



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 718 Lexington Ave.

APPLICATION: RC-18-258

MEETING DATE: July 25, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: South Side of Lexington Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Y

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Review and Comment on Variance application

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: On June 13, 2018 the Commission reviewed and approved application CA2-18-224 for a proposed accessory structure.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the BZA

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

The requested variance would reduce the north side yard setback from 7' to 6'. The Applicant bases their argument on the placement of the existing accessory structure, which will be removed and rebuilt on the existing foundation. In general, Staff finds that the approval of such a variance would not have a negative impact on the property or the District. Further, as the project has already received an approval by the Commission no further review would be required for the project to be permitted. Staff would note that the Conditions of approval of CA2-18-224 would remain in full effect. Those conditions are as follows:

1. The Applicant provide compatibility information for the height of the proposed accessory structure based on the height of the historic accessory structures on the block face, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(6);
2. The Applicant shall apply for a variance to allow an encroachment into the right-side yard setback or the structure shall be redesigned to comply with the 7' right-side yard setback, per Sec. 16-06A.008(2);
3. The total floor area of the accessory structure not exceed 495.3 sf, per Sec. 16-28.004(3);
4. Staff shall be permitted to approve any design changes required to meet the R-4A zoning requirements; and,
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 951 Edgewood Avenue NE
APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-252 (addition)
MEETING DATE: July 25, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R/LC / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1930 per District Inventory

Property Location: Interior lot on south side of Edgewood Ave. between Elizabeth St. and Waverly Way

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural style:** American Foursquare

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Rear elevation not visible from a public street or park

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20L.005, 16-20L.006, and 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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

The proposed project scope consists of a two-story office addition behind the existing house. The proposed addition will have a flat roof, slab foundation, cementitious clapboard siding, and double-entrance doors at the rear.

The District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the relevant regulations were met.

Plan Issues

The submitted documentation and plans did not include existing and proposed site plans for the project. Staff recommends the Applicant submit 2 sets of properly scaled existing and proposed site plans and 12 copies of reduced size existing and proposed site plans that show all proposed changes to the property in sufficient detail for review.

Development Controls

The proposed addition is massed behind the principal structure, does not extend beyond the sides of the existing house, and appears to meet the side yard setbacks for the District (setbacks of the addition are to not be less than the respective setback, at its closest point, of the existing structure). Rear yard setbacks in the District are subject to the compatibility rule. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation that demonstrates the proposed addition meets the rear yard setback requirements for the District.

Design Review

The proposed addition will have a slab on grade foundation. This foundation type is not permitted within the District. Staff recommends the Applicant revise the plans to include a raised foundation type (e.g. continuous or pier) that meets the District regulations. Staff further recommends the proposed foundation materials meet the District regulations.

Staff finds the proposed use of a flat roof to be incompatible with the principal structure, which has a hip roof. Staff also notes that hip roofs are also the predominant roof form for other contributing properties on the block face (same side of Edgewood Ave., between Elizabeth St. and Waverly Way). Staff recommends the roof form of the proposed addition be redesigned to meet the District's compatibility rule.

The submitted architectural plans show one, double-hung window unit on each level of the addition's right elevation. The left elevation would be a solid wall. The District regulations require the size and shape of individual windows and overall pattern of fenestration on elevations visible from a public street or park be subject to the compatibility rule. While Staff finds the size and type of the proposed windows on the right elevation are consistent with existing windows on the house, the overall pattern of fenestration for the proposed addition is not compatible with principal structure. Staff recommends the pattern of fenestration for the proposed addition is compatible with that of the principal structure.

The elevations specify clapboard cementitious siding for the proposed addition. Staff recommends the proposed cementitious siding be smooth-faced with a 4-inch to 6-inch reveal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following concerns:

1. The Applicant shall submit 2 sets of properly scaled existing and proposed site plans, and 12 sets of reduced size existing and proposed site plans in sufficient detail for review, per Section 16-20.008(c)(1);
2. The Applicant shall provide supporting documentation that demonstrates the project meets the rear yard setback requirements of the District, per Section 16-20L.006(2)(b);

3. The Applicant shall revise the existing plans to include a foundation type that meets the District regulations, per Section 16-20L.006(1)(h);
4. The proposed foundation materials shall meet the District regulations, per 16-20L.006(q)(vii);
5. The Applicant shall revise the existing plans to include a proposed roof form that meets the compatibility rule, per Section 16-20L.005(1)(b)(ix);
6. The Applicant shall revise the existing plans to include a fenestration pattern for the addition that is compatible with the existing principal structure, per Section 16-20L.006(1)(n);
7. The proposed siding material shall be smooth-faced with a 4-inch to 6-inch reveal, per Section 16-20L.006(1)(p and q); and,
8. The revised plans, drawings, and other supporting documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the scheduled meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 995 Peoples Street
APPLICATION: CA3-18-256
MEETING DATE: July 23, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: East blockface, North of Sparks Street and South of Dimmock Street

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. 16-20 and Sec 16-20 M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferred to August 8, 2018

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Plans / Documentation

The Applicant proposes to construct new single-family home with four bedrooms and two bathrooms. This new proposed construction will have a front and rear porch, a driveway extending past the front façade of the house, a walkway that will extended to the streets and new sidewalks.

The District regulations have quantitative and qualitative requirements for new construction based the characteristics that predominate in like contributing structures on the block face and that are internally consistent with the historic design of the structure (i.e. the “compatibility rule”).

The Applicant has not submitted comparisons for the compatibility rule or comparisons of abutting properties which are required for the following listed categories below:

Massing and Building Height
Fenestration patterns
Front Porch
Building Materials
Siding Material
Sidewalks
Front yard setback

Staff recommends the Applicant submit detail information and photographic information on the blockface for compatibility comparisons for the blockface and provide abutting properties information for comparison.

Staff has commented on the other categories that does not require compatibility comparison, properties information.

Site Plan / Development Controls

The submitted site plan notes the underlining zoning as R-5. In fact, the actual underlining zoning is R-4A. While this may be the case, the minimum setbacks for both underlining zoning are the same. However, the maximum floor area ratio will vary amongst the two zonings. Staff recommends the Applicant correct the underlining zoning to reflect R-4A.

Walkway

The Applicant has noted a proposed walkway on the plans. District regulations requires that the walkway be concrete, the Applicant has noted that on the plans to comply with the District regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant has noted a proposed drive way with a flare from the proposed new sidewalk. District regulations states that independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare. The Applicant has meant the District Regulation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The proposed plans include a small deck at the rear of the house. The District regulations require decks to be located at the rear of the principal structure and to not be wider than the width of the principal structure. The Applicant has shown on the proposed deck complies with the District regulation. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

Exterior Door

The Applicant has shown on the Front Elevation a proposed door of wood panel. The District Regulation states that notwithstanding the compatibility rule, exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferred to August 8, 2018

1. The Applicant shall submit detail information and photographic information comparisons on the blockface for the compatibility standard and abutting properties information for comparison, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
2. The Applicant shall correct the underlining zoning to reflect R-4A on plans, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(c);
3. The driveway shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and a maximum curb cut of ten feet, per Sec. 16-20M.012 and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 747 Elbert Street
APPLICATION: CA3-18-264
MEETING DATE: July 25, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline Overlay

Date of Construction: 1949

Property Location: North of Albert Street and South of Maryland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)? No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.006 (2)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes to build a one-story addition with a gable roof and continuous brick foundation at the rear of the existing house. The addition will include a new master bedroom, bathroom, laundry room and kitchen expansion.

The District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the relevant regulations were met.

Plan Issues

Staff notes the submitted photographs of the principal structure show it to have six-over-six, double-hung wood sash windows on the front and rear of the house; however, the existing and proposed plans show the original building and addition as having one-over-one double-hung sash windows. Staff recommends the original windows and doors on the front and sides of the house be retained.

Addition

Development Controls

From the plans provided, this proposed addition will be located directly behind the existing house and will not encroach in the rear or side yard setbacks. The height of the addition will be slightly lower than the ridgeline of the existing roof form. The Staff has no concerns with these components of the project.

Design Controls

Windows

Staff finds the proposed fenestration pattern on the right side of the new addition to compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style of the existing windows; however, the proportion of windows on the left elevation does not appear to be compatible with the existing fenestration. Staff recommends the plans be revised for the proposed left elevation windows to meet the District regulations.

Further, the proposed windows also appear to be one-over-one sash units. The District regulations require New fenestration, to be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors. As such, Staff recommends the new windows be sash windows with six-over-six lights.

Roof

The Applicant has not indicated what material will be used for the new proposed roof. Staff recommends the roofing materials be asphalt shingles to meet the District regulations.

Siding

The Applicant has not indicated on the plans the siding that will be used for proposed addition. The District regulations states that siding repair or replacement shall match the original materials in scale and direction. Wood clapboard, if original is preferred; however, aluminum, Masonite vinyl or other horizontal siding is permitted if window trim, corner boards, and fascia/bargeboards are left in place or replaced with new material to match the original. Staff recommends that the new proposed siding match the original siding on the existing house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The original windows and doors on the front and sides of the house shall be retained, per Section 16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
2. The roofing material shall be asphalt shingles to match existing per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(f);
3. The new proposed siding shall match the original siding on the existing house per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(a)(4); and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Central Park Place Streetscape Project
APPLICATION: RC-18-260
MEETING DATE: July 25, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: None **Other Zoning:** Various

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Central Park Place between North Ave. and the Baker Highland Connector.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Improvements to the public right of way.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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

The proposed streetscape improvements would implement a portion of the Cycle Atlanta Plan specified for Central Park Place. The project would remove one travel lane in each direction and replace them with protected bike lanes. New signage and other infrastructure modifications would be added to accommodate the new programming of the right of way.

Staff finds the design of the improvements to be appropriate and has no concerns with the proposal.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1043 (1061) Ponce de Leon Avenue NE
APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-253 (addition)
MEETING DATE: July 25, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Briarcliff Plaza Landmark District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1940.

Property Location: At the southwest corner of the intersection of Ponce de Leon Ave and N. Highland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural style:** Shopping Center / Art Deco Style

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20S.004 and 16-20S.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

The proposed project consists of the installation of an approximate 300-sq.ft. addition within the linear recess (alley) located between the commercial storefront and theater sections on the north side of the 1043 Ponce de Leon Avenue building within the District. The one-level addition will include a new masonry exterior wall, storefront glass curtain wall system with a sloping glazed roof, and trellis screen walls.

The District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the relevant regulations were met.

Addition

Stucco and brick are identified as materials for the new addition in the narrative scope of work. The architectural renderings appear to show brick as the primary cladding material; however, brick is not specified in the plans. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify which materials will be employed for the proposed addition and where they will be used. Staff further recommends the proposed cladding be compatible with, yet differentiated from the existing building, per the District regulations.

Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear if the new addition façade wall will have coping along the parapet all roof line. Staff recommends the new façade wall have coping per the District regulations.

The proposed storefront will consist of a metal and glass curtain wall with a sloping glazed roof that terminates at the new masonry wall. While Staff finds the proposed full-height glass curtain wall compatible with, yet different from, the existing storefronts, Staff has concerns with the design of the sloping glass roof. Staff recommends the design of the new addition be revised to include a storefront configuration that is more consistent the historic storefronts with windows that are flush or slightly recessed from the upper masonry wall, rather than engaging the wall with a sloping glass roof.

Staff would expect the new storefront area will require some type of lighting system for the area; however, no lighting plans were included in the submitted plans. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the lighting for the area and the proposed lighting design be compatible with the District regulations.

Screen Wall

While Staff does not have any concerns with the general design and placement of the proposed trellis screen walls, Staff recommends the height of the walls at the opening of the alley be reduced in height so as not to completely obscure the building façade.

Other Sitework

The submitted plans include renderings that appear to show a new, off-set, rectangular decorative flooring system installed over the existing alley paving; however, no information is provided about a potential paving in the project plans or narrative scope of work. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify if the existing paving within the recessed alley will be repaved with new materials. Staff further recommends that any proposed decorative flooring/paving system be a concrete material that is compatible with the architectural character of the existing building.

Parking requirements

Based on the submitted plans, Staff assumes the proposed addition will function as a restaurant with the enclosed alley area serving as some sort of outdoor dining. Per the District regulations, no more than 25,000 square feet of the total 55,000 square feet of the property's floor area shall be eating and drinking establishments unless a shared parking arrangement is approved. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation on the proposed total amount of square footage for eating and drinking establishments that will be created as a result of the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall clarify the exterior cladding materials for the addition. The proposed exterior shall be compatible with, yet differentiated from the original architectural features and materials, per Section 16-20S.004(1)(i);
2. The addition façade wall shall have coping, per Section 16-20S.007(1)(c)(vi);
3. The proposed storefront system shall be revised to include a fenestration and façade design that is consistent with the architectural features of the existing contributing buildings, per Section 16-20S.007(1)(a and b);
4. The Applicant shall clarify the proposed lighting design for the area and all new lighting shall be compatible with the District regulations, per Section 16-20S.007(1)(i);
5. The proposed screen wall at the along the sidewalk at the edge of the alley be reduced in height, per Section, 16-20S.007(1)(a and g);
6. The Applicant shall clarify if a new flooring/paving system will be installed in the project area. Any new paving/flooring shall be concrete to comply with the District regulations, per Section 16-20S.007(1)(a);
7. The Applicant shall provide the proposed total square footage of eating and drinking establishments in the District that will be created as a result of the project, per Section 16-20S.008 and,
8. The Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 220 Haralson Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-18-229 & CA3-18-263
MEETING DATE: July 25, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1996

Property Location: West blockface of Haralson Ave, south of Alta Ave, north of Dekalb Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: 20th century infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and additions. *Foundation variance.*

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the project which are not visible from the public street.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes. Deferred from the June 27, 2018 meeting. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-18-263: *Approval.*

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-18-229: Approval with conditions.

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

Variance Requests

The requested variance is to allow an addition with a slab on grade foundation to the rear of the existing home which contains a slab on grade foundation.

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

The Applicant identifies the property's topography, as well as the age of the home, as extraordinary and exceptional conditions on the lot. They argue that the topography of the site would render impractical a compliant addition with a crawlspace addition.

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

The Applicant argues that an addition with a compliant crawlspace foundation to the rear of the existing slab on grade addition would be incompatible with the character of the existing home.

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

The Applicant identifies the slab on grade construction of the existing foundation as the peculiar condition of the property.

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 addition will match the character of the existing 20 year old home. They further state that granting the variance would not cause detriment to the public good as it would simply allow a continuance of the home's character in the new addition.

Staff finds that the request meets the variance criteria.

Addition

The proposed addition will be placed to the rear of the principal structure within the side yard setbacks as required by the District regulations. The existing structure is a non-contributing infill building from the 1990's, so Staff has no concerns with the addition damaging historic materials or spatial relationships. However, Staff does have a few specific concerns with the design in its current proposed state.

The District regulations prohibit slab on grade construction. While it appears that the existing structure was placed on a slab foundation, this does not remove the prohibition of slab on grade construction. However, Staff finds it would be impractical to place a new addition on a 14" crawlspace as the District regulations require when the principal structure is on a slab foundation. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant apply for a variance to allow a slab on grade foundation.

Given the Applicant's variance submission, and Staff's findings regarding that request, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Two transom style accent windows are proposed for the second story portion of the rear addition on the left side façade. The size and shape of individual windows for visible portions of the structure are subject to the compatibility rule. No information detailing the compatibility of the proposed accent windows have been received. Further the left side façade of the proposed addition contains a lack of fenestration on the first

floor. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed fenestration on the left side façade.

The updated plans show the transom style accent windows being removed from the proposal. As such, Staff has no concerns with this component of the project. However, the requested compatibility information for the proposed fenestration pattern has not been received. As such, Staff retains its recommendation. Staff further recommends the fenestration pattern for the addition conform to the compatibility rule.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-18-263: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-18-229: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the proposed fenestration on the left side façade, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(n);
2. *The fenestration pattern for the addition shall conform to the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(n); and,*
3. *Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.*

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 279 Little Street SE

APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-228 (special exception)
CA3-18-227 (addition, alterations, sitework)

MEETING DATE: June 27, 2018 (*revised July 25, 2018*)

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: 1905, District Inventory.

Property Location: On the southwest corner of the intersection at Little and Hill streets.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes **Building Type / Architectural style:** Georgian Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Special exception to allow a 6 ft. privacy fence/wall in the half-depth front yard;
- Rear addition;

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Fencing, Reroof; and,
- Interior alterations

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20.008, Section 16-20.009, Section 16-20K.007, Section 16-07.008, and Section 16-28.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes (*updated text in bold italics*)

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA3-17-553

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Because the building is located on a corner lot, the proposed addition and deck at the rear of the dwelling will face a public street and therefore are subject to review by the Commission.

Plan Issues

While the submitted plans show existing and proposed elevations for all sides of the building, Staff notes a few discrepancies on the plans when compared to the photographs of the dwelling. The proposed right elevation is identical to that of the left elevation and based on the proposed floor plan, the proposed right elevation appears to be incorrect (it is shown with a rear shed roof addition). Furthermore, the proposed rear elevation does not appear to correctly delineate the roof form of the rear addition.

Other issues include: the gable vent on the front façade is incorrectly depicted on the existing elevations as a four-light, fixed window; the entrance door transom and chimney on the west side of the building are not delineated on the plans. The rear window on the proposed right-side elevation of the historic section of the building does not appear to be accurately located. Finally, the architectural drawings depict the existing windows as four-over-four double-hung sashes, while current photographs show the windows to be one-over-one double-hung sash units. Staff recommends the Applicant provide revised plans that accurately depict the existing and proposed changes in sufficient detail for review.

The revised architectural plans have corrected some of the previously identified issues (gable vent, window light configurations); however, others remain outstanding (no depiction of the chimney on the right-side elevation, existing rear shed addition is still present on the proposed right-side elevation as well as the left side elevation, no transom over the front door). Staff retains its original recommendation that the final plans be revised to accurately depict the existing and proposed changes.

Special Exception

The Applicant seeks a special exception to replace the existing 6-ft. wood privacy fence with a new, 6-ft. wood privacy fence and gate along the Hill Street frontage. The City Zoning Ordinance classifies privacy fence as walls, given they are less than 50% open and prohibit the passage of light and air. The District regulations only allow fences that do not exceed 4 ft. in height in the front and half-depth front yards.

The Applicant did not provide responses to the questions required in the Special Exception Petition. Following submission of the application, the Applicant stated he preferred to retain and repair of the existing wood privacy fence rather than replace it and no longer sought a special exception for the work. Staff would note that because no prior permit has been issued for the existing 6-ft. wood privacy fence and it does not appear to predate the Zoning Ordinance, the fence may be considered an illegal structure by the City and the owner may be compelled to remove the structure or bring it into compliance. Staff recommends deferral of the Special Exception petition to allow the Applicant time to submit the required answers.

The Applicant did not provide responses to the questions required for the Special Exception petition in the revised submitted materials and again noted in the written scope of work that he would repair the existing damaged panels of the fence. As such, Staff recommends a Denial of the existing Special Exception application. Staff would also reiterate the earlier point, that because no prior permit has been issued for the existing 6-ft. wood privacy fence and it does not appear to predate the Zoning Ordinance, the fence may be considered an illegal structure by the City and the owner may be compelled to remove the structure or bring it into compliance.

Site / Development Controls

Based on the submitted plans, the proposed rear addition will be massed at the rear of the principal structure, will be located within the buildable area of the lot, and will not exceed the height of the existing roof ridge line. It does not appear the proposed 45% Floor Area Ratio (FAR) will exceed the maximum FAR of the underlying R-5 zoning; however, the proposed lot coverage of 59% appears to exceed the 55 % lot coverage

maximum for the R-5 residential zoning. Staff recommends the Applicant revise the plans to bring the proposed project into compliance with the underlying zoning requirements.

The revised plans and scope of work have eliminated the proposed parking pad in the rear lot. This has reduced the proposed lot coverage total to 41% of the net lot area, which meets the underlying zoning requirements.

Addition

The District regulations provide two standards for reviewing proposed alterations and additions to contributing buildings. The proposed work must meet one of the two standards. The first of the two standards require that the alterations and additions “be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure”. The second of the two standards require: “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.”

The rear of the existing house consists of a non-historic shed roof addition and rear deck. Therefore, it does not appear the proposed addition will destroy historic materials or architectural character of the existing building. The height of the proposed addition will be lower than the ridgeline of the existing principal roof structure and the addition and deck will not extend beyond the sides of the existing building.

While visible from the public street, the Staff finds that the overall design of the proposed rear addition and covered porch to be generally consistent with and reinforcing of the architectural character of the existing house. However, the plans do not indicate the materials that will be used for the siding, fenestration, and the foundation. Staff recommends the building materials be specified on the revised plans. Staff further recommends the Applicant install false corner boards at the junction of the original house section and the addition to delineate between the new and existing forms.

The revised plans do not specify the proposed building materials for the addition. Therefore, Staff retains its original recommendation for this component of the project.

Alterations

Primary alterations and repairs identified in the narrative scope of work appear to be painting and reroofing. Staff recommends that no unpainted masonry be painted. Further, Staff recommends the reroofing materials be compliant with the District regulations.

The revised scope of work also states the front step treads will be replaced, new porch floor boards and a railing will be installed, and damaged or deteriorated wood clapboard siding and trim will be repaired or replaced. The proposed front elevation does not include the proposed porch railing.

Staff recommends the existing porch step treads be replaced in-kind with matching materials and dimensions. Staff also recommends the replacement porch decking be finished wood, tongue-and-grove boards measuring approximately 5” x 1” and installed perpendicular to the front façade. Staff recommends the proposed porch railing design be included on the revised final plans. Further, the proposed porch railing shall be finished wood with butt-jointed pickets and a top and bottom rail with two-part construction. Finally, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic documentation of all damaged or deteriorated wood siding and trim proposed for replacement on the front and left side elevations and that all approved new siding and trim be replaced in-kind.

Sitework

Proposed sitework includes the aforementioned fencing and a paver driveway/parking pad that will be located in the rear yard and accessed via Hill Street. In addition to Staff’s concerns noted above (lot coverage, need for a Special Exception), Staff recommends the Applicant provide additional information regarding the material of the proposed driveway.

The proposed driveway has been removed from the project scope and revised plans. Staff no longer has concerns with this component of the project. The Applicant states in the narrative scope of work, that

existing damaged wood fence pickets will be replaced as needed. Staff recommends the Applicant provide supporting documentation as to the percentage of fencing that will be replaced.

CA-18-228 (Special Exception)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

CA-18-227 (Addition, Alterations, Site work)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit 2 sets of properly scaled, final plans that show all proposed changes to the property in sufficient detail for review, per Sec. 16-20.008(c)(1);
2. The Applicant shall specify all proposed exterior building materials (e.g. siding, fenestration, foundation), per Section 16-20K.007(2)(B)(15);
3. False corner boards shall be installed to delineate between the existing house and new addition, per Section 16-20K.007(2)(D);
4. Unpainted masonry shall remain unpainted, per Section 16-20.009;
5. Reroofing materials shall be asphalt shingles, wood shingles, metal shingles, slate, or pre-finished metal panel, per Section 16-20K.007(2)(B)(15);
6. Porch step treads shall be replaced in-kind, per Section 16-20K.006(2)(D);
7. Replacement porch decking be finished wood, tongue-and-groove boards measuring approximately 5" x 1" and installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Section 16-20K.006(2)(D);
8. The revised final plans shall include the proposed porch railing, per Sec. 16-20.008(c)(1);
9. The new porch railing shall be consistent in design with the architectural style of the house and be constructed of finished wood with square pickets, butt-jointed to a two-part top and bottom rail. The balustrade shall be no higher than the existing window sills and a simple rail extension shall be used above the appropriately scaled balustrade to achieve the height if required by code, per Section 16-20K.006(2)(D);
10. If the original wood siding on the front and left elevations is beyond repair, the damaged, deteriorated, or missing sections shall be documented to staff through detailed annotated photographs prior to replacement, per Section 16-20K.006(2)(B)(15c) and 16-20K.006(2)(D);
11. Replacement wood siding on the front and left elevations shall match the original in material, scale and direction per Section 16-20K.006(2)(B)(15c) and 16-20K.006(2)(D);
12. The Applicant shall provide supporting documentation demonstrating the amount of fence pickets to be replaced, per Section 16-20K.006(2)(B)(14); and,
13. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File