



# 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 919 Tift Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-293  
**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** West blockface, South of Bonnie Rae and North of Pearce Street

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No      **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:** Interior work

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

**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.

### **New Construction**

The Applicant propose to construct a new single-family structure on a crawl space. The submitted site plan shows the proposed new construction will meet the required side and back yard setbacks and does not exceed the zoning regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Interpretation of District Compatibility Rule**

The District regulations regarding compatibility states, the compatibility rule is a method of requiring that alterations and new construction are sensitive and sympathetic to existing elements of design, scale and general character of the district with particular attention to the immediate environment constituting a particular block. In accordance with this purpose, the compatibility rule is as follows: "To the maximum extent possible, the element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall substantially match that which predominates on that block. When elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor heights, they shall equal the statistical average of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

#### *Front yard setback*

The Applicant has provided compatibility information of other houses on the block for comparison for the front yard and has indicated an average of 25 feet and 3 inches. The proposed setback average for the new construction is 22 feet and 7 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Roof Form and Roof Material*

The proposed roof form for the new construction is a pyramid roof with a secondary gable roof on the front of the principal structure. A proposed shed roof covers the front porch. The Applicant has provided evidence of predominance of other houses on the block that demonstrates the same roof patterns. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant has not indicated what roof material will be used on the roof. Staff recommends the Applicant indicate the roof material and provide houses on the block that demonstrate the proposed material.

#### *Height of House*

The Applicant has submitted houses on the block for comparison for the height of the new proposed principal structure. The Applicant has indicated the height on the new construction will be 23 feet and 3 inches. The average height of the houses of like construction is only 22 feet and 2 inches. The District regulations allows for a differential from the average of 10 percent, thus permitting a height of 24 feet and 4 inches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Fenestration Patterns and Windows*

Compared to the photos of the compatible houses on the block, the fenestration patterns of window to wall openings of the Applicant's proposed house are compatible. However, Staff has concerns with the inaccuracy of the windows shown on the floorplan to those shown on the left and right elevation. For example, the floorplans show all windows are the same size, while the elevations show varying windows heights, style and groupings. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the windows on the plans and make both the floorplan and elevations the same. Additionally, Staff recommends the Applicant demonstrates the style of the windows are compatible with the other houses on the block.

*Door*

The Applicant proposes a Craftsman style fiberglass entry door to be installed on the principal structure. The photos of compatible of houses on the block do not clearly show the proposed door on comparable houses on the block. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic images of doors of the houses on the block for compatibility comparison.

*Siding*

The Applicant proposes cementitious siding for the new construction. However, the photos provided of the houses for comparison, Staff cannot determine if the siding on the houses is wood or cementitious. District regulations requires all building materials which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, shall be compatible with those which predominate in the subarea. Staff recommends the Applicant indicate through photographic images and narrative the predominate siding material on the block.

*Foundation*

The Applicant has not indicated what material will be used for the foundation. Staff recommends the foundation either be masonry or concrete to apply to the District regulations.

*Porch*

The District regulations states porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with porches in that block. The photos of compatibility of houses on block, the Applicant demonstrates that the proposed porch is align with these houses. Staff is not concerned with the porch proposal. Staff does recommend the railing be comprised of a two-part butt-joined construction with the top rail set no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows. Additionally, rail height if needed to meet code will be achieved with a simple plane extension. The porch steps will have closed riser and end and be brick. Porch will be a tongue and grove material with boards oriented to run perpendicular from the front façade.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**

1. The Applicant shall indicate the roof material and provide houses on the block that demonstrate the proposed roof material. per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(f)(3);
2. The Applicant demonstrates the style of the windows are compatible with the other houses on the block, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(6) & (7);
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic images of doors of the houses on the block for compatibility comparison, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(6) & (7);
3. The Applicant shall provide photographic images and narrative the predominate siding material on the block per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(4);
4. The railing shall be comprised of a two-part butt-joined construction with the top rail set no higher than the bottom sill on the front façade window. Rail height if needed shall be achieved by a simple plane extension, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(g);
5. The foundation shall either be masonry or concrete to apply to the District regulations.
6. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 741 Pearce Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-316  
**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018 (deferred from September 12, 2018)

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** North side of Pearce St., east of Allene Ave.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No      **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Vacant Lot

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New construction.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Portions of the project not visible from the public ROW.

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20I.005 and Sec. 16-20I.006

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

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

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

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

*(The last review is done in italics.)*

### **New Construction**

The Applicant proposes to construct a new single-family house that it compatible with existing houses in the district. The District regulation requires, all new construction shall conform to the existing building orientation (setbacks) by having sidewalks, front yards, porches and front doors facing and parallel to the street. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Interpretation of District Compatibility Rule**

The District regulations regarding compatibility states, the compatibility rule is a method of requiring that alterations and new construction are sensitive and sympathetic to existing elements of design, scale and general character of the district with particular attention to the immediate environment constituting a particular block. In accordance with this purpose, the compatibility rule is as follows: "To the maximum extent possible, the element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall substantially match that which predominates on that block. When elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor heights, they shall equal the statistical average of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

### **Development Controls**

#### ***Height of the House***

The Applicant has proposed the height of the roof to be 24 ft. However, no compatibility information for the height has been provided by the Applicant. As such, Staff cannot determine whether the proposal conforms to the development controls required by the District regulations. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the height of the proposed structure.

*The Applicant's latest plans proposes a roof height of 19ft for the new construction. The comparables houses for comparison for the compatibility standards indicates an average of 17.43ft for allowable built. The District regulations allows for a differential from the average of 10 percent in buildable height. This 10 percent differential will allow for the proposed height to be be 19.17ft. Staff is not concerned with height proposal.*

#### ***Front Yard Setback***

On the site plan, the Applicant proposes the front yard setback to be an average of 26.26 ft. However the Applicant has not provided comparables to allow the Staff to determine if this proposal meets the compatibility rule of the District. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the front yard setback.

*The Applicant has provided comparison of houses on the block that indicate the average front setback is 31.13 ft. The Applicant proposed front setback for the new construction of 31.05 ft does not exceed the 31.13ft. Staff is not concerned with this proposed front setback.*

***Bracket***

The Applicant proposes wood brackets on the front gable. Wood brackets are present on the block. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

***Roof***

The plans show there is a proposed shed dormer on the right and dormer on the left elevation. As well as shingles for the material. Staff is not concern with the shingle, however compatibility comparisons for the roof shape and pitch were not received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the roof shape and pitch.

*The Applicant new plans still does not reflect shed dormers as predominant on the existing houses on the block. Although this maybe the case, Staff finds the dormers are not outside the architectural and historical character of the the district. Staff is not concern with this proposal.*

***Siding***

The Applicant proposes cementitious horizontal siding with a 4 inch exposure. The District regulation requires material to be what predominates on the block. In looking at the block in question the structures the predominate pattern is for either brick or lap siding. Staff recommends the smooth-face cementitious horizontal siding with a 4 inch exposure.

*The proposed siding is cementitious siding with a 4-inch exposure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.*

***Fenestraton***

The Applicant proposes to install one over one windows with wood cap surrounds, and three decorative windows on the front gable and a front door. However, the Applicant has not provided information from other house on the block for comparison to determine the compatibility rule is being met. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for fenestrations patterns and informaton on the block.

*On the new plans the Applicant submitted, the fenestration patterns on the existing houses on the block demonstrates that Applicant proposed fenestration patterns are consistent with those in the District. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Additionally, the Applicant has proposed double grouping one over one and a single one over one on the front façade. These windows are consistent with those that are on other houses in the District. One over one windows are also present on the side elevations and are compatible with other one over one windows on other houses in the District. Staff is not concerned with the fenestration and the window proposal.*

*The Applicant has proposeda craftman style 36”by 80” wood door with glass at the top. It will be a transom above the door similar to other houses on the block. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.*

***Foundation***

The Applicant proposes a concrete foundation with brick veneer. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

***Front Porch***

District Regulation requires porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with porches in that block. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Applicant proposes a traditional railing design which will be comprised of a two-part butt-joined construction with the top rail set no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows. Additional rail height if needed to meet code will be achieved with a simple plane extension. The porch steps will have closed riser and end and be brick. Porch will be a tongue and groove material with boards oriented to run perpendicular from the front façade. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.*

***Deck***

The proposed deck will not exceed the setback or go beyond the side elevation. Staff is not concerned with this deck proposal.

***Garage***

The proposed garage is directly behind the main structure with a carriage house, requirement of the District's regulations. Staff recommends the garage not exceed the height of the principal structure and the dormers not intersect with the garage ridgeline.

*Applicant proposes the detached garage with a carriage house and the dormers will not intersect the ridgeline of the garage nor will the garage be higher in height than the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.*

***Driveway***

The proposed driveway is to extend beyond the back of the mainstructure. Staff recommends the driveway be concrete.

*The Applicant has proposed a concrete driveway and concrete walkway. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.*

***Fence***

The Applicant has proposed a vertical 6 foot fence that will enclose the rear and side property line. Fence will not go beyond the front yard. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with condition**

1. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 702 Brookline St.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-355

**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1924

**Property Location:** South blockface of Brookline St., east of Mayland Ave., and west of Metropolitan Pkwy.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Dormer additions.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Portions of the structure which do not face the public right of way.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approve with conditions.



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

The Applicant is proposing a dormer and rear gable addition within the existing footprint of the home. As the rear façade and the rear roof form are not visible from the public right of way, Staff has no concerns with the proposed rear gable. The two dormers proposed by the Applicant are compatible with the style of the existing structure and do not exceed the ridge of the existing principle structure. The windows will be casement windows with a style matching the original windows on the structure. The Applicant notes that the windows will be wood or composite simulated divided lite windows. However, the District regulations require the windows to be compatible with the historic materials which predominate in the subarea. Staff finds that the historic window material for properties in the residential subarea are wood true divided lite windows. As such, Staff recommends the proposed windows be wood true divided lite windows.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:**

1. The proposed windows shall be wood true divided lite windows, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(3); and,
2. 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 308 Harden St. SE

**APPLICATION:** CA2-18-377

**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1)      **Other Zoning:** PD-H

**Date of Construction:** 1992

**Property Location:** East blockface of Harden St., south of Memorial Dr., and north of Woodward Ave.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Portions of the structure that face the public right of way.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Portions of the structure which do not face the public right of way.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approve with conditions.

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

The Applicant is proposing a partial enclosure of the second story porch, in front of an existing porch enclosure. The District regulations allow two criteria for reviewing alterations to non-contributing structures as follows: [the alterations] shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction. In general, Staff finds the alterations to be consistent with the existing structure and that the alterations reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed alterations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:**

1. 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1427 Lucile Avenue, SW (Enota Park)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-18-372  
**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Historic Westview    **Other Zoning:** Beltline

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** West blockface, between Westview Drive and Lucile Avenue

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Park construction

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** N/A

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Park**

A proposed expansion of a public park (Enota Park) will encompass several parcels owned by the City of Atlanta and the Atlanta Beltline Inc. Several existing buildings will be demolished. Existing paving and trees be removed. The overall park will be 8.1 acres. The Applicant has shown through plans a vast amount of recreational areas for the public such as a half court for basketball with asphalt paving, multi-purpose play field and a playground to name a few. While these are all engaging areas, Staff suggests the Applicant carve out space for a dog park that would have separate areas for small dogs and large dogs. This addition could be welcoming to neighbors and citizens that have dogs; making it more of a destination park. Additionally, for cleanliness and health concerns, Staff suggest the Applicant place pet waste stations in key open spaces and along the trails that would allow for clean-up of pet waste.

The proposed park will have walking trails, a pavilion and a maintenance building. Staff suggest trash receptacles be placed in areas such as the pavilion so that the park will remain tidy as much as possible. The Applicant has shown one restroom on the site. Staff suggest with a park this size at no less than two restrooms should be on the site. One on the southside and one on the northside.

Staff notes that the Applicant has not mention lighting of the park. For safety reasons especially in the more secluded areas, Staff suggest the Applicant add adequate lighting throughout the park and trails including the parking area to alleviate concerns for safety issues. Some of the lighting in the park can be solar panels if not all solar for cost effectiveness.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.**

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 166 Elizabeth St.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-360

**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1)      **Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** 1909

**Property Location:** West blockface of Elizabeth St, south of Waverly Way, north of Euclid Ave. Property directly abuts Springvale Park at the rear property line.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes    **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Shingle Victorian

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Rear additions and site work

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes. Deferred at the September 12, 2018 meeting. *Updated text in italics.*

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** On March 3, 2018, Staff was alerted to work at the property without permits or review by the Commission. Inspectors from the Office of Buildings were sent and posted a Stop Work Order on the property. Staff was alerted to continued work on the property on July 23, 2018 and August 23, 2018. Inspectors from the Office of Buildings were sent on both occasions to re-post the Stop Work Order on the property.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral.

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

#### Plans

In reviewing the proposed plans and comparing them to the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds the proposed plans do not fully cover the work proposed by the Applicant at this time. Specifically, there are three shed roof additions to the left of the “solarium” addition which are not properly represented in the proposed rear elevation.

Additionally, there are several items shown on the proposed plans which are inconsistent both internally and with the completed work shown in the photographs provided by the Applicant. For example, on the top of the pyramidal “solarium” addition, the rear façade elevations show a gabled projection proposed for the ridge of the addition. However, both the side façade elevations as well as the photographs provided by the Applicant show a hipped roof for this feature.

Staff recommends the rear and side façade elevations be re-drawn to be both internally consistent and to accurately reflect the completed and proposed work.

*The Applicant has provided updated plans which are accurate and internally consistent. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

#### Site plan

The rear yard setbacks of additions in the District are governed by the compatibility rule. No compatibility information detailing the allowable rear yard setback for additions on this property has been received. As such, Staff cannot properly review the proposed additions and site work. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide the allowable rear yard setback range for the property based on the contributing houses on the block face.

*The Applicant has provided compatibility information for the proposed rear yard setback. Based on this information the allowable setback range for this property is a minimum of 46’ (based on 176 Elizabeth St.) and 96’ (based on 188 Elizabeth St.). As such, Staff finds that the proposed 71’ rear yard setback meets the compatibility rule. As such, Staff finds the related conditions have been met and has no concerns with the proposed setback.*

#### Additions

The Applicant is proposing several rear façade additions. The bulk of the addition consists of a three-story projection on the left side of the rear façade. The addition will be capped by a “solarium” containing a hipped roof. In the District, roof form is based on the compatibility rule. As this project involves an addition to a contributing structure, Staff finds the regulations require non-quantifiable elements such as roof form to be compatible with the existing structure. The existing structure is defined by three front gables, the main form of which carry through to the rear façade. Previous additions have added shed roofs to the rear façade consistent with additions to structures of this style. Staff does not find that the proposed hipped roofs are compatible with either the existing structure or the style of the home. As such, Staff recommends the solarium addition and roof projection be re-designed to use shed roofs.

*The Applicant has provided updated plans which show the roof form of the “solarium” being changed to a rear facing gable, which mimics the pitch of the original gables of the property. While the recommendation was for a shed roof over this addition, Staff finds the change is consistent with the Architecture of the existing structure and has no concerns with the proposal. Staff finds the related recommendation has been met.*

The District regulations require the fenestration pattern for additions to meet the compatibility rule with regards to size and style. As with the roof form, Staff finds it is appropriate to compare the proposed

fenestration to the existing structure. The fenestration proposed for the right side of the rear façade bump-out which includes the proposed “solarium” contains several different types of windows including transom windows, double hung windows with transoms, double hung windows without transoms, and half-size windows double hung windows. Staff is not concerned with the transom, half-size double hung, or the standard size double hung windows as these windows correspond to window sizes on the original portions of the structure. However, Staff is concerned with the introduction of double hung windows with transoms as is proposed on the “solarium” addition. Staff can find no evidence of similar window styles on the existing structure. As such, Staff recommends the transoms above the double hung windows on the “solarium” addition be removed from the plans.

*The Applicant has submitted updated plans showing the transom windows removed from the “solarium” addition. Staff finds the related recommendation has been met.*

Staff has concerns with the placement of the windows on the ground floor portion of the Addition. The windows on this portion of the structure are placed much higher on the façade relative to the floor level than other windows on the existing or proposed portions of the structure. Staff finds that this composition is inappropriate for use on an addition or alteration to a contributing structure in a Historic District. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the ground floor level of the rear and side façade be moved to a height consistent with windows on the existing portions of the structure.

*The updated plans show the windows mentioned above being retained. Staff has learned that the change in sill height is due to a stairway landing directly associated with the windows on the interior of the structure. With this in mind, Staff finds the rear façade windows are situated in such a way that they will not compromise the fenestration pattern of the structure. However, Staff does recommend the first-floor window on the south side façade of the structure be changed to a casement window similar in size to the original accent windows on the structure.*

The Applicant is proposing to side the addition with a composite shake material to match the style of siding on the existing structure. Staff has no concerns with this portion of the proposal.

#### Site work

A new two-story deck is proposed for the rear of the structure. The District regulations require decks to be placed to the rear of the structure and that they be no wider than the existing structure. Staff finds the deck meets these regulations.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:**

1. *The first-floor window on the south side façade of the structure shall be changed to a casement window similar in size to the original accent windows on the structure, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(n); and,*
2. 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 801 Lullwater Road NE

**APPLICATIONS:** CA3-18-369 (new construction)  
CA3-18-370 (variance)

**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Druid Hills Landmark District

**Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** N/A (vacant lot)

**Property Location:** On an interior lot on the east side of Lullwater Rd., just south of Lullwater Pkwy.

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

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

- New construction of a principal structure;
- Variance to reduce front yard setback from 75 ft. to 37 ft.; and

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 16-20B.003 and Section 16-20B.006

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** In July 2015 a variance was granted to allow structures in the 100-year floodplain where otherwise prohibited (CA3-15-173). In November 2015, the Landmark District was revised (15-O-1417) and 801 Lullwater was listed as a non-contributing property due to a loss of architectural integrity. A permit for the demolition of the former 1947 dwelling on the site was issued in June 2018.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** CA3-18-370: Approval  
CA3-18-369: Deferral.

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

**Variance (CA3-18-370)**

In July 2015, the Urban Design Commission approved the variance to allow construction within the 100-year floodplain, where otherwise prohibited by the District regulations (CA3-15-173); however, any additional development on the site was prohibited by the Department of Watershed Management (DWM). Since that time, the Landmark District was revised and the former 1947 dwelling on the lot was identified as non-contributing. According to the Applicant, DWM will allow development on the site if the proposed design accommodates unimpeded waterflow within the floodplain.

The Applicant requests a variance to reduce the front yard setback from 75 ft. (required) to 37 ft. (proposed) in order to place the principal structure away from the 100-year floodplain at the rear of the lot. The following answers were provided to the questions of this variance petition:

1. What are the extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question (size, shape, or topography)?

*The front road diagonal in respect to the property creates a need for a greater calculated reduction in the front setback than is actually physically viable.*

2. How would the application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property create an unnecessary hardship?

*The home would be built 100% in the flood plain [without the variance] and the natural grade to the proposed threshold would be 15.83 ft. above grade versus 11 ft. above grade when moved up hill.*

3. What conditions are peculiar to this particular piece of property?

*The 100-year flood plain covers the site up to 43 ft. from the front property line.*

4. Submit facts to show that 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.

*Relief, if granted, does not impair the purpose of the zoning code and preserves the human scale and the consistent scale of the street because: the proposed siting is not in the side or rear yard setbacks; is not in the 75 ft. creek setback; does not increase the house height higher than the 35 ft. limit. The house is physically going to be a max of 53 ft. back from the front property line and only requires a variance for front setback at 37 ft. from 75 ft. due to the angle of the road.*

5. State whether the property described in this application forms any part of the subject matter of a pending application or ordinance for a zoning change or Special Use Permit.

[no response provided]

Staff finds the variance request demonstrates that a hardship is present due to the 100-year flood plane that precludes development within the buildable area of the lot. Staff further finds the requested setback for the proposed new principal structure will be substantially consistent with that of the previous dwelling on the lot. As such, Staff recommends approval of the variance request.

**New Construction (CA3-18-369)**

The proposed project involves the construction of a new single-family residential structure. According to the submitted plans, the façade of the three-level house will have a Mediterranean Revival Style appearance with a

barrel tile covered, hip roof, painted stucco exterior, and multi-light windows with French doors opening to the front porch and upper, third-level balcony. A long-run of entrance stairs would provide access from the walkway to the partial width front porch and the continue up to the entrance door. The Mediterranean Revival motif gives way to a flat-roofed Modernist aesthetic on the sides and rear of the building. Fenestration on the sides and rear consists of single-light casement and fixed windows and single-light patio and entrance doors. Horizontal, wood slat breakaway walls are proposed as infill between the piers of the raised foundation to allow unimpeded flow within the floodway on the east side of the structure. A two-bay garage is proposed on the east (left) side of the house. Multi-level decks with access to each floor occupy the rear of the building. A concrete driveway is proposed on the east side of the lot, providing vehicular access to the interior garage and a pedestrian walkway, with unspecified paving, will extend from the driveway to the large entrance stairs.

#### Entrance Stairs

Staff has several concerns with the proposed design as submitted. First among them is the long entrance stairway to the second level of the dwelling. The Applicant has provided photographs of eight other houses with elevated entrance stairways; however, only two of the comparative properties (795 and 856 Lullwater Rd., not including the non-contributing house formerly located at 801 Lullwater Rd.) are located in the Landmark District. Further, Staff finds two comparative houses have entrance steps that number between five and 10 steps, compared to over 20 on the proposed house. Further, the steps on the other houses terminate at the first level of the building, rather than the second level of living space as proposed with the current project. Staff recommends the proposed entrance steps provide access to the first level of the house for compatibility with the contributing properties in the District.

#### Building Height

The proposed height of the three-level building is approximately 35' as measured on the submitted architectural elevations. Staff finds that most surrounding contributing houses along Lullwater Road are either one or two stories in height, with some attics of some two-story dwellings containing conditioned living space with dormers. Staff does not find the proposed three-level dwelling to be compatible with other surrounding contributing properties as required by the Landmark District regulations. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic documentation other three-level contributing houses in the District that demonstrates compatibility.

#### Architectural Design

Staff has additional concerns with architectural design of the proposed house, which is currently an amalgamation of Mediterranean Revival Style (front) and Modernist (sides and rear) design elements. Staff finds that most contributing houses in the Landmark District date from the early twentieth century and are representative examples of architectural revival styles (e.g. Colonial Revival, Mediterranean Revival, English Vernacular Revival, Italian Renaissance Revival). While the regulations allow for new construction to be differentiated from the old, the properties must also be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the contributing houses in the District. Staff finds the architectural features of the Mediterranean Revival aesthetic to be compatible with other houses in the District; however, the design must extend to all four sides of the house, rather than only the front as currently proposed. Staff finds the flat, Modernist roof, horizontal baluster side railings, and asymmetric fenestration patterns on the sides of the house, which consists of varied window arrangements, sizes, and types, with large expanses of solid walls, to be incompatible with the architectural character of the Mediterranean Revival style of the house façade and with the District as a whole. Staff recommends the new construction exhibit a unified design aesthetic on all four sides of the house. Staff further recommends the Applicant delineate the fenestration types and materials.

#### Breakaway Walls

The building design includes horizontal wood breakaway slat walls as infill between the foundation piers of the sides of the house to allow for unimpeded flow of water within the floodplain area. While Staff recognizes the need for this feature to accommodate potential flooding, Staff recommends the breakaway walls employ a more traditional lattice design that would be more compatible with the character of the District.

Horizontal wood slats are also proposed as wall cladding on the left, right, and rear sides of the house above the flood plan elevation. Staff recommends this component be removed from the project plans.

### **Sitework**

The materials of the proposed walkway are not delineated on the site plan. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information about the paving material for this component of the project.

Staff further notes the proposed driveway will be located within the 20 ft. side-yard setback on the northeast side of the lot. The District regulations prohibit off-street parking within 20 ft. of any property line, including the side property line. While the Staff does not consider driveways to be off-street parking (given their usually 10-12 ft. width), the site plan indicates that a 26.5 ft. wide motor court in front of the garages will be within 20 ft. of the side property line. Consistent with previous reviews, the Staff finds that only those portions of the motor court that are required for maneuvering a vehicle in and out of the garage can be within the 20 ft. distance. As such, the Staff would recommend that the site plan document through turning diagrams that this paving is required for proper maneuvering of vehicles in and out of the garages.

### **Landscape plan**

Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear if new landscaping will accompany the construction of the new house on the lot. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify any proposed landscape plan and demonstrate that it is compatible with the overall landscaping on the block.

### **CA3-18-370 (variance)**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.**

### **CA3-18-369 (new construction)**

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

1. The entrance stairs shall terminate at the first level of conditioned living space, per Section 16-20B.003(6);
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation of other three-level contributing houses in the District for compatibility purposes, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i) and (6);
3. All four sides of the building shall have a unified architectural design that compatible with the historic character of the District, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i) and (6);
4. The Applicant shall provide information regarding the proposed fenestration types and materials, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i) and (6);
5. The Applicant shall employ a more traditional lattice design for the pier infill on the sides and rear of the house, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i) and (6);
6. The horizontal wood slat wall cladding on the left, right, and rear elevations shall be removed from the project plans, per Section 16-20B.003(1)(i) and (6);
7. The Applicant shall clarify the materials of the proposed walkway, per Section 16-20B.003(6);
8. The Applicant shall document on the site plan through turning diagrams that the width of the driveway paving is required for proper maneuvering of vehicles in and out of the garages, per Section 16-20B.003(3)(b);
9. The Applicant shall provide clarify any proposed landscape plan and demonstrate it is consistent with the overall landscaping on the block per Section 16-20B.003(4)(b); and,
10. 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 652 Ormewood Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-371

**MEETING DATE:** September 26, 2018

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

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

**Date of Construction:** 1927

**Property Location:** North blockface of Ormewood Ave., east of Boulevard SE, west of Confederate Ave. SE

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Variance for parking location

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Design of paved area

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The structure has had major alterations to the front façade of the structure. The original gambrel roof form of the front porch has been changed to a gable roof, and a gable dormer has been added to the front roof plane. It also appears that the ridge of the roof was raised in those alterations.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approve.

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

**Variance Request**

The requested variance is to allow a driveway in the front yard where otherwise prohibited.

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

The Applicant states that the lot in question is too narrow for a compliant driveway to be installed. Staff finds that while compliant driveway's frequently can be built on properties with 50' of frontage, the principal structure is placed in such a way (with a 7.5' west side yard setback and a .5' east side yard setback.) that it prevents a compliant driveway from being constructed. Further, the topography of the site prevents a driveway from being installed on the west side yard due to a retaining wall which runs from the west corner of the house to the street.

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 given the issues noted above, compliance with the zoning ordinance is an unmeetable standard and would prevent a driveway from being installed on the property.

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

While narrow side yards and wide houses are not uncommon in the District, Staff finds that the majority of houses in the District are able to install compliant driveways. Many of the neighboring properties contain driveways, and a curb cut from a previous driveway on the subject property is extant.

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 responds to this criteria by stating that an existing gravel driveway is present on the property and does not impair the public good.

Staff finds that the request meets the variance criteria.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File