



# 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:** 716 & 724 Edgewood Avenue  
**APPLICATIONS:** CA3-18-553 (new construction)  
**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Inman Park Historic District (Subareas 1)      **Other Zoning:** LW / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1928 (716-18 Edgewood Ave.); 1948 (724 Edgewood Ave.). per District Inventory.

**Property Location:** Two lots on the northeast corner of Krog St. and Edgewood Ave.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes (716-18 Edgewood Ave.)      **Building Type:** Commercial retail

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New construction of six (6) townhouses and renovation of existing contributing building

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 16-20L.005 and Section 16-20L.006

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None – this project is related to the 16 unit townhouse project at 0 and 49 Krog Street (CA3-18-111, 112, and 149) that was approved with conditions in 2018.

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS:** Approval with conditions.

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

The overall project (including the previously approved 16 unit townhouse phase along Krog Street) involves four lots located in Subarea 1 and Subarea 3 of the District located on the east side of Krog Street and north side of Edgewood Avenue at the northeast corner of the intersection the two streets. This phase of the project is six (6) new townhouses along Edgewood Avenue, including the incorporation of a renovated commercial building into one (1), corner townhouse unit.

This phase of the project (that is the subject of this Staff Report) was rezoned from R-LC (Residential Limited Commercial) to LW (Live Work).

Table 1 below contains address, building type and date of development, contributing/non-contributing status, District subarea and underlying zoning for each property in this phase of the project:

**TABLE 1. Project Location Properties**

Address	Building	Build Date	Status	Subarea	Underlying Zoning
716-18 Edgewood Ave.	Commercial Retail	1928	Contributing	1	LW / Beltline
724 Edgewood Ave.	Commercial	1948	Non-contributing	1	LW / Beltline

The Applicant is proposing new construction of a 6 (six) unit townhome development. Each townhome will be four stories with two points of rooftop terrace access. The townhouse unit on the actual street corner will incorporate the renovated commercial building, providing additional square footage and a roof terrace.

This phase of the project has its highest point of grade along Edgewood Avenue. (Krog Street rises significantly from north to south to intersect with Edgewood Avenue.).

To the west of the property (across Krog Street) is the “Alexan on Krog Urban Apartments,” a multi-story residential building with an interior parking deck that was completed in 2016. To the immediate north of this phase of the project is the 16 townhouses that were in the first phase of the project. Further north along the west side of Krog Street is the Stove Works and further north along the east side of Krog Street, is Krog Street Market. Both the Stove Works and Krog Street Market include eating and drinking establishments, some commercial office space, and surface parking. All three of the previously mentioned properties are zoned C-2. To the east side of this phase of the project is a vacant lot that is zoned Residential-Limited Commercial (R-LC). To the south (across Edgewood Avenue) are one-story commercial buildings, including an apartment building in a converted elementary school.

As noted above, the underlying zoning of this phase of the project is now Live-Work (LW). The property is also subject to the Beltline Zoning Overlay, which requires the approval of a Special Administrative Permit (SAP) to ensure compliance with those zoning regulations. That review will be concurrent with or follow the Commission’s review of the project.

**Potential Lot Consolidation**

In the survey provided with the application, 716 and 724 are shown as two separate lots. The Staff reviewed the previous application to determine if these two lots were consolidated as a part of the review of the first phase of the project and that review was inconclusive. The lot at 716 Edgewood Avenue has a 60 ft. of frontage and 724 Edgewood Avenue has 97 ft. of frontage. Consolidation of the two lots would create a new lot with about 150 ft. of frontage along Edgewood Avenue and a 16,230 sq. ft. net lot area.

Per the District Subarea 1 regulations, the proposed lot consolidation must be “substantially consistent with the historic character of the district”, “conform to the historic platting pattern in the Inman Park Historic District with regard to lot size, dimensions, and configurations” and “The compatibility rule shall apply, and no subdivision or consolidation shall be approved unless and until the urban design commission has made a finding that it is consistent with this provision or with the platting pattern of the neighborhood, as it existed in 1945.” It is not clear to the Staff that these two lots have been consolidated at this time. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm that the lots have previously been consolidated and meets the District requirements.

### **New Construction**

The proposed new construction consists of six (6) townhomes with rooftop access and brick veneer exteriors. Each townhome will be 21 ft. wide and 52 ft. deep, with an eight (8) ft. deep front porch. The corner unit will be larger, wider, and have a more irregular shape. The townhomes will be sited in one row facing Edgewood Avenue, with an extension of the concrete drive built for the first phase of the project providing access to rear loaded garages on the north side of the units. The townhomes will have 4 ft. wide concrete walkways to new sidewalk lining the public street.

No retaining walls or fences are shown for this phase of the project.

### **General Zoning Analysis**

The Staff has completed a general zoning analysis and reached the following conclusions:

1. The new LW (Live Work) zoning requirements address many characteristics of the project including: allowed uses (principal, accessory, special); transitional characteristics (uses, height planes, yards, and screening); density, open space requirements; setbacks, lot size; yard requirements; height; and the number of off-street parking spaces, etc.
2. Most of the District regulations for Subarea 1 only apply to the “construction of and for additions to one- and two-family residential structures” which is not what is proposed for this phase of the project. As such, the District regulations that do apply to this phase of the project are those found in Section 16-20L.005(1)(b) which provide general architectural and design criteria to be followed, and setback and parking location requirements to all apply to all projects in Subarea 1 of the District.
3. The Beltline Zoning Overlay District supersede or modify the LW zoning requirements related to transitional yards, open space allowances, front setbacks, off-street parking requirements, overall design, building articulation and fenestration, facades, site arrangement and parking lot design.
4. Both the District and Beltline Zoning Overlay District have requirements that address front yard setbacks and parking location requirements that go beyond the LW underlying zoning requirements to address.
5. The Beltline Zoning Overlay District has also various requirements that are stricter than the LW and District regulations, and thus are the governing requirement for that topic.
6. The Beltline Zoning Overlay requirements will be addressed through the concurrent Beltline Special Administrative Permit (SAP) review process.

The Staff would recommend that if the Beltline SAP has not been applied for at this time, that it be submitted, and that the Staff review and if appropriate approve revisions to the proposed project to accommodate Beltline Zoning Overlay requirements.

### **General Development Controls**

A calculation of the amount of residential floor area is provided, as well as a general breakdown of the open space and parking (vehicle and bike) requirements. Except as noted below, it appears that the bulk limitations have been met and an adequate amount of parking has been provided, taking into account the “open space” bonus utilized given the project has provided excess open space. This will be confirmed during the general zoning and Beltline SAP review processes.

The residential floor area ratio calculations appear to note that the proposed square footage is slightly above the allowed square footage. The Staff would recommend that the Applicant confirm the density of the project meets the LW zoning requirements.

### **Site Plan and Basic Design Analysis**

Unless noted below, the Staff has concluded the following: that the site plan-related elements meet the applicable site plan related requirements of Subarea 1; the requirements are superseded by a stricter Beltline Overlay Zoning District regulations; or the requirement is not applicable to this phase of the project due to the retained, existing features, the proposed design, or the characteristic of the adjacent properties.

The Staff is concerned about the setback requirements of Subarea 1 which apply to all types of projects, not just one and two-family projects. The front, side and rear setbacks are subject to the compatibility rule. While the Staff acknowledges that there are setback requirements outlined in the LW and Beltline Zoning Overlay Districts and that those could create competing requirements, it is not clear to the Staff that the proposed design meets any of the setback requirements. The Staff would recommend the Applicant document the proposed design meets all applicable setback requirements.

The vehicle access will be provided by an extension of the U-shaped driveway included in the first phase of the project to the north. Staff would note that while the District's Subarea 3 regulations (which applied to the first phase of the project) did not allow for more than one curb cut for a lot with less than 300 ft. of frontage, the southern curb cut is in this phase of the project, which is in Subarea 1.

### **Architectural Analysis**

Generally speaking, the Staff finds that given the more general requirements that apply to projects in Subarea 1 that are not one and two-family developments, the proposed project meets the applicable architectural requirements of the Subarea 1 regulations. At a general level, the Staff finds that the size and massing of the buildings is appropriate for the site, as well as compatible with the District.

Unless noted below, the Staff has concluded the following: the architectural related elements meet the architectural requirements for new construction in Subarea 1 of the District; the requirements are superseded by a stricter Beltline Overlay Zoning District regulations; or the requirement is not applicable to this project due to the proposed design.

### **Rooftop Access Levels**

The architectural plans show each townhouse having a roof top terrace above the third floor (there is also a roof terrace to the rear on the third floor), effectively creating a fourth-level of living space. While enclosed stair structures providing rooftop access are common to historic multi-story commercial and residential buildings, they are generally small, functionally-designed features with flat or shed-roofs and unconditioned footprints typically confined to the stairway itself. Based on the submitted rendering, it is not clear the specific design or building materials that would be used for the roof top access above third floor. Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the design and materials of all roof top elements and that all roof top elements reflect their functional and utilitarian purpose.

### **Overall Pattern and Style of Building Façades**

The Staff is concerned that all but one of the individual townhomes will have the same architectural treatment, materials, window and door patterns, and architectural articulations. Given the size, length, and heights of the attached townhomes, the Staff finds that this will create a repetitive appearance along the Edgewood Avenue blockface. The Staff would recommend that meaningful and coherent variations in the building's architectural treatments, materials, and windows and door patterns are included in the design to interrupt the repetitive pattern of the primary façades and impart additional visual interest to the project design.

Architectural Materials/Ornamentation

Based on the submitted elevations and rendering, Staff finds that some of the proposed architectural elements and materials appear to be appropriate for a building with a contemporary interpretation of a traditional, industrial aesthetic. However, there are several architectural elements and materials that are not clear in the proposal. While it appears that brick veneer will be the predominant exterior material, no materials are specified on the elevations. The Staff would recommend the Applicant provide specifications regarding all exterior finishes including fenestration (window and door) materials.

Renovation of the Existing Contributing Building

The submitted renderings show what appears to be a substantially renovated building, including an entire new glass storefront system, water table, potential new exterior sheathing (masonry of some type), sconces, and the extension of the parapet wall with a design that is the same as five (5) or the six (6) townhouse units' parapet walls. It is not clear how this extension renovation relates to the existing conditions on the building and how much existing building fabric will be retained. The Staff is concerned that little if any of the existing building will be retained in this renovation. The Staff would recommend the Applicant provide substantially more information about the renovation of the existing building and the proposed renovation retain the architectural character of the existing building except in the cases of material deterioration or missing elements.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. The Applicant shall confirm that the lots have previously been consolidated and meets the District requirements, per Section 16-20L.005(5);
2. If the Beltline SAP has not been applied for at this time, it shall be submitted, and that the Staff review and if appropriate approve revisions to the proposed project to accommodate Beltline Zoning Overlay requirements;
3. The Applicant shall confirm that the density of the project meets the LW zoning requirements;
4. The Applicant shall document the proposed design meets all applicable setback requirements;
5. The Applicant shall confirm the design and materials of all roof top elements and that all roof top elements shall reflect their functional and utilitarian purpose, per Section 16-20L.005(1)(b);
6. Meaningful and coherent variations in the building's architectural treatments, materials, and windows and door patterns shall be included in the design to interrupt the repetitive pattern of the primary facades and impart additional visual interest to the project design, per Section 16-20L.005(1)(b);
7. The Applicant shall provide specifications regarding all exterior finishes including fenestration (window and door) materials, per Section 16-20L.005(1)(b);
8. The Applicant shall provide substantially more information about the renovation of the existing building and the proposed renovation shall retain the architectural character of the existing building except in the cases of material deterioration or missing elements, per Section 16-20L.005(1)(b); and
9. The Staff shall review, and if appropriate approve, all final supporting documentation, elevations, and design documents.

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:** 50 Hurt Plaza (Hurt Building LBS)  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-18-541  
**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** LBS **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 1)

**Date of Construction:** 1913 with additions completed between 1923-1926.

**Property Location:** South blockface of Edgewood Ave., north east blockface of Hurt Plaza, and northwest blockface of Peachtree Center Ave.

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-28A.007/.010 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

In general, Staff has no concerns with the design or materials of the proposed signage. From the plans it appears that the signs will be attached through the face of the granite façade. Staff finds that the historic façade material is a character defining feature of the structure's street level façade and it would be inappropriate to bolt the signs through the face of this material. As such, Staff recommends the proposed signs be attached at the joints of the granite to avoid damage to the historic façade material.

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

1. The proposed signs shall be attached at the joints of the granite to avoid damage to the historic façade material, per Sec. 16-28A.007(v)(4).

cc: Applicant  
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:** 620 Home Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA2-18-551

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1932

**Property Location:** Northwest corner of Home Ave. and Rosedale Ave.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Revisions to previously approved plans.

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

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

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

### **Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

On December 13, 2017 the Commission approved application CA3-17-543 for additions and site work on the property. The current application is to remove both historic and non-historic windows and replace with new windows.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval 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 District regulations allow for two criteria for reviewing alterations to contributing structures. First, the alterations shall be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure while complying with the regulations for new construction, or, the work shall not damage historic materials. With regards to the non-historic windows on the site, Staff finds that their replacement would meet either criteria.

However, with regards to the historic windows, Staff finds the second criteria would not be appropriate as historic materials would be lost. Staff is additionally concerned that the proposal would not meet the first criteria as the removal of the original windows would not reinforce the architectural character of the existing building. Based on the information submitted thus far, Staff finds no evidence that the windows are damaged beyond the possibility of repair. Besides aesthetics, the Applicant cites the inoperability of the windows, previous alterations including the installation of minimally expanding foam to prevent draft, multiple paint layers on the windows, and loose or poorly fitting sashes as the primary grounds for replacing the windows. Staff finds that many of these conditions are common issues with historic windows which are easily repaired. As such, Staff recommends the historic windows be retained and repaired in-kind.

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

1. The historic windows shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20K..

cc: Applicant  
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:** 217 Walker St.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-555

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West blockface of Walker St., north of the Fair St. intersection.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Gabled Ell Cottage (converted to commercial)

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New signage and painting of unpainted masonry.

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20, Sec. 16-28A, & Sec. 16-20A of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

#### Signage

The District regulations allow for signage to be placed in one of the following locations: In the area of the storefront above the transom and below the second-floor windows or centered between the transom and the cornice, on or in display windows or upper façade windows, on or in the glazing of the doors, on the valance of awnings, on the fascia or top edge of canopies, or, projecting perpendicularly from the building.

The Applicant has provided photograph of one sign installed on the site. This sign is located between the transom area and the cornice line on the front projecting gable of the structure. As such, Staff finds this sign to be compliant. However, Staff has found through publicly accessible photographs of the site that several other signs have been installed on the property including a sign in the glazing of the door, a wall sign on the left side of the front façade, two banner signs installed on the stoop railing, and a sign installed on the dumpster of the property. Staff has no concerns with the sign installed in the glazing of the front door as that is one of the locations prescribed by the ordinance. The wall sign on the left side of the front façade does not appear to be located in one of the permitted locations. As such, Staff recommends the wall sign on the left side of the front façade be relocated in one of the permitted locations. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the size of both the wall signs and the door sign comply with the size requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Staff finds that banner signs such as those currently installed on the stoop railing are not permitted in the City at large. With regards to the dumpster sign, Staff finds that this sign is not located in one of the prescribed locations permitted by the Ordinance. Further, the dumpster itself is visible from the public street which is a violation of the Castleberry Hill Landmark District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the non-conforming banner signs and dumpster sign be removed from the property.

#### Alterations

The Applicant is proposing to paint the retaining wall and front stoop foundation. In looking at archival photographs of the property, Staff finds that the existing wall may be a later addition to the site and may have been installed when the property was converted from a residence to a commercial structure. If this is the case, Staff would have no concerns with the painting of the non-historic masonry. However, the photographs provided by the Applicant are too narrow for Staff to make a proper determination of this. Staff recommends the Applicant provide detailed, wide shot, photographs of the retaining wall and front stoop foundation so Staff can confirm whether this is a historic feature.

#### Site issues

In reviewing this application Staff has found that the existing dumpster is located where it would be visible from the public street. The District regulations require commercial dumpsters to be located where they cannot be seen from the street. As such, Staff recommends the dumpster be relocated to a compliant location.

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

1. The wall sign on the left side of the front façade shall be relocated to one of the permitted locations, per Sec. 16-28A.010(49)(5);
2. The Applicant shall confirm that the size of both the wall signs and the door sign comply with the size requirements of the zoning ordinance, per Sec. 16-28A.010(49)(8);
3. The non-conforming banner signs and dumpster sign shall be removed from the property, per Sec. 16-28A.010(49)(5);
4. The Applicant shall provide detailed, wide shot, photographs of the retaining wall and front stoop foundation so Staff can confirm whether this is a historic feature;
5. The dumpster shall be relocated to a compliant location, per Sec. 16-20N.008(1)(g)(i); and,
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 644 Woodward Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-524  
**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019 (deferred from December 12, 2018)

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East, between Cameron Street and Berean Avenue

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes    **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Shot Gun

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** 20K.007

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

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

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

***The Applicant has modified the original submitted plans. New language to reflect the modifications are in bold italics.***

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

#### **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to vertically build an addition on top of a contributing main structure allowing for two bedrooms and two bathrooms. ***This will alter the existing main structure from a single Shotgun to a Victorian Folk.*** The new addition will use the same foot print of the existing house which already exceeds the side and front yard sets backs. This new addition will not exceed the 35 ft height limit with a pitch of 10:12 which is in-line with the other comparable houses next or near this house. ***With the new addition the existing gable will remain, however, the roof line will become a hip roof that pushes back from the existing shed roof over the roof area that is extended to the right side. Staff is not concerned with the addition construction.***

#### **REMOVAL OF STORAGE ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to remove a storage addition that is not original to the house to construct a brick terrace and awning. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

#### **ALTERATIONS**

In addition to the addition and the removal of a non-contributing storage addition, the Applicant proposes to do several alterations. Alterations for contributing structures shall be governed by the following District regulation which states that alterations and additions shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations for new construction. Additionally, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work may differentiate from the old. To protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, any new work will be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and environment.

#### **Door**

The Applicant has proposed a new wood front entry door to replace a wood door that was not original to the house. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

#### **Siding**

The Applicant proposes to install new cedar 4-inch Beveled lap siding over the existing cementitious siding which was over the asbestos siding which was the wood overlap siding. Staff is not clear if the Applicant plans to remove the previous siding applications or apply the new wood lap siding over all the applications. The wood lap siding is favored by Staff. ***Staff recommends, the Applicant remove the previous applications of siding to determine if the original wood lap siding is viable. If the siding is, Staff recommends the Applicant repair and use the original lap siding. If the siding isn't viable, the Applicant should install the 4-inch Beveled wood lap siding.***

### **Windows**

Overall, the Applicant has indicated and provide photos that demonstrates that the existing windows on the main structures are not original. Staff has no concerns with the removal of the non-original window, replacing with wood windows and taking the windows back to their original size.

#### ***Front Elevation***

The Applicant proposes new double-hung wood windows with wood trim on the front elevation to replace what is deemed a non-original single pan window. The plans demonstrated that new double-hung window will be larger than the single pan window. Staff has no concern with the larger double-hung windows. Staff deems these windows are in-line with windows that are in the District.

#### ***Right Elevation***

On the right elevation, the Applicant proposes two new double-hung wood windows with wood trim on the lower level. The windows are larger but will match the front window. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The proposed new windows on the right elevation on the second-level will mimic the windows on the front and the new addition. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

#### ***Left Elevation***

The Applicant proposes a new wood window with wood trim for a proposed kitchen upgrade in the interior. Staff is not concerned with the proposed style of window for a kitchen. Additionally, the Applicant proposes a new larger wood window with wood trim on the lower-level near the front. Staff is not concern with this proposal, this window will match existing windows on the main structure.

### **Porch**

Currently there are two porches attached to the main structure; one front wrap around porch that extends to the left elevation and one side porch on the left elevation in the rear.

### ***Columns***

The Applicant has proposed to change the existing wood columns with 3-part decorative column. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Paving**

The Applicant proposes to alter the paving of the side walk and walkway. The currently the sidewalk and walkway material is slate. District regulation requires the paving to be concrete. Staff recommends the paving be concrete.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions**

1. Staff recommends, the Applicant remove the previous applications of siding to determine if the original wood lap siding is viable. If the siding is viable, Staff recommends the Applicant repair and use the original lap siding. If the siding isn't viable, the Applicant should install the 4-inch Beveled wood lap siding, per Sec.20K.007(15)(c) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1027 Lawton Street

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-549

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 2006

**Property Location:** East blockface, North of Peoples Street and South of Merrill Avenue

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

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** 20M.007

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Stop work ordered issued 9/4/18 for unpermitted work.

### SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

**ADDITION**

*Front Porch*

The Applicant has constructed a new front porch on this non-contributing structure, which includes a gable roof over the porch, porch columns, porch rails and stairs. District Regulations states, the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends. There are a variety of porch styles on the blockface and the Applicant has also provided houses for the compatibility purposes, many cannot be used because they are not on the blockface. Additionally, most of the listed houses on Lawton Street were not on the blockface. However, further research indicates there are at least three houses on the Applicant's blockface that contains front porches for comparing. The columns, railings and steps shown on the plans indicates the new porch is compatible with the porches on the blockface. However, Staff could not glean if the propose steps have closed risers. To comply with the District Regulations, Staff recommends the steps have closed risers and ends.

*Wood Deck*

The Applicant proposes general repair on the existing wood deck and adding a guard rail. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

*Fence*

Through provided plans, the Applicant proposes to install a 6-foot privacy fence at the rear of the property that will not exceed the rear setback. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions**

1. The steps shall have closed risers and ends, per Sec.20M.007(2)(i) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# 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:** 683 Lawton Street

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-428

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019 ( Deferred from December 13<sup>th</sup>, November 28<sup>th</sup>, November 14<sup>th</sup>, moved from to November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018 originally heard on October 24, 2018)

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/ Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1900's

**Property Location** West blockface, North of Lawton Place and South of Ralph David Abernathy Boulevard

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Queen Anne

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20G.006

**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 20G of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

*Update comments are in Italics*

### **PLANS**

The Applicant has proposed to remove and replace existing concrete stairs that currently exist on the site. However, the Applicant does not provide site measurement, setbacks and FAR information that will be needed for zoning requirement. The site plan does not indicate the new proposed accessory dwelling nor does the elevations show the new propose accessory dwelling. Staff recommends the Applicant provide an updated site plan and elevations that would encompass the missing information stated.

***The Applicant has provided updated plans that include the new proposed accessory dwelling, site measurements, setback and FAR information. Staff has no concerns regarding the plans.***

### **ALTERATIONS**

#### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes to remove all windows and replace with existing. The Applicant has not provided photographic evidence demonstrating the condition of the existing windows. District Regulations states that replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a window schedule that provides photos of each window on the main structure and tie that schedule to a feasibility scale.

***The Applicant has provided a detail window schedule listing the feasibility of windows on the main structure. Additionally, the Applicant has indicated on the plans to keep all the existing wood windows. Staff is not concern with this proposal.***

#### *Siding*

The Applicant has also proposed cementitious siding on the entire house. The Applicant has not provided photographic evidence of the siding on the existing main structure. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence of the existing siding to allow for determination of its feasibility. If the siding is determined to be replaceable or need of repair, District Regulations states that siding repair or replacement shall match the original in material, scale and direction.

***The Applicant has indicated that all wood lap sliding will remain. If damaged, Applicant will repair as required. Staff is not concern with this proposal, however Staff recommends damage siding be repaired in-kind.***

#### *Deck*

The Applicant proposes a new deck to be constructed on the rear of the main structure that does not extend beyond the sides. District Regulations requires that decks shall be constructed to the rear of the structure and shall not extend beyond the sides of the structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### *Roof*

The Applicant proposes to build a new roof over the side stairs on Elevation 1. District Regulation states, replacement roofing materials shall be of the same size, texture and material as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the scope of work of regarding the new roof; entirely a new roof or only replacement of roof material.

***The Applicant proposes over the side porch on what is now labelled the West Elevation the roof structure and supports brackets will be have minor repairs to the stone base and handrails. Staff has not concerned with the proposal. Staff does recommend the repairs be done in-kind with the existing materials.***

### *Porch*

The Applicant proposes to screen in the front porch on the main structure. The District Regulations states that porches may be enclosed with screen wire or glass provided that the main characteristics of a front porch are maintained. Staff is not concerned with the proposal. However, Staff does recommend the porch be screen in with screen wire or glass.

### **ACCESSORY DWELLING**

The Applicant proposes the construction of a two-story new accessory dwelling. On the first level the proposed accessory dwelling will have a 22 feet 4 inches by 21 feet 10 inches garage. The second level will have 22 feet 4 inches by 12 feet 8 inches bedroom/studio, restroom and kitchen area with sink. Staff cannot determine the location of the new proposed accessory dwelling because the Applicant has not provided information on the site plan nor has the Applicant indicate its position on the elevations. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information pertaining to the proposed accessory dwelling and put that information on the site plan and elevations.

***The Applicant has provided information on the accessory dwelling and has placed the information on the plans. The proposed dwelling has a gable roof with two side dormers. The proposed roof material is 3-tab asphalt shingles to match the existing main structure. Proposed siding will be cementitious lap siding. The proposed windows will be double-hung wood windows with trim details that will mimic the windows on the main structure. The garage doors will be standard garage doors and the entry door will be metal doors with trim details that will main structure. Staff is not concerned with the accessory structure.***

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions**

1. The siding shall be repaired in-kind, per Sec16-20G.006 (2)(d);
2. The roof shall be repaired in-kind, per Sec.16-20G.006 (7)(a);
3. The porch shall be screened with wire or glass, Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(c) 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 509 Peoples Street SW  
**APPLICATIONS:** CA3-18-503 (Special Exception)  
**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019 (deferred from December 12, 2018)

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** c.1903, District Inventory

**Property Location:** Interior lot on the west side of Peoples Street between Lucile Ave. and Oak St.

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

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

- Special Exception

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sections 16-20G.006 and 16-26.006.

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** CA2S-18-304 for the installation of a 4' iron fence. Legal issues

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approve

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapters 20, 20G and 26 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

In July 2018, the Applicant received a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness to erect a 4' metal fence on top of an existing brick masonry retaining wall in the front yard of the property. In August 2018, Historic Preservation Staff received notice from neighbors that a combined brick masonry retaining wall with piers and a 4' metal fence was being erected on the property in excess of the allowed 6' height of a combined fence and retaining wall.

December 12, 2018, the Applicant presented a requested for a variance in excess of 6' height. However, it was realized that the variance was the wrong application for this situation. Instead, the Applicant should be requesting a Special Exception.

### **Special Exception**

The current application before the Commission is for a special exception to allow a retaining wall and fence with a combined height of 8' 4" where otherwise **a combined height of 7' is permitted** under Sec. 16-28.008 (5). The Applicant provided the following answers in response to the questions of the Special Exception petition:

- 1. Such wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining properties and is not incompatible with the character of the neighborhood?**

*Such wall and fence are justified by reasons of security and privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to the adjoining properties.*

- 2. Such greater height is justified by requirements for security of person or property in the area?**

*Yes, The Hammonds House next door has changed its use from a museum when we first purchased our house to an event space. There is more random foot traffic with birthdays, weddings, weekly church services and baby showers. People park in front of our home and causes us to have less security by approaching our home more frequently. For example, we have come out to people sitting on their porch. taking picture of themselves with our house in the background in our front yard or we have had to confront people walking through our yard to access the back of the Hammonds House. We have a glass front door, so you can imagine coming down stairs to someone looking into your house can be scary. The fence will add security to our personal property decreasing foot traffic around our home.*

- 3. Such greater height is justified for topographic reasons?**

*Yes, such greater height is justified for the topography of the property our home sits 8 above grade.*

- 4. Such greater height, in the yard or yards involved, is not incompatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood?**

*Such greater height is compatible with the charter of the surrounding neighborhood the wall is constructed in the likeness of other fences along Peeples Street.*

**Staff Analysis**

In reviewing the Special Exception rationalization for the height of the entire fence from the allowable amount of 7 feet to 8 feet and 4 inches, the Applicant has explained that with the increase foot traffic of the neighboring properties due to change of the neighboring properties' use, the Applicant has experienced increased security issues and unwanted intrusions. Staff deems while a higher fence may not stop all the frequency of mistaken properties or disturbances it can decrease them. Additionally, it might can give the message, this property is not to be disturbed thus minimizing the foot traffic. Staff would suggest, the Applicant also erect signage that states, ***private property not an event hall. Hammond House next door.*** Wording along that line to help with mistaken identities of the properties.

Regarding the actual extra allowable height from 7 feet, the Applicant has shown photos where the property does slopes therefore the topography is not the same along the front. At its highest point the retaining wall and fence is 8 feet and 4 inches. While the retaining wall and fence is larger in appearance than the other retaining walls and fences on the blockface, it is not out of character to the other fences, nor will it appear to be a fortress to where light or air could not pass through it.

Under the Special Exception standard, Staff finds the request justifiable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

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:** 2522 Godfrey Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-547  
**MEETING DATE:** January 09, 2019

---

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** West Blockface, South of Hamilton E. Holmes Drives and North of Hutton Place

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional

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

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

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

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

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

## SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

## **COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS**

The compatibility standards should be applied to this project. It reads. In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face." (a)For the purposes of the compatibility rule, height and width shall be measured at the front façade.(b)Those elements to which the rule applies are noted in the regulations by a reference to the "compatibility rule."(c)When no structure exists on a block face that would qualify as a comparable structure under the compatibility rule, the comparisons shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) on the block, and if no such structure exists on the block, the comparison shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) on an adjacent block face or block, and if no such structure exists on an adjacent block face or block, the comparison shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) located in the district.

## **ADDITION**

### *Roofline*

The Applicant proposes to add additional floor space for interior renovations that would include a larger master bedroom, kitchen expansion and laundry room at the rear of the house. The Applicant has shown the new roof line for this new addition will not pier over the existing roof line. Nor will the new addition exceed the rear and side setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### *Stoop*

The Applicant proposes to add over the existing stoop a front gable which would include columns and picket hand rails thus creating a porch. The Applicant has provided photos of contributing houses on the blockface that demonstrates porches on the front of the house. However, District Regulations states that original or historic porches or stoops, including their component features shall be retained. And replacement porches or stoops or their component features shall be permitted only when the original or historic porch or stoop or their component feature(s) cannot be rehabilitated. The Applicant has not provided sufficient information as to why the stoop should be changed into a porch. Staff recommends the Applicant provide narrative or photographic demonstrating deterioration of the stoop to justify changing it originally to a porch.

### *Deck*

The Applicant proposes to add a deck to the rear of the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal, decks are permitted at the rear of the house that does not exceed the sides are permitted.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes new three over one window on the entire main structure. However, three over one windows are not indicative of American Small houses. The original windows patterns for American Small houses would be one over one, two over one or multi-pan over multi-pan. Instead

the Applicant has presented a Craftsman style window on an American Small house. Furthermore, the District Regulations requires original or historic windows and exterior doors shall be retained. The Applicant has not demonstrated the windows cannot be retained. Staff recommends that the Applicant retain the original windows. Through photographic evidence, if it is determined the windows cannot be retain, Staff recommends, the Applicant install windows that are conducive to an Minimal Traditional construction.

*Siding and Roof Material*

The Applicant has indicated on the plans lap siding and roof shingles. However, the Applicant has not proposed any intentions for the siding or the roof shingles. Staff recommends the Applicant explain the intention for the siding and the roof shingles.

*Paint*

The Applicant has proposed having painted brick. The main structure has lap siding and photos of the foundation appears to be CMU. If the foundation is CMU, the Applicant can paint that. The Applicant has also provided comparison of houses with painted brick on the body of the house. However, painted brick of any sort is not permitted in the District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall provide narrative or photographic demonstrating deterioration of the stoop to justify changing it originally to a porch, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(10)(a)(b);
2. The Applicant shall retain the original windows, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(2)(a);
3. If it is determined the windows cannot be retained, that Applicant shall install windows that are conducive to an American Small house, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(2)(c);
4. The Applicant shall explain the intention for the siding and the roof shingles, per Sec. 16-20Q.006 ;
5. Brick on the main structure shall not be painted, per Sec. 16-20Q.006 and
6. 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:** 2577 Godfrey Drive

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-548

**MEETING DATE:** January 09, 2019

---

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** Interior lot, North of Hutton Place and South of Hamilton E. Holmes Drive

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional

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

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

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

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

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

## SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

### **COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS**

The compatibility standards should be applied to this project. It reads. In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face." (a)For the purposes of the compatibility rule, height and width shall be measured at the front façade.(b)Those elements to which the rule applies are noted in the regulations by a reference to the "compatibility rule."(c)When no structure exists on a block face that would qualify as a comparable structure under the compatibility rule, the comparisons shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) on the block, and if no such structure exists on the block, the comparison shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) on an adjacent block race or block, and if no such structure exists on an adjacent block face or block, the comparison shall be made to a qualifying structure(s) located in the district.

### **PLANS**

The Applicant has proposed to add addition space for interior renovations that will push the main structure out. The Applicant has not provided a site plan to allow Staff to determine if the Applicant has exceeded the rear and side yard setbacks. Staff recommends the Applicant provide three sets of site plans that are to scale.

### **ADDITION**

#### *Roof*

The Applicant proposes to add additional floor space for interior renovations that would include a larger master bedroom, kitchen expansion and laundry room at the rear of the house. The Applicant has shown the new roof line for this new addition will not pier over the existing roof line and will continue the hip form of the existing roof. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **ALTERATIONS**

#### *Front Door*

Indicated plans illustrates the Applicant proposes to replace the front door. However, the Applicant has not provided any information or photographic information regarding the door. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic information regarding the front door.

#### *Siding and Roof Material*

On the new addition on the rear of the house, the Applicant proposes to add 8-inch smooth cementitious siding with a ½ overlap. Cementitious siding is permissible in the District subject to the compatibility standard. The Applicant has demonstrated through photographic information cementitious siding is present on the blockface. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Paint*

The Applicant has proposed having painted brick on the main structure. The Applicant has also provided comparison of houses with painted brick on the body of the house. However, painted brick of any sort is not permitted in the District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall provide three sets of site plans that are to scale, per Sec. 16-20Q.006;
2. Brick on the main structure shall not be painted, per Sec. 16-20Q.006 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 451 E. Kildare Avenue

**APPLICATION:** CA2-18-550

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1967

**Property Location:** Interior lot, South of Larchmont Avenue and North of Larchmont Circle

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Split-level

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Stop Work Order on November 11/26/18 due to unpermitted work.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approve

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

## **ALTERATIONS**

The Applicant proposes various alterations on the main structure. Proposed work includes new roof shingles, new fascia and soffits, new gutters and downspouts and new windows.

### *Roof*

The Applicant proposes new roof shingles to match the original asphalt shingles. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### *General Repairs*

The Applicant proposes new fascia and soffits to match the original fascia and soffits on the main structure. In addition, the Applicant proposes new gutters and downspouts on the main structure. Staff is not concerned with any of the proposal for general repairs.

### *Windows*

New vinyl windows have been installed on the main structure. However, no photos from the Applicant were presented to demonstrate the feasibility of the windows. These windows were installed without a permit. District Regulation states original or historic windows and exterior doors shall be retained. Because the original windows were disposed, they can not be retained. District Regulations also states, replacement windows and doors for non-original or non-historic windows and doors shall be compatible with the architectural style of the structure or shall be subject to the compatibility rule. The Applicant has provided photographic evidence of other houses in the District that have vinyl windows and recently were permitted to retain or install these windows. Abiding by the District Regulation, the Applicant has demonstrated through compatibility comparison vinyl windows can be permitted. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

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:** 686 Kirkwood Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-555

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** Pre 1911

**Property Location:** Northeast corner of Kirkwood Ave. and Tye St.

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

#### Plan Issues

In looking at the plans provided by the Applicant, Staff has found several internal consistency issues when comparing the floor plans to the proposed elevations. These issues relate to windows which are either shown on the floorplan but which are missing on the elevations, or which are missing on the floor plans but which are missing on the elevations. Staff recommends the plans be re-drawn to be internally consistent.

#### Addition

The proposed addition will add a second story above an existing non-historic shed roof addition on the rear of the structure. The proposed addition will be placed below the ridge line of the principal roof hip. The rear façade of the addition will be a gable which will not contain any fenestration or ornamentation, matching the style of the secondary gable on the front façade of the existing structure. Skylights will be added to the west side of the gable roof to allow for egress from the bedroom which will be located in the second story of the addition. As the addition will be massed in the footprint of an existing single story addition, no changes to the lot coverage or setbacks will occur.

With the exception of the plan consistency issues noted above, Staff has no concerns with the proposed addition and finds the overall design of the work to be in compliance with the Landmark District regulations.

#### Alterations

From the plans provided, it appears that the Applicant is proposing to replace all doors and windows on the property. However, Staff has not received photographs which contain sufficient detail to approve this request. Further, the materials of the proposed windows and doors are not noted on the plans. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide individual photographs for each window and door proposed for replacement which have been labelled and keyed to a floor plan. Staff further recommends that only those windows and doors which Staff has determined to be non-original or unrepairable be replaced with windows and doors which meet the material requirements of the District regulations. Staff further recommends that those windows and doors which Staff has determined to be original and repairable be retained.

On the west elevation, the proposed floor plan shows the “rear” window on the original portion of the house being retained while the proposed west elevation shows this window being removed. Staff finds that the District regulations require original window openings to be retained at their original size. As such, Staff recommends all original window openings on the original portion of the structure be retained in their original location and sizes.

At some point in the past, this structure was converted to a duplex and a second entry door was added to the left side of the front façade. The Applicant is proposing to replace this non-historic with a new window. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

The District photographs show the current siding to be a vinyl or aluminum product. As such, Staff would have no concern with the removal of this material. However, it is common for this type of siding to be installed over original wood siding. As such, Staff finds it would be inappropriate to approve the wholesale replacement of siding when original siding on the structure could be salvaged. Further, Staff finds that the District regulations require replacement siding to match the original siding. Staff finds that the siding material used on a structure of this style constructed before 1911 would have been a wood lap with a reveal of between 4” to 6”. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide detailed photographs showing the status of any original wood siding beneath the currently installed vinyl or aluminum siding. If the original

siding is no longer extant, Staff recommends the replacement siding material be wood lap with a 4" to 6" reveal.

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

1. The plans shall be re-drawn to be internally consistent;
2. The Applicant shall provide individual photographs for each window and door proposed for replacement which have been labelled and keyed to a floor plan, per 16-20A.006(14);
3. Only those windows and doors which Staff has determined to be non-original or unrepairable shall be replaced with windows and doors which meet the material requirements of the District regulations, per 16-20A.006(14);
4. Those windows and doors which Staff has determined to be original and repairable shall be retained, per 16-20A.006(14);
5. All original window openings on the original portion of the structure shall be retained in their original location and sizes, per 16-20A.006(14);
6. The Applicant shall provide detailed photographs of the existing siding, per 16-20A.006(14);
7. The Applicant shall provide detailed photographs showing the status of any original wood siding beneath the currently installed vinyl or aluminum siding, per 16-20A.006(14);
8. If the original siding is no longer extant, the replacement siding material shall be wood lap with a 4" to 6" reveal, per 16-20A.006(14); and,
9. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant

File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 725 Kalb Street, SE

**APPLICATION:** CA3-18-558

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1925

**Property Location:** Interior lot, turns into Kalb from Cameron Street

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

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** 20K.007

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approve

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

**ADDITION**

Due to a fire, the Applicant has proposed 8 by 8 stoop addition that will be covered by a gable shed roof at the entry of the main structure. On the blockface, there is a comparable house with a similar stoop. Staff has no concerns for this proposal.

Additionally, the Applicant proposes a 10 feet addition at the rear of main structure. The plans provided by the Applicant indicates a proposal to utilize the same roof form from the main structure. The Applicant also propose to rebuild an existing deck that is currently on the main structure at the rear. This 10-foot addition or deck will not extend the rear or side setbacks. Staff is not concern with the proposal for the 10 feet addition or the rebuild deck

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

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:** 719 Caron Cir.

**APPLICATION:** CA4PH-18-535

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District      **Other Zoning:** R-3

**Date of Construction:** 1960.

**Property Location:** East blockface of Caron Cir., north of W. Peek Rd.

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-28A.007/.010 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

#### **Type IV and In-Rem Process**

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a public threat to health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the application. In this particular case, the property has gone through the In Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta. Below is a description of the In Rem process as described by the Office of Code Compliance:

“The In Rem process, as defined is the process “against the property” versus against the individual owner. The cases that are handled by my office are cases where the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) has been unsuccessful in either identifying the owner, the owner is out of state or out of this jurisdiction, the owner is indigent or the owner is deceased and heirs either cannot be identified or fail to bring the property into compliance. The cases are due to code violations of Section 19 of the Atlanta Housing Code. Most remain open and vacant. The properties are problematic as they tend to be a refuge for criminals and or a danger to the public at large. The properties effect the quality of life for the neighbors as well as a safety hazard.

The In Rem board meets once a month to assist in the decision making of the City as to the action that should be taken to bring the properties into compliance either by demolition or cleaning and boarding the house. The resultant is a lien on the property for the expense incurred by the City to correct the non-compliance. The Board consists of individuals who are not City employees, who have been appointed by the Mayor and approved by City Council.”

The Applicant is not the owner and the In Rem process does not allow for repair, renovations or sale of the property. Staff finds the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values are useful for informational purposes but do not always apply in City of Atlanta In Rem cases. Staff finds the most relevant questions in this case are the following:

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists; and
2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives

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

The Applicant cites a complaint received in January 2013 for property maintenance as well as a complaint in May 2019 for an open and vacant structure and a fire damaged structure.

#### **Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives**

The following is the Applicant’s answer to this question:

“There are no alternatives feasible to rectify the threat to public safety and welfare. The owners are deceased. No evidence of an established estate according to extended research by Staff; no response to any certified letters sent to the owners estate nor did the owner heirs or representative attend the Public In Rem hearing August 30, 2018.”

### **Pictures**

In looking at survey pictures taken at the time of the districts designation, this hipped roof house appears to be unoccupied but still in good condition. In looking at pictures submitted by the Applicant, it is clear that the majority of the structure has been destroyed by fire. The majority of the roof structure appears to be missing. The only extant historic features are the brick exterior walls.

In looking at the inspection form, there are several items both interior and exterior that need to be renovated, repaired or replaced. The form indicates the total cost for repairs as \$42,963. Staff finds the cost of demolishing the existing structure and building an identical new house would far exceed the listed costs of repairing the existing structure. However, given the extensive fire damage Staff finds it is likely that the actual repair cost would far exceed the projected amount. Further, as the majority of the historic features have been destroyed, Staff finds that demolishing what remains of the building as opposed to repairing it would not constitute a significant additional loss to the District.

### **Documentation**

In the package submitted by the Applicant, there are several documents regarding the demolition request. There was a notice sent on August 10, 2018 regarding the public hearing on August 30, 2018. On August 30, 2018, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. In looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, the owner was not in attendance to speak at the meeting. While no letter was included in the Application, the standard process for these cases is for the Office of Code Compliance to notify the owner or their heirs of the decision of the In Rem Board. It has been three months since the decision of the board was sent.

### **Conclusions**

Staff finds the existing building has suffered a fire and extensive damage which has, for all practical purposes, destroyed the character of the historic structure. Staff finds that the actual costs for repairing the existing structure would exceed the amount given by Staff of the Office of Code Compliance. Further, due to the extent of loss from the fire, Staff finds that the removal of the remnants of the former structure so that a new structure which meets the District regulations could be built would not be a loss for the District. As such, Staff finds the Applicant has met the burden of proof to approve a demolition request on the basis of a threat to public health and safety.

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

1. The Applicant shall submit archival quality photographs showing all exterior facades and interior spaces as may be reasonable given the dangers with entering the home. The photographs shall be clearly labeled with both the address and the directional view of the structure and shall be submitted in hard copy on 5x7 or similar sized paper along with digital copies on an archival quality CD.

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:** 125 Palisades Road  
**APPLICATION:** RC-18-531  
**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Conservation      **Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1928

**Property Location:** South of Woodcrest and North of Huntington Road

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes      **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** English Vernacular Revival

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Per Section 16-20.007(b) of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended

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

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

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

Due to rotting on the existing left elevation, the Applicant proposes to remove an existing one-story addition with vinyl siding that was constructed in the 1950's. On the same foundation the Applicant proposes to build a new one-story addition with new 7 inches wood lap siding. This new addition will include a parge coat with timber columns over the existing CMU foundation. Where the existing stoop, steps and railing are the Applicant proposes a stone patio that will include staircase, that will include stone risers and thread.

Additionally, the Applicant proposes to add a rear cover porch on the main structure, repave the driveway, rebuild the stone landscape walls long the driveway and street and add new exterior doors and windows at the rear of the existing structure.

Staff finds that the scoped of work the Applicant proposes does not take away from the architectural integrity or original construction of the main structure. In fact, Staff supports the Applicant removal of vinyl siding on the 1950's addition with the replacement of wood siding. Staff finds no concerns with the project.

**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:** 935 Oglethorpe Ave.

**APPLICATION:** RC-19-018

**MEETING DATE:** January 9, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** West End Historic District    **Other Zoning:** R-4A / West End Historic District.

**Date of Construction:** Early 1900's

**Property Location:** North blockface of Oglethorpe Ave., east of Gordon Pl., west of J.E. Lowery Blvd.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes    **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Folk Victorian / New South Cottage

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Comments on the Variance Application & the proposed alterations.

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**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 & Sec. 16-20G of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The Applicant is proposing a variance for a reduction in the west side yard setback and the rear yard setback. In general, Staff does not oppose requests for variance reductions to side yards in Historic Districts as the existing structures are typically situated closer to the side yard setbacks than modern Zoning requirements would allow. With regards to the setback reduction requests, Staff finds that granting the variance request would not impair the application of the West End Historic District regulations on the proposed additions and site work.

Staff would note their concerns with the proposed principal roof changes shown in the proposed designs. The preferred treatment of a historic structure is to mass additions to the rear of the structure so as to not destroy the historic materials or character of the structure. However, this aspect of the project will be reviewed by the Commission for compliance with the West End Historic District regulations at a later date.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the BZA.**

cc: Applicant  
File