



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 935 Oglethorpe Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-447

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions and alterations visible from the public right of way.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Location and design of the accessory structure (Staff's purview)

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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 District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations and additions. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related design element met the District regulations.

Site plan

The provided site plan does not detail the existing/proposed lot coverage. As part of the review of this project, Staff is required to confirm that the lot coverage meets with the underlying R-4A requirements. The R-4A zoning district limits the lot coverage to 55% of the net lot area. In measuring the lot, Staff finds that the subject property has an approximate net lot area of 6658.4 sf. which allows for a maximum lot coverage of 3662.12 sf. Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the lot coverage complies with the R-4A requirements and note the existing/proposed lot coverage on the site plans.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing 5 in 12 roof and replace it with a new 9 in 12 roof to accommodate a second story addition. The proposal would raise the ridge height of the structure 7' from 18' to 25'. Staff has several concerns with the proposed addition method. The existing structure expresses the hipped roof with lower cross gable subtype of the Queen Anne style. This style subtype is defined by a steeply hipped roof with one or more lower cross gables. The shallow pitch of the existing roof hip and cross gables is out of step with this general standard and sets the property apart as unique within the style subtype. The shallow pitch of the primary hip and the cross gables were likely deliberate architectural choices to embellish an otherwise simple expression of the style. As such, Staff finds the shallow pitch of the principle hip and cross gables to be a character defining feature of the structure. Further, Staff finds the proposed height of the addition would drastically alter the spatial relationships of the existing one-story structure. Therefore, Staff recommends the addition be re-designed to retain the existing 5 in 12 hipped roof and cross gables. Staff further recommends the addition be placed to the rear of the structure, behind the principal hipped roof deck, and be no higher than the ridge of the existing structure.

Site work

The design of the accessory structure falls under the purview of Staff. The District regulations require the height of all structures to be established by the compatibility rule. Compatibility comparisons for the historic accessory structures has not been provided. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable height for the proposed accessory structure based on historic accessory structures on the block face.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The addition be re-designed to retain the existing 5 in 12 hipped roof and cross gables, per Sec. 16-20.009;
2. The addition be placed to the rear of the structure, behind the principal hipped roof deck, and be no higher than the ridge of the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20.009;
3. The Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable height for the proposed accessory structure based on historic accessory structures on the block face, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(f); and,
4. The updated documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 calendar days before the deferred meeting date.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 110 Centennial Olympic Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-18-562
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Caslteberry Hill Landmark District (Subarea 2) **Other Zoning:** None

Date of Construction: Modern

Property Location: Interior building, East of Chapel Street and West of Nelson Street

Contributing (Y/N)?: No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Modern mix/use

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

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

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 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance and Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to do alterations on the existing building that includes replacing light fixture, new painted wood door, new graphics and new sign and placement.

Light fixture

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing light fixtures with new light fixtures on the existing building. The proposed light fixtures will be 17.25 inches in height and 7 inches with a depth of 10.5 in. District regulations, state that any security, decorative, or other lighting luminaries shall be located a minimum height of eight feet above the sidewalk, drive, or pedestrian area. Staff is not concened this proposal.

Wood painted panel door

The Applicant proposes to remove the single glazed pane off the existing door and install a new painted wood panel door with trim color to match the storefront. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Graphics

The Applicant proposes new graphics to replace existing graphics. The graphics will remain in the same location, in the display window and above the transom door window. District regulations permit signage in these speciefied areas. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

New Sign

The Applicant proposes installing a new sign on the main structure. The top of the sign will be plus or minus 8 feet and 4 inches from the finish floor. It will be double sided blade, stainless steel with brass electroplating with recessed logo and text in fill black. It will be supported by a 1.5 x1.5 steel tube. District Regulations states that signs shall be located 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 demonstrated on the plans the placement of the proposed sign will not be placed in either of the required areas listed in the District regulations. Staff recommends the Applicant move the new sign as instructed by stated District Regulations above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The new sign shall be placed in the designated areas specified by the District regulations, per Sec. 16-28A(49)(5) 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 764 Woodson Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-563

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: East blockface of Woodson Ave. south of Bill Lucas Dr., and north of Little St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: The design of facades not facing the street

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

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. 16-20K of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The District regulations have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for new construction. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related design element met the District regulations.

Compatibility Study

The Applicant has provided a compatibility study for this project which includes all houses on the same blockface of Woodson Ave. as the subject property. The District regulations base the compatibility comparisons on only the contributing buildings on the same blockface as the subject property. As such, Staff has determined that only the properties located at 754, 756, 770, and 774 Woodson Ave. may be used for comparisons.

Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that the provided compatibility study appears to assume certain aspects of the design are based on the Compatibility Rule which are in fact not governed by this regulation, such as height, architectural details, and distance between structures. For the purposes of new construction in the Grant Park Historic District regulations, only the front and side yard setbacks of new construction are based on the compatibility rule.

Site plan

Based on the comparison analysis, the 4 contributing properties have a front yard setback range of 18' 3" to 21' 9". However, it is unclear whether these measurements were taken from the lot line to the front façade or from the lot line to the front porch. The front porch of the structure is set at 17' from the lot line, which would be too close to the ROW if the comparison analysis was taken from the lot line to the front porch. The front façade of the structure is set at 23', which would be too far from the ROW if the measurements were taken from the lot line to the front façade. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the method of measurement used for the compatibility study. Staff further recommends the front yard setback meet the range established by the contributing structures on the blockface using the same method of measurement.

Regarding the side yard setback options, the regulations allow for side yard setbacks of not less than 7'. Staff finds the side yard setbacks meet the regulations.

The District regulations require all new construction to contain a walkway leading from the front door to the sidewalk. Staff recommends a walkway from the front door to the sidewalk be shown on the site plan.

The District regulations require sidewalk repair to preserve the original layout and materials where possible. In looking at the property in question, Staff finds that portions of the historic brick herringbone sidewalk are still extant. As such, Staff recommends the historic brick herringbone sidewalk be retained where possible and replaced in kind where repair is unfeasible.

The Applicant notes on the site plan their intention to repair an existing retaining wall on site. Staff recommends the Applicant note the materials of the proposed retaining wall on the site plan.

A new driveway is proposed for installation on the north side of the property. The District regulations require sidewalks to continue across driveway aprons. As such, Staff recommends the sidewalk continue across the driveway apron and consist of herringbone brick on a concrete base.

Massing and Building Height

The structure is capped with a 5 in 1 pitched roof. Per regulations, the maximum height allowed is 35'. The Grant Park Historic district regulations do not specify how the height should be measured. Therefore, Staff finds the standard City measurement should be used. In looking at the front façade, Staff finds the height requirement has been met. While Staff finds the overall height, massing and design of the proposed dwelling is not similar with the historic house on the block, Staff finds the regulations have been met.

Building Facades

The Commission reviews the facades that face a public street. This is corner lot, therefore Staff will only comment on the façades facing Woodson Ave.

Windows and Doors

A single front door is parallel and facing Woodson St. as required. Staff finds the design of the proposed door is appropriate to the style of the house.

The Applicant is proposing to install 1 over 1 double hung windows on the front facades. Staff finds the design of the windows is appropriate. The Grant Park regulations allow for the amount of fenestration to either be compatible with the windows on contributing houses or be no less than 15% and no more than 40% of the total wall surface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide evidence that the front façade fenestration pattern meets the District regulations.

Foundation and Porch

Per regulations, the plans show visible foundations elevated at least 1' above grade on the front façade. The foundation will be comprised of either Architectural CMU or brick. Staff has no concerns with the design of the proposed foundation.

Per regulations, the minimum allowed depth for the front porch is 7'. Staff finds that the proposed porch is 6' 6" deep and therefore does not meet this requirement. Staff recommends the front porch depth meet the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall clarify the method of measurement used for the compatibility study, per Sec. 16-20K.007(1)(A);
2. The front yard setback shall meet the range established by the contributing structures on the blackface using the same method of measurement, per Sec. 16-20K.007(1)(A);
3. A walkway from the front door to the sidewalk shall be shown on the site plan, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B)(2);
4. The historic brick herringbone sidewalk shall be retained where possible and replaced in kind where repair is unfeasible, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(E)(1);

5. The sidewalk shall continue across the driveway apron and consist of herringbone brick on a concrete base, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(E)(4);
6. The Applicant shall provide evidence that the front façade fenestration pattern meets the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B)(11);
7. The front porch depth shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B)(3); and,
8. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 999 Oakland Dr.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-565

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1935

Property Location: West blockface of Oakland Dr., south of Plaza Ave., north of Ladd St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition and alterations.

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

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

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. 16-20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The District regulations allow options for reviewing work on contributing structures. Staff finds the first criteria appropriate for use on this proposal as historic materials are likely to be lost. If a project element is not discussed below, Staff found the related requirement was met.

Alterations

The Applicant has not stated their plans regarding the repair or replacement of the existing windows. As such, Staff cannot properly review this aspect of the project. Staff recommends the Applicant detail their plans for the repair and replacement of any existing windows and doors. Staff further recommends any window and door replacement meet the District regulations.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition to the existing contributing structure. per the regulations, the new addition will maintain the side yard setbacks of the existing structure and the new roof will tie in to the ridgeline of the existing roof.

The plans show a new accent/transom window proposed for installation on the left side façade of the addition. The District regulations require new windows to match the size and shape of window openings on the existing contributing structure. As such, Staff recommends the accent/transom window on the left side façade of the proposed addition be changed to a window matching the shape and size of the original windows on the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall detail their plans for the repair and replacement of any existing windows and doors, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(0);
2. Any window and door replacement shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(0);
3. The accent/transom window on the left side façade of the proposed addition shall be changed to match the shape and size of the original windows on the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(0)(2); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1115 Princess Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-567

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West blockface of Princess Ave., south of Arlington Ave., north of Wilmington Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman bungalow.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to the existing structure and site work.

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

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

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. 16-20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The District regulations provide two methods for reviewing alterations to contributing structures. Staff finds that the first of the two criteria is appropriate for the review of this proposal as historic material will be lost in the If an item is not discussed below, Staff found that it met the related regulations.

Photographs

The Applicant has provided context photographs of properties which contain board and batten siding and other embellishments which are proposed for the subject property. The addresses of these properties have not been given. These properties are either outside of the District boundaries and are not subject to the regulations or the work was completed without permits or review by the Commission and Staff. As such, these properties could not be used for compatibility comparisons. Staff will be researching this situation and will take appropriate compliance resolution action once the addresses of these properties have been identified.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing the removal and replacement of the existing windows with new vinyl windows. Some of the replacement windows are either smaller than the existing windows or convert the windows to accent/transom style windows. The District regulations require replacement windows to match the size of the original windows. As such, Staff recommends the replacement windows match the size of the original windows.

The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing asbestos shingle siding and replace it with a board and batten siding material. The District regulations require replacement siding material to meet the compatibility rule. In looking at the contributing properties on the block face, wood lap siding is the predominate building material. In the photographs provided, Staff noted that several areas of missing shingles reveal the original wood lap siding may still be installed beneath the asbestos siding. As such, Staff finds that the appropriate replacement material for this structure would be lap siding. Staff recommends the replacement siding material be either a wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding material with a 4" to 6" reveal.

The Applicant proposes expanding the existing front porch to be a full width porch. The new porch roof will have two accent gables. In general, Staff has no concerns with the conversion of the ¼ width porch to a full width front porch, but finds the addition of accent gables on the porch roof would introduce conflicting architectural elements to the structure and reduce the historic character of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the accent gables be removed from the proposed porch roof. The Applicant states wood planking is proposed for the porch floor. Staff is in support of this but finds that added clarification is needed to ensure historically accurate materials are used. Staff recommends the porch floor be comprised of a wood 1x4 or 1x5 tongue and groove product.

The Applicant is proposing to remove the original side porch and replace it with a carport. Staff finds that the existing side porch is a character defining feature of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the side porch be retained.

New porch railing is proposed for the front porch. Staff recommends the proposed railing be constructed using a two part butt-joint method as opposed to installing deck railing.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a 12' wide driveway. The District regulations require driveways to be no wider than 10' when located in the front yard. Further, given Staff's previous recommendation regarding retaining the side porch, Staff finds that the proposed driveway could not be built as shown on the site plan. As such, Staff recommends the driveway be no wider than 10' exclusive of the flare.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The replacement windows shall match the size of the original windows, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o)(1);
2. The replacement siding material shall be either a wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding material with a 4" to 6" reveal, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
3. The porch floor shall be comprised of a wood 1x4 or 1x5 tongue and groove product, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
4. The side porch shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
5. The proposed railing shall be constructed using a two-part butt-joint method as opposed to installing deck railing, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
6. The driveway shall be no wider than 10' exclusive of the flare, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4)(c);
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 66 Huntington Rd.

APPLICATION: RC-18-568

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1926. Altered in 1946 and 1966.

Property Location: North blockface of Huntington Rd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Structure has been heavily altered and the original architectural character is not able to be determined.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

RC-18-568 for 66 Huntington Rd.

January 23, 2018

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing an addition to the left side façade to allow for the installation of an elevator. The location for the addition is partially hidden from the public view shed by a two-story sunroom addition and a fence. The addition will be capped with a hipped roof which will be placed below the ridge of the existing roof. Staff finds that the placement and design of the proposed addition is appropriate and has no concerns with the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with commends to the Applicant.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1294 Lucile Avenue, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-001
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Interior Lot, East of Langhorn Avenue and West of Holderness Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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: Work Stop Order on November 9, 2018

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

Alterations

Work was done on the existing structure without the proper review by the Commission.

Front Porch

Rails

Photographs provided by the Applicant demonstrates porch railings that are horizontal and appear to be higher than 33 inches above the finish floor. District Regulations requires porch railings to be consistent with the architectural style of original porches on the block in the District. Horizontal railings are not consistent with the architectural style of original porches in the District, vertical rails are. Staff recommends the rails be vertical in orientation. Additionally, Staff recommends the rails be a top and bottom railing with a two-part construction with butt-jointed pickets. Further, Staff recommends the railing be appropriately scaled to the front façade with the rails be no higher than 33 inches above the finish floor to abide by the District regulations.

Floor

Photographs provided by the Applicant, demonstrates the Applicant installed new flooring to match the existing floor. The Applicant's narrative states the replacement was due to rotten floor boards. From photos, the new flooring has been matched in orientation (vertical) and size. While, not a function of the Commission's preview, the Applicant has proposed to stain the floor to join and match the new with the old. Staff suggestion, the Applicant do so. Staff has no concern with this scope of work.

Deck

The Applicant replaced an existing deck in the rear of the main structure. The Applicant purports the replacement was due to rotting wood. Staff is not concerned with the deck. The deck is at the rear of the main structure and does not exceed the rear or side yard setbacks.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall use the existing rails and columns for reinstallation. If rails or columns are damaged, the Applicant shall repair in -kind, per Sec. 16-20G.006;
2. If damage to the Bay window occurs during installation of support footing and columns, the Applicant shall repair the window in-kind to the existing bay window, per Sec.16-20G.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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 649 Gaskill St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-002

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District (Subarea 3) **Other Zoning:** Beltline.

Date of Construction: Pre-1911

Property Location: North blockface of Gaskill St., east of Berean Ave., west of Powell St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Georgian Cottage.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to the existing structure, rear addition, and dormer 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.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing two additions. The rear addition will be placed no closer to the side yard than the existing side yard setback. Staff has no general concerns with the design of this addition, but recommends the Applicant provide compatibility comparisons to determine the allowable rear yard setback range.

With regards to the design of the proposed dormer, Staff has no general concerns but recommends the roofing material be shingle to match that of the principal roof. Staff further recommends the Applicant submit information detailing the dormer does not occupy 35% of the total surface area of the roof plane on which it is to be constructed. The District regulations also require the siding to be consistent with the siding on the principal structure. As such, Staff recommends the dormer be clad in wood siding with a reveal matching that of the original siding elsewhere on the structure.

While the project documents note the use of wood 2 over 2 windows, the District regulations require the windows to be true divided lite windows. As such, Staff recommends all new windows be true divided lite windows.

Porch repairs

The Applicant is proposing to replace the existing non-historic decorative metal columns with turned wood columns matching the design of the Victorian cottages on the block face. Staff finds this approach to be appropriate and has no concerns with the proposed columns.

Given the state of the front porch shown in the photographs, it is likely the porch flooring will require repair or replacement. Staff recommends any repair to the porch floor be done in-kind and any replacement be done with a wood tongue and groove material matching the dimensions of the original. If the original tongue and groove flooring is no longer extant, Staff recommends the replacement flooring be a 1x4 or a 1x5 wood tongue and groove material.

The Applicant is proposing a standing seam metal roof. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

Alterations

The plans show the replacement of windows with smaller windows on the left side façade to accommodate interior changes to the floor plan. However, the Applicant has handwritten a note on the plans stating that the existing windows will be retained. Staff recommends the plans be redrawn to reflect the existing windows on the side façades being retained.

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of the non-historic front doors with new doors that meet the regulations. A new rear door will also be installed to allow access to the new deck. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a new rear deck. Per the District regulations, the deck is not visible from the public right of way and meets the side yard setback requirements. The compatibility of the rear yard setback will be confirmed by an earlier recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide compatibility comparisons to determine the allowable rear yard setback range, per Sec. 16-20A.006(9);
2. The dormer shall be clad in wood siding with a reveal matching that of the original siding elsewhere on the structure, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(d)(1);
3. All new shall windows be true divided lite windows, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(3);
4. Any repair to the porch floor shall be done in-kind and any replacement shall be done with a wood tongue and groove material matching the dimensions of the original, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(a);
5. If the original tongue and groove flooring is no longer extant, the replacement flooring shall be a 1x4 or a 1x5 wood tongue and groove material, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(b);
6. The plans shall be redrawn to reflect the existing windows on the side façades being retained, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(c);
7. 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
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1056 Donnelly Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-19-003
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: Interior lot, East of Peeples Street and West of Lawton Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PLANS ISSUES

The plans and the photo provided for the front are not consistent. The plans show a front with three columns while the photo depicts a front with two columns. The front gable vent is missing off the plans. On the plans the Gable front roof is much smaller than the Hip roof. A provided photo, shows the opposite. The Gable front roof is smaller than the Hip roof. Staff recommends the Applicant revise the plans to show the front porch with two columns, to show a gable vent and show the Gable front roof in the correct proportion to the Hip roof.

ADDITION

Space

The Applicant proposes to add additional 675 square feet to the existing structure for a new master suite. The roofline of the addition will not pier over the existing Hip roofline and will follow the Hip's form. Additionally, the proposed addition will not exceed the rear and side yard setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to construct a deck at the rear of the main structure that will not be wider than the main house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Roof

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace the roof. However, the Applicant has not indicated specifics regarding this scope of work. Staff recommends the Applicant identify what material will be used and provide more detail regarding the intentions of the gutters.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to replace and repair windows. The Applicant has not provided a window schedule to indicate which windows are to be replaced and which windows are to be repaired. From the provided photos, the window shown is in good shape. District regulations states that replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a window schedule identifying which windows will be repaired and which will be replaced. Staff recommends all windows be repaired in-kind or replace in-kind.

Doors

The Applicants has proposed to replace and repair the doors. The photo of the front door provided by the Applicant shows the front door to be a wood Craftsman door. The door is in pretty good condition and can be retained. Staff recommends the front door be retained and repaired in-kind. The other door is on the Left elevation in the rear. The Applicant has not provided a photo of this door or clearly stated whether to replace or repair it. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a photo to Staff and determine whether to replace or repair in-kind.

Siding

The main structure currently has wood clapboard siding. The Applicant proposes to repair the siding. Staff recommends that the siding be repaired in-kind to the existing siding.

Driveway

The Applicant has noted repairing the concrete driveway. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall revise the plans to show the front porch with two columns, to show a gable vent and the Gable Front roof in proportion to the Hip roof, per Sec 16-20M.001;
2. The Applicant identify what material will be used and provide their intention regarding the gutters, per Sec 16-20M.
3. The Applicant shall provide a window schedule identifying which windows will be repaired and which will be replaced all windows be repaired in-kind or replace in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M;
4. All windows shall be replaced or repaired in-kind per Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(o);
5. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the side door to Staff and determine whether to replace or repair in-kind, per Sec.16-20M.013;
6. The siding shall be repaired in-kind to the existing siding, per Sec.16-20M.013 and
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2977 Eleanor Terrace

APPLICATION: CA2-19-04

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1952

Property Location: Interior, East of Woodson Drive and West of Eleanor Court

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: 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: On November 30, 2018, a Stop Work Order for unpermitted work was issued.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

CARPORT

The Applicant converted an existing carport into a one car garage without acquiring the permits. District Regulations state existing attached carports may be enclosed with garage doors, provided that the alteration is consistent with the original architectural style of the existing structure. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

PAINTING OF EXTERIOR

Without review from the Commission, the Applicant has painted the brick façade of the existing structure. Painting masonry is not permitted in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the paint from the brick masonry through a method that will not damage the brick. Pressure washing would not be permitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall remove the paint from the brick masonry through a method that will not damage the brick, pressure washing shall not be permitted , per Sec. 16-20Q.005;
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 676 Elbert Street
APPLICATION: CA3-18-005
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Interior lot, East of Mayland Avenue and West of Metropolitan Parkway

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PLANS

The Applicant has not submitted a site plan with FAR information that is required for all additions to allow for underlining review. Staff recommends the Applicant provide three sets of to-scale site plans with FAR information. Additionally, the depicted roofline on the plans and what is shown on photos are not consistent. On the plans the dormer on the front elevation is not as high as the Hip roof. The photograph shows this is not accurate. In fact, the dormer is shown to be higher than the existing Hip roof. The Staff recommends, the Applicant make this correction so that there is no confusion as to what the correct roofline is.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to build two dormers on the Left Elevation and on the Right Elevation to allow for two bedrooms and bathrooms. Being that the plans are not accurate, these dormers appear to be not as high as the peak of the Hip roof line. The Applicant has not provided information on the pitch of the existing roof or the pitch of the dormers to allow for a thorough evaluation of the proposed dormers. Along with providing accurate plans showing the correct roofline, Staff recommends the Applicant also provide the roof pitch for existing roof and the proposed dormers.

ALTERATIONS

Siding and Trim

The Applicant has noted that siding and wood trim repaired as need and in-kind to the existing siding and trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The Applicant has noted that new window will be installed in the proposed dormers. District regulations states that new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors. The new proposed windows are shown on the plans to be double hung paired six over six with lite divides and two side by side ribbon windows for the bathrooms on the second level. Neither of these size windows are present on the existing structure. However, the style and pairing are representative of windows that are currently on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Roof materials

The Applicant proposes shingles for the roof material on the new dormers.. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall provide three to-scale site plans that include FAR information, per Sec. 16-20I.001;
2. The Applicant shall provide plans that depicts a correct roofline to include the proposed dormers, per Sec. 16-20I.001;
3. The Applicant shall provide information for the pitch of existing roof and dormers, per Sec.16-20I.006 (4)(f) and
4. Final plans and photos to be reviewed by Staff for final 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 287 Berean Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-008
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District (Subarea 3) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: Interior Lot, North of Gaskill Street and South of Pickett Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A.005, Sec. 16-20A.006, Sec. 16-20A.009

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

ALTERATIONS

Windows

Due to interior renovations, the Applicant proposes to add windows to the existing main structure.

North Side Elevation

Due to a new kitchen and dining configuration, for added light, the Applicant proposes to remove the exterior hall to add two double hung wood windows with simulated lite divide, 1/1 glazing configuration with trim to match the existing double hung wood windows on the main structure. The District regulation states that on existing principal structures, new doors and windows in new openings, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement and style to existing windows and doors. The addition of the proposed added windows will not destroy the historical style of the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant proposes to repair or replace in-kind the siding are the proposed windows if needed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Rear Elevation

Due to the new configuration in the interior, the Applicant proposes to install in the rear of the house two double hung wood windows with simulated lite divide, 1/1 glazing configuration trim to match the existing double hung wood windows on the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant proposes to repair or replace siding in-kind around the proposed windows. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1152 Eggleston Street
APPLICATION: CA2-19-009
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: South blockface of Holderness and Westend Pl

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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: COA Approval: CA3-18-233

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.

Alterations

The alterations the Applicant proposes are addendums to an approval from June 2018.

Front Porch

Handrails and Columns

The Applicant proposes to remove and reinstall porch rails and columns. The porch rails and columns were removed to replace rotten floor boards on the existing porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend using the existing rails and columns for reinstallation. If damaged the Applicant is to replace the rails and columns in-kind.

Porch Flooring

The Applicant proposes to replace rotten floor boards. Staff recommends, the Applicant replace rotten floor boards in-kind to match the original floor boards that match in size style and materials. In this case will be 1" X 4"-5" tongue-and-groove and installed perpendicular to the front facade.

Posts/Bay Window

The Applicant proposes to install support footing and columns under the existing bay window due to the window not having proper support. Staff is not concerned with proposal if the support footing and columns do not alter the historic fabric of the window. Staff does recommend if installation of posts causes damage to the window, the Applicant repair the window in-kind to the original.

Window

The Applicant proposes to replace vinyl sashes with wood sashes. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall use the existing rails and columns for reinstallation. If rails or columns are damaged, the Applicant shall repair in -kind, per Sec. 16-20G.006;
2. The Applicant shall replace rotten floor board in-kind to match the original floor; 1"x 4"-5" tongue and groove to be installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Sec.16-20G.006(9)(b);
3. If damage to the Bay window occurs during installation of support footing and columns, the Applicant shall repair the window in-kind to the original bay window, per Sec.16-20G.006 and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 649 Woodward Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-18-416
MEETING DATE: December 12, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: South blockface of Woodward Ave., east of Berean Ave., west of Cameron St.

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

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)?: Yes. *Updated text in bold italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously reviewed CA2-17-466 for alterations and window replacement at this address. The Application was deferred several times and eventually was denied without prejudice due to a lack of response from the Applicant. As the substance of the project has not changed, and as the items requested in the previous Staff Report have not been provided, Staff will use the previous comments for their review of the new application.

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 Photographs provided by the Applicant appear to show an addition added to the rear of the property. Staff recommends photographs of the rear of the property be provided so the scope of the project can be confirmed by Staff.

The Applicant has provided a single photograph of the rear façade. This façade appears to be a recent addition to the property, consistent with Staff's findings in the original review from 2017. However, a single photograph does not give proper context to allow Staff to confirm the extent of additions made to the property. As such, Staff finds clarification of the original recommendation is needed to avoid confusion. Staff recommends multiple photographs taken from different angles and showing all three sides of the rear portion of the structure be added for Staff to confirm the scope of work on the property.

The District regulations allow two criteria for the review of alterations to contributing structures. Staff finds that as the work was completed without proper review or permitting, neither of the two criteria would adequately address the project in question for various reasons. Firstly, the completed work is not consistent with, nor does it reinforce, the historic architectural character as required by the first criterion. Secondly, as the work has already been completed and involved the destruction of historic materials that characterize the property in violation of criterion number 2. However, Staff finds that the application of the first criterion would be most appropriate as the historic materials have already been destroyed, and the project can be altered to be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the property. As such, Staff will apply the first criterion to the project.

Plan issues

The updated plans contain graphical representation errors and other issues. Many of these issues are discussed elsewhere in this report in responses to previous conditions. However, two new issues are present in the revised drawings that Staff will discuss here.

Firstly, the porch roof shown in the proposed elevations does not match the existing porch roof and is not internally consistent. The issue lies with the representation of the front façade elevation where the proposed porch roof terminates much lower on the front roof hip than the actual roof or the roof shown in the side façade elevations. As such, Staff recommends the front façade elevation porch roof be re-drawn to reflect the existing conditions and be internally consistent with the porch roof shown in the side façades.

The same issues mentioned in this recommendation are still present in the updated plans. As such, Staff retains its previous recommendation.

Second, the structure shown on the proposed site plan does not match the structure shown on in the revised elevations or floor plan. As such, Staff recommends the site plan be re-drawn to reflect the proposed structure and be internally consistent with the proposed elevations and floor plans.

The applicant has provided an updated site plan which is internally consistent with the plans and the photographs. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Staff finds that the gable addition at the rear of the property is drawn as a hipped roof addition on the rear. Staff recommends the plans be changed to show the rear addition containing a gable roof.

Replacement of both front windows

Both front windows have been replaced with new windows. The replacement windows appear to be brickmould windows with wood trim added to act as casing and cornices. However, Staff finds there are several issues with the existing windows which have been installed.

The height of the original windows can be determined by the outline left on the original siding. In comparing the installed windows with the outline of the original, Staff finds that both the currently installed windows and cornices are much smaller than the original. Using this same standard Staff finds the currently installed windows are much narrower than the originals. As such, Staff finds that this configuration is inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. Staff recommends the front façade windows be replaced with new windows matching the height and width of the original features as shown in the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front façade.

The updated plans show front facade windows which are larger than those previously proposed, but which are also much larger than the previously existing windows. Staff retains their previous recommendation.

The trim added as casing to the sides and bottom of the windows is wider than the original windows. Staff finds that this was likely done to fill out the outline of the original windows. The original windows had a narrow casing on the sides. As such, Staff finds that the currently installed window casing on the sides is inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. Staff recommends the side casing of the front facade windows match the width of the original features shown in the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front façade.

The updated plan shows casing on the front façade windows which are inconsistent with the previous front façade window casing. As such, Staff retains its previous recommendations.

The windows shown on the plans have not changed from the previous submission. As such, Staff retains its previous recommendation.

The currently installed windows do not include a sill as would be expected for windows on a historically contributing property. As such, Staff finds this aspect of the currently installed windows is inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. Staff recommends a sill matching the design and dimensions of the original features as shown by the in the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front façade be added to both front façade windows.

The updated plans do not provide sufficient information on the proposed window sills. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

The updated plans contain a window schedule which provides information on the proposed window sills which are sufficient for review. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The cornice/frieze of the currently installed windows appears to be comprised of square stock wood. This rudimentary configuration is inconsistent with the design of the original cornice/frieze shown in the District photographic inventory. As such, Staff finds this aspect of the currently installed windows is inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. As such, Staff recommends a cornice/frieze matching the design and dimensions of the original as shown by the in the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front façade be added to both front façade windows.

The updated plans do not provide sufficient information on the proposed window cornice/frieze. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

The window schedule provided by the Applicant contain cornice/frieze information which is sufficient for review. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

In addition to these retained recommendations, Staff recommends a scaled window schedule be submitted showing the proposed front façade windows and the proposed casing, sill, and cornice/frieze for review by Staff.

The updated plans show a scaled window schedule. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Removal and enclosing of the left front door

The left side front door is proposed for removal. The property in question was originally constructed as a duplex. As such, Staff finds that enclosing one of the two front door openings would be inconsistent with the architecture of the structure and would not reinforce the original use of the structure. Staff recommends both front door openings be retained.

The updated plans show the left side front door being retained. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

At some point in the past, both front doors were replaced. As such, Staff has no concerns with the Applicant's plans to replace the existing front doors. The District photographic inventory shows the design of the original front doors for this structure. Staff recommends any replacement front doors match the design, materials, and size of the original doors as shown in the District photographic inventory.

The updated plans show new wood slab doors being installed. Staff finds these doors do not match the original doors on the structure and therefore retains its previous recommendation.

The updated plans show front doors similar in style to those originally on the house. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Front porch alterations

The front porch flooring was replaced with what appears to be 2 by 4 or 1 by 4 stock laid side to side. The original structure had a tongue and groove floor installed with a front to back orientation. As such, Staff finds the currently installed porch floor is inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. Staff recommends the currently installed front porch flooring be replaced with a wood tongue and groove floor matching the design and orientation of the original features.

The updated plans show a 1x4 tongue and groove flooring installed perpendicular to the front façade. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The porch ceiling has been replaced with what appears to be plywood. Staff finds this is not architecturally appropriate for a porch ceiling on this historically contributing structure. As such, Staff recommends the porch ceiling be replaced with a wood bead board product.

The updated plans show the porch roof being replaced with a wood bead board material. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The left side front porch square fluted column was replaced with a new squared column which does not appear to have fluting. As such, Staff finds the currently installed porch column on the left side is inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. Staff recommends the left side porch column be replaced with a square fluted column matching the design, ornamentation, and size of the original as shown by the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the extant front porch columns.

The updated plans show a square fluted column in place of the squared column installed without approval. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The front porch rails and balusters have been replaced with new features which are much taller than the originals. The original porch rails appear in the District inventory photograph and were scaled to the front façade so as to be no higher than the sills of the original windows. As such, Staff finds the currently installed porch rails and balusters are inconsistent with the architectural features of the structure. Staff recommends an appropriately scaled front porch railing be installed matching the design and size of the originals as shown by the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front porch. Staff further recommends any additional porch railing height required for code compliance shall be achieved through the use of a plane extension consisting of a simple rail only after the need for additional height is properly documented for Staff to review and approve.

The updated plans show the same porch rails that were mentioned in the previous analysis. As such, Staff retains these recommendations.

The porch rails shown in the plans have not changed since the previous submission. As such, Staff retains its previous recommendation.

Front façade alterations

The current plans show the front façade gables being replaced with new elements with a pitch that is much shallower than the existing gables. The plans also show the removal of the front gable vents. Staff recommends the front façade gables be retained and that the plans be altered to show the correct pitch of the existing gables. Staff further recommends the gable vents be retained.

The updated plans show the front façade gables being retained at their existing dimensions, shape, and pitch. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The plans show the transoms above both front doors being removed. Staff finds the proposed change would be inconsistent with the architecture of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the existing transoms above the front façade doors be retained.

The updated plans show the door transoms being retained, but the dimensions shown in the updated plans do not appear to match the dimensions of the existing transoms. As such, Staff further recommends the plans be updated to show the accurate height of the existing door transoms.

The transoms shown in the updated plans have not changed since the previous submission. As such, Staff retains its previous recommendation.

Site work

A new driveway is proposed for installation on the left side of the property. Staff recommends the proposed driveway extend 20' past the front façade of the structure.

The updated plans show the driveway extending 20' past the front façade of the structure. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. ***The plans shall be changed to show the rear addition containing a gable roof;***
2. *The front façade elevation porch roof shall be re-drawn to reflect the existing conditions and shall be internally consistent with the porch roof shown in the side façades;*
3. The front façade windows shall be replaced with new windows matching the height and width of the original features as shown in the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front façade, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(1);
4. An appropriately scaled front porch railing shall be installed matching the design and size of the originals as shown by the District photographic inventory and the extant physical evidence present on the front porch, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(1);
5. Any additional porch railing height required for code compliance shall be achieved through the use of a plane extension consisting of a simple rail only after the need for additional height is properly documented for Staff to review and approve, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(1);
6. *The plans shall be updated to show the accurate height of the existing door transoms, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(1); and,*
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1021 Sparks Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-18-508 (addition, alterations)
MEETING DATE: January 23, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950, per District Inventory

Property Location: North side of Sparks Street between Peeples and U.S. Highway 29.

Contributing (Y/N)? No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Side Gable Cottage/No Style

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Second story addition
- Door and window replacements

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Deck
- Interior renovations

Relevant Code Sections: Sections 16-20M.005, 16-20M.013, 16-20M.016, and 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)? Yes, deferred January 09, 2019. *Updated text in Italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: STOP WORK ORDER – Working outside scope of permit

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are not in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

On February 16, 2018, the Applicant was issued a building permit for general repairs. The Office of Buildings received complaints the Applicant was working outside the scope of the permit (including a second story addition and exterior alterations). An inspector issued a Stop Work Order on September 17, 2018.

According to the architectural plans and submitted photographs, the original side-gable roof of the non-contributing cottage was removed and a front-gable, second level addition with a two-level front porch and cementitious siding was constructed on the house. The existing building footprint was also extended to the rear. All of the windows have been replaced with one-over-one, double-hunt sash vinyl units. The front door will also be replaced, and a deck constructed at the rear of the building.

As the subject property is located on an interior lot, the Staff finds that only the front and side facades are visible from the street and fall under the purview of the Commission.

The District regulations requires one of two standards for additions and alterations to non-contributing properties. One standard is that the proposed work be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or comply with the design regulations for new construction. Staff does not find the second story, front gable addition to be consistent with the architectural character of the original, one-story side gable cottage. As such, Staff will apply the second standard in the design review for this project, which has both qualitative and quantitative requirements for compatibility with contributing structures on the block face (same side of street between intersecting streets).

Plan Issues

The submission documents state a deck will be constructed at the rear of the principal structure; however, a deck is not depicted on the existing or proposed site plan. Staff recommends the Applicant include the deck location and dimensions on the revised site plan.

Compatibility Measurements

The District's compatibility rule states, "*Where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.*"

The Applicant has provided compatibility information for nine properties within the District on Dimmock Street (987, 989, 995) and White Oak Avenue (1039, 1041, 1046, 1085, 1089, 1100).

CA3-18-508 for 1021 Sparks Street
January 23, 2018
Page 4 of 5

None of the identified properties are located on the block face of the subject property and all appear to be new construction and therefore are not contributing to the District.

According to the District Inventory, the following are contributing properties on the subject property block face (north side of Sparks Street between Peeples Street and US Highway 29):

995 Sparks St.	1013 Sparks St.
999 Sparks St.	1027 Sparks St.
1003 Sparks St.	1031 Sparks St.
1005 Sparks St.	1037 Sparks St.

Staff recommends the Applicant demonstrate compatibility with the quantitative (building height) and qualitative (roof form, siding materials, door style, etc.) requirements of contributing buildings on the subject property block face.

The Applicant has provided updated plans showing architectural changes aimed at conforming to the general design of the homes at 1003 and 1005 Sparks St. In general, Staff finds this design moves the structure closer to conformity with historic structures on the block face. However, Staff has not received information showing the allowable height range based on the contributing structures on the block face. Staff has performed a visual survey of the contributing structures on the block face as shown in the District photographic inventory, and finds it unlikely that the two-story structure will meet the height requirements imposed on it by the Compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide height information for all contributing structures on the block face. Staff also recommends the Applicant show the 7 in 12 roof pitch meets the compatibility rule.

Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that any variation from the height range on the block face would require either the second story to be removed or for the Applicant to apply for a variance and show that the size, shape, and topography of the site require a second story addition which does not meet the compatibility rule. Staff would also note that

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

1. The Applicant shall revise the existing and proposed site plan to include the proposed rear deck, per Section 16-20.008(b)(1);
2. The Applicant shall demonstrate the proposed addition and alterations are compatible with the contributing properties on the Sparks Street block face, per Section 16-20M.005;
3. *The Applicant shall provide height information for all contributing structures on the block face, per Section 16-20M.005;*
4. *The Applicant shall show the 7 in 12 roof pitch meets the compatibility rule, per Section 16-20M.005; and,*
5. All updated documents and information shall be submitted no less than 8 days prior to 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 69 Randolph Street NE

APPLICATIONS: CA3-18-251 (accessory structure)
CA3-18-517 (variance)

MEETING DATE: Revised January 23, 2019 (revised text in courier)

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 2) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1999, per District Inventory.

Property Location: On the east side of Randolph St. between Gaspero St. and Auburn Ave.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Variance from District lot coverage and building height requirements

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Two-level accessory structure.

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes -from the 7/11/2018, 9/12/2018, 11/14/2018, and 12/12/2018 meetings.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: CA3-18-517 – Denial.
SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: CA3-18-251 - Denial.

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

Since the original submission for the construction of a two-story, attached garage, which is not allowed by the District regulations, the project was revised into a two-story detached garage with upper level living space and rooftop access. Since the December 12, 2018 meeting, the design has been revised again in the most recent submission to reduce the height and footprint of the detached garage, and alter the architectural components and materials to include horizontal siding, a flat roof, and an horizontal emphasis on the garage doors. Because the revised project is a detached accessory structure, the Applicant has requested several variances to District development controls pertaining to accessory structures.

Review of the variance request and proposed accessory structure are provided below. The District regulations also have both qualitative and quantitative requirements for accessory structures. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the relevant regulations were met.

(CA3-18-517) Variance

The Applicant is requesting the following variances for the rear yard accessory structure to have a height of 24' where no more than 20' height is allowed; to have a lot coverage of 32% where no more than 25% is allowed; and have an equal floor plan percentage for total square footage of the principal structure where no more than 30% is allowed.

In the most recent submission, the height of the accessory structure has been reduced to 20 ft., which would not require a variance from the District regulations. The reduction in the size and footprint of the accessory structure would reduce percentage of the rear yard variance to 28% (vs. the previous request of 32% but still above the District maximum) and the percentage of the floor area of the main house to 88% (vs. the previous request of more than 100% but still above the District maximum).

In the most recent submission, the Applicant did not provide any additional response to the variance criteria. As such, the Applicant's previous response (included below) is still pertinent:

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

69 Randolph [Street] is a non-rectangular lot shape and is missing a corner from Auburn Avenue angling northeast. If the lot were fully rectangular, we would be within the requirement of 25% rear yard lot coverage with an accessory building.

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 zoning ordinance would prevent us from building additional living space for our growing family and changing needs. We currently have no space to host friends and family stay in our home. We also would like private outdoor space for a vegetable garden and a safe place for our cats to enjoy the outdoors away from the busy street/intersection below. Last, we are unable to afford larger homes in this neighborhood, which list for over three times the value of our home.

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

Although the lot itself is larger for the block face, the home is one of the smallest. Total 1040 SQ. FT. 69 Randolph is built with 2 x 4 construction making a second story impossible. The only way to expand the home is to build at the rear (as 84 Randolph has done - CONTRIBUTING). Additionally, we want to keep the character of the neighborhood with 1 story bungalow as the primary structure.

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.

By building [an] accessory building to the rear of the property, it will be situated away from the adjacent Marie Cowser Memorial Park and the corner of Auburn Avenue and Randolph St. The structure would be situated such that it will be shrouded behind the mature trees on Auburn Avenue. The scale and aesthetic of the building as it relates to the park next door will not be altered.

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.

The City's Zoning Ordinance states that variances may be granted only by satisfying all of the findings. Based on the answers provided by the Applicant, Staff does not find a compelling reason that a hardship is present due to the size, shape, or topography of the lot to allow for relief from the District regulations pertaining to the maximum lot coverage and floor area for accessory structures (The accessory building height variance is no longer necessary due to the reduction to 20 ft.)

As stated in an earlier review and Staff Report, while Staff notes the lot's irregular shape, it is one of the largest lots on the east side of Randolph Street between Auburn Avenue and Irwin Street; therefore, Staff does not find the Applicant's argument regarding the request for greater lot coverage of the accessory structure to be persuasive.

The Applicant has previously stated a desire to create additional living space to accommodate family and changing needs. However, the proposed project involves the construction of a garage structure with ancillary living space on the second level. Staff finds that by using a design that is compatible with and meets the District regulations, a rear addition to the existing principal structure *without* an attached garage would most likely satisfy those programmatic needs without the need for a variance. With the current approach the Applicant is requesting a conditioned two car garage / work shop *and* living space.

Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the variance request to allow the proposed accessory structure to exceed the maximum lot coverage and floor area of the principal structure.

Accessory Structure

The proposed design of the project has been revised somewhat since December 12, 2018. The scope still consists of a Modernist style, two-level garage accessory structure at the rear of a non-contributing, one-story Bungalow type house. The accessory structure design also still includes a first level conditioned garage and upper-level conditioned living space. The structure will still have a flat roof, and double-hung single-light windows covered with a shallow shed canopy on the second level and a flat cantilevered canopy / "balcony" over the overhead

garage doors on the first level. The building will still be set on a slab foundation with brick veneer siding on the lower part of the facades to approximate the appearance of a continuous foundation. Significantly, the rooftop terrace or outdoor living space on the roof has been eliminated and the siding has been changed from vertical to horizontal.

The proposed height of the structure is 20'. As stated earlier in the report, the proposed design would have a lot coverage of 28% of the rear yard and 88% of the floor area of the principal structure.

Vehicular access to the garage from Auburn Avenue would be via a brick paver driveway that would cover almost the entire rear yard. The Staff would note that in addition to the percentage of the rear yard requirement, the District regulations also have an overall lot coverage requirement that is based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant has not provided any updated analysis on the overall lot coverage calculations and whether they meet the compatibility rule.

Accessory structures, by definition, are to be accessories and subordinate to, the principal structure. Though its height and size have been reduced, as currently designed, the proposed two-story accessory structure still overshadows the one-story principal structure both in its design, massing and size. Further, Staff finds the placement of the street-facing garage doors on Auburn Avenue to not be compatible with the urban character of the District. As such, Staff recommends denial of the proposed project as currently designed.

Variance (CA3-18-517)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

Accessory Structure (CA3-18-251)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File