future reference.

Overall Comments

Staff agrees that the property appears to have wood rot, termite damage, and water damage, as well as other structural defects. Staff finds, however, that most of the structural damage to the home is consistent with what is expected of a century-old house after many years of use. Further from the photographs provided, it is unclear whether these issues have affected every part of the structure or if they are located only on certain parts of the structure. Additionally, the use of non-historic materials and alterations in a structure's past are not uncommon conditions for structures in Atlanta's historic and landmark districts, and that the majority of structures weather such past treatment well.

In keeping with past interpretations made by the Commission, Staff finds that a structure that is a major and imminent threat to public health and safety would be a structure that is deteriorated to the point where it could collapse and harm someone on the public Right of Way. While the subject property is clearly in a state of disrepair, Staff does not find evidence in the submitted materials that the structure is in a state where collapse is imminent and could harm someone on the public Right of Way. As such, Staff cannot support the project in its current submitted form. However, due to the information missing from the analysis, Staff would support a deferral of the project to allow for the required analysis to occur.

REVISIONS FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING:

The Applicant has provided all additional documents requested and consulted with the appropriate professionals for a comprehensive assessment of the true feasibility of restoring the structure. Based on the documents submitted by the engineer, which clarify the depth of the assessment, as well as the extensive analysis done by historic preservation specialist John Sitton, it appears that the Applicant

has conducted an extensive, due diligence analysis of all possible alternative routes rather than demolishing the entire property. Based on the economic return assessment, Staff believes that it would be a major undertaking for the Applicant to restore the home to its historic state. This would place them in significant financial hardship. Thus, Staff believes that demolition of the structure accompanied by the construction of a principal structure that is in-kind with the Grant Park Historic District Code and visible aesthetic would be the best course of action.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: ~~Deferral to the November 13th, 2024 UDC Hearing to allow the Applicant time to address the following:~~

1. ~~The Applicant shall confirm whether or not a real estate professional has been secured; **Condition has been met**~~
2. ~~The Applicant shall provide a more comprehensive engineer's analysis that includes an inspection of the interior of the structure, the crawlspace, and the existing foundation in greater detail;~~
3. ~~The Applicant shall obtain an analysis of structural soundness and suitability for rehabilitation from a third party architect who is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans; **Condition was removed at October 9th, 2024, UDC Hearing.**~~
4. ~~The Applicant shall provide a valuation of the total restoration costs for the property to facilitate a fair comparison of all alternative options;~~
5. ~~The Applicant shall provide an estimated market value after the structure has been renovated in the manner considered under criterion 10(a);~~
6. ~~The Applicant shall **obtain a financial analysis determining the** of structural soundness and suitability **feasibility for rehabilitation and restoration** from a third party architect who specializes in historic preservation and is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans; **Condition was revised at October 9th, 2024, UDC Hearing.**~~
7. ~~The Applicant shall provide an analysis of any funding, tax credits, or grants that the subject property may qualify for due to its location within the Grant Park National Register Historic District.; and,~~
8. ~~All updated plans and materials shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.~~

REVISIONS FOR NOV. 13TH UDC HEARING:

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
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 990 & 994 Donnelly Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-433 & 438
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A, Beltline

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Donnelly Avenue and Peoples Street SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: n/a

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred October 9, 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. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes new construction of a single-family home and an accessory dwelling unit at both 990 (CA3-24-438) and 994 Donnelly Avenue SW (CA3-24-433). Given that the submitted plans are identical for both properties, and the concerns apply to both designs, Staff has addressed the projects jointly in this Staff report though these are two separate parcels and applications. While Staff acknowledges that the proposed structures are largely governed by the constraints of features under the compatibility rule, Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(a) clearly states, “No individual house design shall substantially repeat a design of a new principal structure on the block face that was approved by the commission since the adoption of this district.” A proposal for identical new construction houses cannot be approved. The Applicant shall differentiate the properties to create two separate and distinctive designs.

The Applicant overall has proposed two identical Craftsman-style bungalows, while one property on the street is a bungalow, it is not the house form which predominates. The structures must be substantially redesigned to match the house type and massing which predominates on the block face, which is an American Small House/Minimal Traditional. The roof form and pitch must be completely revised, which will likely significantly alter the proposed house design. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to meet the compatibility rule in terms of form and massing.

No material specifications for any exterior materials have been provided. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials to be used on the structures.

Staff is concerned about the proposed site plans, which do not have lot coverage calculated. The Applicant shall update the site plan to include itemized proposed lot coverage.

Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(d) requires, “A paved walkway from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure shall be provided.” No walkway is shown on the site plan for 990 or 994 Donnelly. The Applicant shall revise the proposed site plans to include a walkway in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(d).

There is a large concrete pad shown on the site plan for 990 Donnelly, which currently extends over the property line. It is not clear to Staff if this is existing or proposed. If proposed, it cannot extend over the property line. If existing, an easement must be acquired for the feature. The Applicant will clarify the scope of work in terms of the concrete pad at 990 Donnelly Avenue SW. The proposed driveways for both 990 and 994 Donnelly terminates at the front of the house. Sec. 16-20M.012 (4)(a) states, “Off-street parking shall not be permitted in the front yard or half-depth front yard.” The Applicant shall revise the proposed driveway designs to continue at least 20 feet past the front façade of the house to be in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.012 (4)(a).

Setbacks

Staff has serious concerns that no actual measurements were taken in regards to setbacks. A simple visual inspection reveals that all of the contributing houses on the block face are not aligned and the same distance from the street. The proposed front yard setbacks of 30 feet are based on the

underlying zoning, not the compatibility rule, as the zoning code requires. The Applicant shall submit revised compatibility data for the front yard setbacks.

Roof Form and Pitch

The roof form which predominates on the block face is side-gabled, with an 8/12 pitch. The Applicant proposes a hipped roof which does not meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant shall revise the proposed roof form and pitch to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(f).

Height

The proposed building height of 18 feet for both structures falls within the permissible range determined by the compatibility rule.

Foundation

The Applicant proposes a brick foundation, with a 1-foot height. Sec. 16-20M.013 (2) (h) states, “the maximum height of the first floor of the front façade above grade shall be subject to the compatibility rule. At a minimum, the first floor of the principal structure shall be on foundations and shall be elevated above grade at the front façade a minimum of two entrance risers each of which shall not be less than seven inches in height. Slab-on-grade construction is not permitted.” The proposed foundation may not be any shorter than 14 inches. The Applicant shall revise the proposed foundation height to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20M.013 (2) (h).

Further Sec. 16-20M.013 (2) (r)(10) states, “Above-grade foundation materials. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.” None of the contributing structures on the block face have a brick foundation. All are CMU. The Applicant shall revise the proposed foundation materials to utilize CMU covered in a parge coat of stucco.

Cladding

The Applicant proposes an exterior cladding material of lap cementitious siding. Staff is not concerned with the proposal, so long as the proposed reveal does not exceed six inches. The Applicant shall utilize smooth-face cementitious siding with a reveal between 4 and 6 inches.

Porch

Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(i) states, “The compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.” Full porches do not predominate on the block face, rather narrow, stoop-like, front gabled porches prevail. While Staff notes that the existing porches on the block face are at grade, given the requirements of a foundation, the stoops by necessity must also be raised. The proposal is for brick foundations and columns, neither of which is present elsewhere on the block face is also of concern. Of the contributing structures one has square wooden porch supports, the other turned spindles. Staff recommends using one on each proposed principle structure to differentiate the structures. The Applicant shall utilize different porch supports as a distinguishing

character feature on the two properties. The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to utilize a front-gabled, partial-width stoop rather than a full porch. The Applicant shall utilize a porch foundation material that matches the overall foundation as CMU covered with a parge coat of stucco. The Applicant shall install balustrades of two-part, butt-joint construction. The Applicant shall install tongue-in-groove porch flooring, installed perpendicular to the façade. The Applicant shall utilize concrete steps.

Fenestration

The Applicant proposes one-over-one windows on both structures. The window style which predominates on the block face is six-over six, double-hung windows. The Applicant shall revise the proposed window style to meet the compatibility rule.

Further, the proposed design utilizes far too few windows, leaving large spans of wall with no fenestration. The Applicant will revise the proposed fenestration patterning to reflect the historic patterning present on the block face.

Accessory Dwelling Unit

The proposed accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are proposed at 782 square feet, with an exterior porch of 130 square feet. ADU are not permitted to exceed 750 square feet of conditioned space. The Applicant shall reduce the proposed square footage of the ADU to not exceed 750 square feet of conditioned space.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant shall submit material specifications for all exterior materials to be used on the structures. **While there is a schedule, no manufacturer's specifications have been provided.**
- 2.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed site plans to include a walkway in compliance with Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(d). **Does not connect to the sidewalk, as required.**
- 3.) The Applicant shall submit revised compatibility data for the front yard setbacks. **No data has been provided, the proposed front yard setback remains at 30 feet, even though a visual inspection has not established this data to be accurate.**
- 4.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed foundation materials to utilize CMU covered in a parge coat of stucco. **Not noted on plans for 990 Donnelly.**
- 5.) The Applicant shall utilize smooth-face cementitious siding with a reveal between 4 and 6 inches. **No specs provided (see condition #3 above). One house is utilizing shingles, which is not permitted by the compatibility rule.**
- 6.) The Applicant shall utilize different porch supports as a distinguishing character feature on the two properties. **One porch uses brick supports, which are not found on the block face. Staff recommends revising to turned porch supports, particularly as the size must be diminished to stop proportions.**
- 7.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed design to utilize a front-gabled, partial-width stoop rather than a full porch. The plans still show a porch, not a stoop. **The size of the feature must be reduced to the minimum required landing size for access (4 feet square).**

- 8.) The Applicant shall install balustrades of two-part, butt-joint construction.
- 9.) The Applicant shall install tongue-in-groove porch flooring, installed perpendicular to the façade.
- 10.) The Applicant shall reduce the proposed square footage of the ADU to not exceed 750 square feet of conditioned space.
- 11.) 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 Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 428 Edgewood Avenue NE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-495 (Addition) & CA3-24-509 (Variance)
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Landmark District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1954

Property Location: North block face of Edgewood Avenue SE, block located between Boulevard NE and Jackson Street NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Low-density commercial space/warehouse (owned by the Georgia Justice Project)

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New construction of two-story parking garage and general exterior restoration of existing structure (CA3-24-495); Variance request to allow parking between building and street (CA3-24-509)

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

CA3-24-495 & CA3-24-509 for 428 Edgewood Avenue SE

November 13, 2024

Page 2 of 4

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: CA3-24-495: Approval; CA3-24-509: Approval

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

Variance (CA3-24-509)

The Applicant is requesting a Variance to defer from the Martin Luther King Landmark District regulations to allow parking between an existing building and street as an existing non-conforming condition, which is otherwise not permitted per *Sec. 16-20C.009(1)(b)*.

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 property size: 86 feet wide by 100 feet deep with a steep grade change. The Applicant states that the property consists of a contributing building and an open lot currently used for parking. The front of the lot is accessible from Edgewood Avenue, ramping down to a lower parking area. The existing contributing building has a front setback of approximately 30 feet, which has been historically used for parking.

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 property is located under low density commercial land use zoning and the building will be used for services by the nonprofit Georgia Justice Project. The front of the site is currently under special permit *U-17-016 Park For Hire*. The Applicant states that these parking spaces will remain unaltered with the new addition to the existing building. Parking for clients is critical, and with the loss of the lot parking when the addition is built, the existing, historical parking in front of the building would need to be retained.

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

The Applicant states that the existing contributing building has a deeper front setback than most other buildings along Edgewood Avenue, as does the building on the adjacent lot at 438 Edgewood. Parking has existed in front of these buildings to serve the businesses, and the proposed project under this application does not intend to change that. The new addition on the existing open lot will align with the existing front facade and match the setback and building height. The Applicant states that the existing parking area is limited for the employees and clients of Georgia Justice Project, and the front will remain unaltered as paved concrete for previously permitted surface parking.

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 Applicants submitted site plan, elevations and documentation supporting the new addition and existing parking demonstrate that no substantial harm will be caused to the public good or will impair the purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance.

It appears that the Applicant has undertaken a due diligence process to ensure that the proposed construction will cause a limited amount of interference with adjacent properties. This is based on the existing site shape and topography. Staff believes that the construction of a parking garage connecting 428 and 438 Edgewood Avenue would greatly benefit the district. It would provide much-needed parking in an area that has experienced considerable development over the past several years.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

New Construction (CA3-24-495)

The Applicant proposes the construction of a two-story parking garage connecting 428 and 438 Edgewood Avenue SE. The project scope would also include general restoration and maintenance including masonry repairs, window restoration, and door replacements. The interior of the existing building will be converted into office space. As part of the new construction, there will be a contemporary two-story entrance addition with an elevator to allow access to both the floors above grade and the existing basement. The addition would be constructed of masonry with punched window openings and a steel-framed canopy, and would occupy the adjacent lot where a building previously stood. The addition would include a wooden deck with steps leading down to a permeable paver courtyard on the remainder of the property.

Overall, Staff does not have any concerns regarding this proposal. It is the opinion of Staff that all reasonable efforts were made to ensure that the addition was visually compatible with the existing commercial properties on Edgewood Avenue. As the Martin Luther King Landmark District continues to develop, it is important to prioritize off-street parking. Staff believes the proposed parking garage will contribute to the growth of an already thriving commercial corridor.

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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 4012 Peachtree Dunwoody Road NE (Little Nancy Creek Park)
APPLICATION: RC-24-499
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: 2009

Property Location: West block face of Peachtree Dunwoody Road, directly adjacent to intersection of Peachtree Dunwoody Road and Winall Down Road NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: City Park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Replacement of existing bridge, proposed installation play equipment

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

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.

The Applicant proposes the replacement of an existing pedestrian bridge at the Little Nancy Creek Park, and the installation of parkour exercise equipment.

The proposed replacement bridge would have the same footprint as the existing bridge. This is a pedestrian bridge that provides a pathway through the park that connects over the creek. Staff would note that the proposed bridge does not appear to include railing as it does currently but is using in-kind materials. To prevent any safety hazards, Staff recommends adding railings along the sides of the bridge.

The project also proposes the installation of equipment for parkour exercise in addition to the replacement of the pedestrian bridge. The equipment would be installed in the park west of an existing playground. This particular type of exercise equipment has already been incorporated into other city parks, and the staff believes it is a valuable addition to the community. Accordingly, Staff has no objections to the installation of parkour equipment.

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

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: 537 Cameron Street SE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-500
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: West block face of Cameron Street SE, southwest of intersection of Cameron Street SE and Hansell Street SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Renovation of front facade that exceeded original approved scope of work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The subject property was originally associated with a staff review, under CA2S-24-037. The original scope of work reviewed by the Historic Preservation Studio consisted of the following:

- Interior renovations
- Changing the location of two exterior windows

- Replacement of a missing back deck
- The addition of a dormer
- Removal of vinyl siding
- Restoration of original siding
- Roof replacement

Staff referenced the Grant Park Historic District Regulations to ensure every aspect of the above proposed scope of work was in compliance. Based on plans submitted, Staff approved the project with the following conditions in March 2024:

1. Repair and replacement with in-kind materials is approved only for the front porch decking and columns, and for the siding on the front facade.
2. Replacement wood for the front porch decking columns should be of similar dimensions to the existing decking and columns.
3. The Applicant will make a due diligence effort to repair damaged siding where possible and will provide detailed documentation of existing conditions if the siding is beyond repair due to water or termite damage.

The next correspondence with the Applicant occurred in July 2024 when the Applicant requested the assigned planner review revisions made to their existing plans. These revisions included the change in placement of three windows on the side and rear facades, and an increase of five feet in height at the rear of the houses roof. Plans were stamped off once they had been reviewed by the planner and found to be in compliance. It must be noted, however, that it appears that Staff did not receive revised plans that indicated that conditions had been met. Based on Staffs interpretation, this approval was still subject to the aforementioned conditions.

In September 2024, the subject property was cited with a Stop Work Order for exceeding the previously approved scopes of work. As the scope of work had exceeded the criteria for an administrative Type II staff review, a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness, CA3-24-500, was created to address every alteration that has been made. The current scope of work that is subject to Commission review is as follows:

- Replace historic siding, soffits, boards and trims with hardie plank
- Replace retrofit vinyl windows with wood windows
- Repair brick porch foundation
- Refinish existing historic front door and replace transom
- Replace wooden porch columns in-kind
- Repair existing wood gable vent
- Replace roof with architectural shingles

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

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

Please note that as this scope of work is applicable to just the street-facing facade, as cited in the Grant Park Historic District Regulations.

Scope of Work:

- Replace historic siding, soffits, boards and trims with hardie plank

The proposed scope of work for the subject property includes the full replacement of the historic wood siding, soffits, boards, and trims along the front facade with either hardie plank or artisan siding. Staff referenced *Sec. 16-20K.007.(2)(D)2.*, “...*exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property*” and *Sec. 16-20K.007.(2)(B)15.(c).*, “*Horizontal lap siding, vinyl siding, aluminum siding, shingles, brick, hard stucco, and stone shall be permitted*” of the Grant Park Historic District Regulations when reviewing this project. Staff believes that replacement of these components with hardie plank or artisan siding would not be appropriate. HP Staff is only responsible for the street-facing facades in the Grant Park Historic District and recognizes that siding, soffits, boards, and trims along the rear and side facades have already been replaced with hardie plank. As such, Staff believes that accepting any other materials than what was there historically, namely wood, would dilute the entire purpose of the district code. Staff recommends the Applicant revise existing plans to show that the siding, soffits, boards and trims will be replaced in-kind with wood.

- Replace retrofit vinyl windows with wood windows

At the time of renovations, the four double-hung, single windows on the front facade were encased in a non-historic vinyl casing. It should be noted that neither the vinyl casings nor the glass panes are original. At some point during the renovation process, the vinyl casings were removed to reveal the original, wood window casings. The four windows on the front facade retained their historic wood casings underneath the non-original vinyl casings and appeared in overall good condition with some expected signs of wear. In terms of design, these historic windows had ram crown moulding at the top, but no apron at the bottom. As these four historic windows were removed without the appropriate permits, this retroactive approval would require replacement of the windows in kind to the originals in material, measurement, and design. According to the materials submitted by the applicant, along with an independent analysis performed by the assigned planner, the proposed windows appear to be in accordance with the historical materials, measurements, and design. Therefore, Staff finds that the proposed window replacements comply with the historic district code.

- Rebuild brick porch foundation and wood porch flooring

The photographs of the existing foundation and flooring of the front porch demonstrate the extent of damage that has been sustained. There was significant damage to the original porch flooring and wood rot, creating a hazard. Accordingly, Staff finds that the proposed scope of work of replacing the porch flooring in kind with a tongue and groove design of two inches is appropriate. Staff interprets the proposed rebuilding of the brick porch foundation as disassembling and reassembling bricks that are already present on the property, rather than installing a new foundation. Based on Staff's assessment, this is in compliance with district code, specifically *Sec. 16-20K.007.(2)(E)6.* “*Historic materials such as brick, granite, and cobblestones shall be reused where possible.*”

- Refinish existing historic front door and replace transom

The Applicant proposes refinishing the existing, historic wood front door. Staff finds this to be in compliance with the district code. However, Staff would recommend that the Applicant submit materials specifications and measurements for the proposed transom window to confirm that it is in-kind with the original transom.

- Replace wooden porch columns in-kind

Photos submitted indicate that the wood columns that supported the front porch had a bit of damage, which resulted in unstable support. According to the Applicant, these columns are to be replaced in kind, while maintaining the same design as the originals.

- Repair existing wood gable vent

According to photographs provided by the applicant and Code Enforcement, the existing wood gable vent appears intact. As a result, Staff determined that repair of the vent would be appropriate. It is important to note that if the vent is to be removed, it must be included in the scope of work.

- Replace roof with architectural shingles

The replacement of the subject property's existing shingles is allowed and is considered general maintenance but must be included in the plan set at the very least. The Applicant shall revise their existing plans to include a note specifying that the existing shingles are to be replaced in-kind.

Overall, Staff finds minor concerns with the plans as submitted. Staff believes that an approval with conditions would be the appropriate response to this project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall revise existing plans to show that the siding, soffits, boards and trims will be replaced in-kind with wood;
2. The Applicant shall submit materials specifications and measurements for the proposed transom window to confirm that it is in-kind with the original transom;
3. The Applicant shall revise their existing plans to include a note specifying that the existing shingles are to be replaced in-kind; and,
4. The Applicant shall submit all revisions to Historic Preservation Studio Staff for a final stamp of 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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 849 Lullwater
APPLICATION: CA3-24-502
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lullwater Road and North of Ponce de Leon

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior of the new construction

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: No, none known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Defer to November 25th UDC

PLANS

The Applicant has not provided a site plan that is reflective of the setbacks. This is required. Staff recommend the Applicant provide a site plan that indicates, setback.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

General Architectural

While the Applicant has provided elevations and renderings that depicts a modern construction that mimics many of the traditional housing on the street, the Applicant has not met the District regulation which states,

“Any new construction, additions, renovations or alterations in the District shall maintain the general architectural scale and character reflected in the original development of Druid Hills in order to preserve the historic character of the district shall follow the standards set forth by [section 16-20B.003\(1\)](#).”

Nor has the Applicant shown patterns of side facing garages in the District to compare this proposal to. While this is the case, research shows, that on the street, there are several houses that have front facing and side facing garages. In most traditional neighborhoods, front facing and side facing garages are not the standard. This leads, Staff to believe the traditional pattern of the District was to allow side facing garages. Never-the less, Staff recommend the Applicant provide additional evidence that the District support side facing garages.

Materials

The proposed roofing material is Spanish Clay Tile; siding material is hard coat stucco and wood lap siding; eaves are wood with decorative corbels. The proposed materials are not problematic to Staff.

Windows

The proposed windows are aluminum clad divided light windows. Staff are not concerned with the proposal.

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: Defer to November 25th UDC

1. The Applicant shall turn in a site plan that show setback as required, per Sec.16-20B;
2. The Applicant shall provide additional evidence that the District supports side facing garage per Sec.16-20B.003 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 972 Boulevard SE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-503
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 1

Other Zoning: R-5

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East side of Boulevard SE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the December 13, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

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

The Applicant proposes major alterations to the existing structure, including a full second story addition. Staff has significant concerns with the proposal. First the proposed site plan does not include either lot coverage or floor area ratio. Given the degree of proposed alteration, Staff needs to see how the proposed changes would impact these items. Though the house is non-contributing, the code clearly outlines the criteria for alterations and additions. Sec. 16-20K.007 (C) states, "Alterations to non-contributing structures, for which a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be required, shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction set forth in subsection 16-20K.007(2)(B) above." The proposal, which encloses a side porch, adds a new front porch, and completely removes the historic roof form to add a second story, changing the front profile of the house, and changing the roof pitch, does not meet either of these two scenarios. The house has a distinctive double gable profile on the front elevation which would be erased, crating an American Four-Square house form, that completely erases the structural design, character, and form of the residence.

Staff strongly recommends that the massing of the addition be pushed to the rear of the property. Given the depth of the lot, there is 55 feet between the rear of the existing house and the property line, which more than allows for an ample rear addition to the structure, which would not impact the existing structure so radically, and allow for the changes to reenforce the existing architectural character of the property. Further, Staff strongly disagrees with the proposal to add a full porch and enclose the side porch, which are character defining features of the structure. Pushing the massing to the rear of the structure would allow for dormer additions, with a continuation of the roofline, without requiring the placement of a stairwell in the existing side porch. Staff notes that there are two existing chimneys, which are extant on the structure which were going to be fully reconstructed. This also allows for these character defining features to remain in-situ, with dormer additions behind. This retains the essential form of the structure, and also allows for a rear addition, which maintains the historic character. The Applicant shall update the proposed site plan to include all features present on the lot and calculations of lot coverage and floor area ratio (FAR). The Applicant shall not enclose the side porch. The Applicant shall not construct a full porch. The Applicant shall retain the historic chimneys in their original locations and dimensions. The Applicant shall redesign the proposed addition to push the massing to the rear of the structure, which may include dormer additions behind the existing chimneys.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral until the December 13, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission to allow the Applicant to Address the Following:

- 1.) The Applicant shall update the proposed site plan to include all features present on the lot and calculations of lot coverage and floor area ratio (FAR).
- 2.) The Applicant shall not enclose the side porch. The Applicant shall not construct a full porch.

CA3-24-503 972 Boulevard SE

November 13, 2024

Page 3 of 3

- 3.) The Applicant shall retain the historic chimneys in their original locations and dimensions.
- 4.) The Applicant shall redesign the proposed addition to push the massing to the rear of the structure, retaining the existing roof form and pitch, which may include dormer additions behind the existing chimneys.
- 5.) The Applicant shall submit revised materials to Staff no later than eight (8) days prior to the next scheduled hearing of the Urban Design Commission where the case will be heard.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

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

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 53 Huntington Road NE
APPLICATION: RC-24-504
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: South side of Huntington Road NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory Structure

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 November 13, 2024, hearing of the Urban Design Commission

RC-24-504 53 Huntington Road NE

November 13, 2024

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant proposes installation of a new shed in the rear yard. In reviewing the proposed site plan, Staff notes that the proposed placement of the shed would not be permitted by the underlying zoning, as it is outside the buildable area of the lot. The underlying zoning of the property is R-4, which requires a 15-foot rear yard setback and a 7-foot side yard setback. The proposed location of the new accessory structure violates both these restrictions per Sec. 16-06.008 (4) "Accessory structures other than fences, when permitted, shall be placed to the side or rear of the main structure within the buildable area of the lot so as not to project beyond the front of the main structure." Staff recommends revision of the proposed location of the accessory structure to comply with the requirements of the zoning code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm Delivery of Comments at the November 13, 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: 38 Huntington Road NE
APPLICATION: RC-24-505
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1931

Property Location: North block face of Huntington Road NE, west of intersection of Huntington Road NE and Northwood Avenue NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Federal style

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Porch addition, replacement of nine existing windows, installation of two exterior doors, general brick repair

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

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

The Applicant's proposed scope of work is listed as follows:

- Porch Addition

The Applicant states that the proposed porch addition will include a blue stone patio, an iso-kern fireplace, and a standing seam metal roof. In order to match the existing home, the fireplace will be clad with modular brick laid in a running bond pattern. The porch fireplace will feature a clay chimney pot in order to blend in with the existing architecture of the house.

- Windows

There will be nine windows that are incongruous with the original home that will be replaced. Windows 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205 & 206: New wood windows that replace the existing windows in the original sections of the house. All double hung windows will feature a six-light top sash and a clear bottom sash without muntin bars. In order to maintain a consistent look with the existing windows, all casement windows will have six or eight lights, depending on their size. The new windows cannot be seen from the street.

- Doors

Door 101: A new wood side door will be installed. In order to complement the existing exterior features of the home, the new side door will be equipped with a glass panel divided into eight lights.

Door 107: A new folding door will be installed to access the porch. Each door will feature a glass panel divided into eight lights to complement the existing exterior features of the home. Neither door is visible from the street.

- Brick Repair

All brick repairs will be made with modular bricks matching the existing brick size and texture.

Consequently, Staff is not concerned about the proposed project and would like to point out that the applicant appears to have made a good faith effort to ensure the exterior is in-kind aesthetically with the existing structure.

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

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

RC-24-505 for 38 Huntington Road NE
November 13, 2024
Page 3 of 3



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: 784 Springdale
APPLICATION: CA3-24-506
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1939

Property Location: North of Ponce De Leon Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: 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: A new addition was added to the right side of original house. This makes part of the house non-historic.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions.

NOTE

The non-historic side (right) is not under view since it is not historic.

SCOPE OF WORK

- The following will be reviewed reflecting the historic house: Replace missing wooden front shutters; replace brick stoop floor and treads with bluestone; replace wooden front door; replace all original windows with new windows replicating same size and style; replace rear windows with still windows; permanently remove wood windows in the rear outside kitchen.
- Add brick cheek walls and new iron railings to non-original front stairs; add brick wooden breezeway to existing garage; add small accessory building with pool power room and storage; modify new rear porch behind the Porte Cochere
- Replacement of existing doors and change of material.
- Removal of existing windows and replaced with a direct material.
- Redo pool and hot tub in rear.

ADDITION

The added cheek walls on the non-original front stairs are not problematic to Staff. District regulations states, “new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” Since the steps are not original to the house, there is no fear of the cheek wall damaging any historic brick.

The added brick wooden breezeway and the added small accessory building for pool power room and storage are also not problematic to Staff. Both effaces are not heated and are in the rear of the house and the proposal meet the required lot coverage of 35% at 18.1%. Staff are not concern with the proposal.

ALTERATIONS

The replacement of the missing front shutters is not problematic to Staff. The Applicant plans are to utilize the existing hinges and doors.

The replacement of the brick stoop floor and treads with bluestone, Staff are not concerned with this proposal.

Photos of the door is not very clear; however, it can be determined that door may not have been original. The replacement to a wooden front door, is not problematic to Staff.

From the photos of the original windows that were provided there is deterioration. While this is the case, Staff would ask the Applicant to provide a windows schedule of all the original windows with photos to determine if all the windows are in decay to merit replacement.

The modified parapeted essentially will create a new rear porch. The proposed parapeted is taller and will block much of the kitchen and rear rooms. It is also proposed to be brick. Staff is not

concerned with the new parapeted. It does not destroy historic materials and is compatible with historic material on the house.

REMOVAL/REPLACEMENT

The Applicant proposes to remove a historic window in the rear of the property and replace it with a different shape steel window and added a matching steel window to the right of it. Staff are concerned with the steel material being proposed because there is no other steel element on the house. The fan pattern of the proposed windows is not so concerning to Staff because the back doors are the same shape. Staff recommend the Applicant replace the windows with a wood material that will be durable to the elements.

The Applicant also proposes to replace the existing back doors with a fan pattern and steel material. Staff are not concerned with the fan pattern, because the existing doors had a fan pattern. However, the steel material gives Staff pause for the same reason has stated above for the windows. Staff recommend the Applicant employ a durable wood that can stand the elements.

SITE WORK

The remodeling of the hot tub does not concern Staff. The lot coverage is complying to the Landmark regulations.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall provide a window schedule and photos of original wood windows to determine if all the windows merit replacing, per Sec.16-20B.003(1)(b);
2. The Applicant shall replace the windows and door with a durable wood material to keep with historical material per Sec.16-20B.003 (1)(i) 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: 764 Memorial Drive SE
APPLICATION: CA2-24-512
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 2019

Property Location: North block face of Memorial Drive SE, block is bound by Estoria Street SE on the west and Pearl Street SE on the east

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Mixed-use residential condos with commercial spaces on the first floor

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Replacement of exterior signage

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 CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval

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.

The proposed project relates to the replacement of a healthcare clinic's exterior signage. The placement of the clinic's signage would remain the same as it's existing orientation, which is located on the ground level of the mixed-use residential complex. This signage would consist of lettering stating the name and purpose of the clinic. It would cover 16.89 square feet of the front facade.

Upon review of this proposal, Staff finds that it meets all of the requirements set out in Subarea 5 of the Cabbagetown Landmark District Code. As such, Staff has no concerns or comments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File