



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: 641 Rosalia St.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-518 & CA3-18-519

MEETING DATE: November 14, 2018

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction:

Property Location:

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred 11/14/2018. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

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

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow a two car garage entrance on a façade facing the half-depth front yard.

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

The Applicant states that the size of the property in question is less than 7,500 sf and the lot width is less than 50' which are both required by the R-5 regulations.

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

The Applicant has not stated how the requirement to have double width garage doors facing the rear of the property presents an unnecessary hardship. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation as to how the requirement to have double width garage doors facing the rear of the property presents an unnecessary hardship.

The Applicant has responded with information regarding the needs of the family due to concerns regarding turning radii, personal safety, and medical issues of the property owners.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property in question does not meet the underlying zoning requirements. While Staff finds this response meets the criteria, Staff would note that it is not unusual for lots in the City's Historic Districts to not meet the underlying zoning as the related properties were developed prior to the current Zoning Ordinance.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant has not provided a response as to how the allowance of a double width garage entrance on a prohibited façade would not impair the purposes and intents of the Zoning Ordinance. As such Staff recommends the Applicant show how relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant has provided photographs of several attached and detached garages. The attached garages appear to be on structures which were built or altered before the District regulations were adopted. Staff would note that the double width garages on accessory structures are not prohibited by the District regulations. However, given the specific issues faced by the property owner, with specific weight given to their medical issues, Staff finds that the allowance of this variance would not impair the proper application of the garage door regulations on future projects.

Staff finds that the request does not meet the variance criteria. In addition to the recommendations listed above, Staff recommends the Applicant detail why accessing the property from the alleyway to the rear of the property, thereby allowing for compliance with the garage door requirements, is not an option.

The Applicant has provided clarification in response to Staff's recommendations. Staff would note that the granting of this variance for this specific situation would not give approval for other properties to install a

non-compliant double width garage door on a façade facing a public street. Staff finds that the Applicant's responses meet the variance criteria.

Addition

The District regulations allow two criteria for reviewing alterations to contributing structures. As historic materials will be lost in attaching the proposed addition to the structure, Staff finds the first of the two criteria to be appropriate for application to the project.

The Applicant is proposing a new addition to the rear of the property. The Addition will consist of a stairwell which will attach to a new garage and screened in porch. Absent the issues with the garage doors requiring the variance, Staff has few general concerns with the design of the addition.

Staff finds the proposed gable roof over the rear porch, while providing differentiation with the principal structure, is out of character for a primary roof on this predominately hipped roof structure. As such, Staff recommends the proposed gable roof above the rear porch be changed to a hipped roof.

The updated plans show the gabled roof changed to a hipped roof. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing a 16' wide driveway. The District regulations allow driveways with a maximum width of 10'. As such, the proposed driveway does not meet the District regulations and will need to be redesigned. As such, Staff recommends the driveway have a maximum width of 10'.

The updated plans show the driveway narrowed to 10' between the side façade line of the principal structure and the street. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The site plan provided does not note repairs to the existing sidewalk. However, Staff finds the existing sidewalk is in a state of disrepair and the new curb cut will remove existing sidewalk materials. Staff recommends any sidewalk repair or replacement meet the District regulations.

The updated plans show compliance with Staff's recommendations regarding the sidewalk. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-18-518: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-18-519: Approval conditioned upon the following conditions:

1. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1194 Church St. (Knight Park)
APPLICATION: RC-19-014
MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: None **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: Pre-1911

Property Location: Southeast corner of Church St. NW and Rice St. NW.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to existing infrastructure

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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

The Applicant proposes the alteration of the remains of an existing brick structure for re-use as open space for the community. Staff is generally in support of the retention of existing buildings for reuse in public spaces, but has several concerns with the methods proposed by the Applicant. The proposal involves the removal of the majority of the side and rear façades of the structure, and the removal of the gable peak of the front façade. The proposed alterations would alter the remaining character of the structure. Staff finds that the spatial relationships of the resulting building would have little in common with that of the original structure.

Staff also has concerns with the loss of historic materials proposed. The existing structure retains the original windows on the front, left side, and rear façade. Staff was not able to determine whether the front door was original. Based on the photographs received by Staff, these windows appear to be metal and in a state where their retention and reuse would be feasible. Staff finds that if the glass were to be removed, the existing frames could be retained and re-used in the finished product while still allowing for the open style of the proposed structure.

Staff suggests the Applicant consider methods that would allow for proper architectural interpretation of the structure and maximize the retention of historic materials.

Staff would also encourage the Applicant to put effort towards researching the history of this building and its significance to the neighborhood. This information could then be memorialized in a plaque or interpretative signage.

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

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: 851 Oakdale Rd.

APPLICATION: CA3-29-029 & CA3-19-030

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location: East blockface of Oakdale Rd., north of Ponce De Leon Ave., south of the City limits.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance requests, alterations, site work.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20B.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: In November of 2016 the Commission reviewed and approved applications CA3-16-475 and CA3-16-561 for the demolition of a non-contributing structure and the construction of a new single family home.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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

Variance Requests

The requested variances are to allow parking within 20' of the right side property line (reduce distance to 14'), to reduce the required left side yard setback for a swimming pool from 25' to 14', to reduce the left side yard setback for an accessory structure from 20' to 12', to allow accessory structure eaves to encroach 40" into the setback, and to allow an accessory structure to be built on a grade greater than 15%. In their narrative, the Applicant cites the subject property's proximity to the DeKalb County Druid Hills Historic District, and the differences in those regulations compared to the City of Atlanta's Landmark District regulations. Staff finds that another municipalities zoning regulations have no bearing on projects within the City of Atlanta's Landmark and Historic Districts. As such, this factor will not be considered in Staff's analysis.

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

The Applicant cites the location of a sanitary sewer line with a 20' easement which cuts diagonally across the side and rear of the property, the topography of the site, and the existence of old growth trees as the extraordinary and exceptional condition pertaining to the subject property.

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

With regard to parking within 20' of the side property line, the Applicant states that a compliant driveway would not allow for proper turnaround on a steep drive for personal vehicles and would not allow for adequate access to the sanitary sewer for work-trucks that may access the site for maintenance.

With regards to the other project elements, the Applicant states that due to the existence of the sanitary sewer, the stream buffer, and the old growth trees, over half of the site is undevelopable. While Staff agrees that these conditions constrain the development of the site, the Applicant has not shown how these constraints impose an unnecessary hardship on the property. Staff recommends the Applicant demonstrate how the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would impose an unnecessary hardship by providing alternate design solutions and discussing their infeasibility. Staff would also recommend the Applicant demonstrate how each requested variance is impacted by the identified site constraints.

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

The Applicant cites the existence of the sanitary sewer as the peculiar conditions of the subject property.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that the positioning of the projects behind the principal structure, the site topography, and

Staff finds that there is not sufficient information on how the site constraints create an unnecessary hardship for a proper review of the request to be performed. Staff suggests the Applicant discuss how the site constraints would provide a hardship for any design other than the one proposed.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing a new pool, a driveway extension, grading, and a new accessory structure/gazebo. Given the Staff findings relating to the variances, a full review of the proposed site work is not possible at this time. Additionally, Staff finds that there is not currently sufficient information to review all aspects of the proposed design.

With regards to the gazebo, Staff recommends the Applicant provide elevations showing all 4 sides of the proposed structure. With regards to the pool and hard surface, Staff has no general concerns with their design absent the setback issues. However, Staff recommends the Applicant provide materials for the proposed hardscape associated with the proposed pool.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONCA3-19-030: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall demonstrate how the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would impose an unnecessary hardship by providing alternate design solutions and discussing their infeasibility;
2. The Applicant demonstrate how each requested variance is necessitated by the identified site constraints;

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONCA3-19-029: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide elevations showing all 4 sides of the proposed structure;
2. The Applicant shall provide materials for the proposed hardscape associated with the proposed pool;

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 803 Briarcliff Road, NE

APPLICATION: RC-19-031

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** RG-3

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: West of Ponce De Leon

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Play Court installation

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

CONCLUSIONS:

Atlanta Public Schools proposes to install a new play court at an existing public elementary school in the Druid Hills district. The new play court will consist of a 50 feet x 31 feet concrete pad. This will eliminate a grassy area that is currently there. On the proposed scope of work, the Applicant has indicated an ADA pathway to connect the existing patio play court. Some minor grading will be necessary to install the pad. Overall, Staff is in support of the play pad, however, Staff does have a concern regarding the closes of the proposed play pad to the road. The plans show a fence between the proposed play pad and the road; however, it does not indicate what kind of fence. Staff suggest a visual barrier between the pad and the road, perhaps foliage to soften the direct-on view. Staff, also suggest the Applicant consider seating options for the

students and possibly using another material such a recyclable rubber instead of concrete to soften the falls of young students.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 687 Queen St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-033

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1880's to 1910

Property Location: West block face of Queen St., south of Ralph David Abernathy Blvd., north of Oglethorpe Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New South Cottage.

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve with conditions.

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

Addition

In general Staff finds the proposed rear addition to be a sensitive addition to a historic structure. Staff does find that the project would be improved by retaining the original rear corner boards which would allow for proper interpretation of the original massing of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the original rear corner boards be retained to allow proper interpretation of the original and new sections of the structure.

With regards to the materials proposed, Staff recommends any cementitious siding be smooth faced. Staff further recommends the proposed windows be unclad wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The original rear corner boards shall be retained to allow proper interpretation of the original and new sections of the structure, per Sec. 16-20.009(2);
2. Any cementitious siding shall be smooth faced, Per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d); and,
3. The proposed windows shall be unclad wood, Per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c); 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: 46 Camden Road

APPLICATION: RC-19-034

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West of Wakefield Place and East of Montclair Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and Site work

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.

Main Structure

The Applicant proposes to construct a new covered brick porch/patio addition to the existing main structure. This new addition will not protrude beyond the sides of the main structure nor exceed the rear yard setback. The proposed roof over the proposed porch/patio will a standing seam metal roof and the new columns will be square columns with Tuscan cap and vase. Additionally, the Applicant proposes to remove several existing windows on the rear of the house, allowing for an entry door to a proposed mudroom. Existing French doors are proposed to be removed allowing for a series of doors to lead to the new proposed driveway. New proposed 6 over 6 windows matching the existing windows on the mains structure will be added to the new proposed porch/patio. An existing brick wall will be removed this will permit the new proposed new concrete driveway to be built. The same material for the existing driveway will be used for the new proposed driveway. With the construction of the new proposed covered brick porch/patio, a new right and left side elevations will be formed. Even so, this will not take away the architectural integrity of the existing main structure. Nor will any of the alterations take away the integrity of the existing main structure.

Garage

The Applicant proposes to remove the garage doors and right side plus frame a new roof to give the appears of a carport instead of a garage, on a recently constructed detached garage. The garage is not original to the construction of the main structure, Staff is not concern with this change. Also, the garage is in the rear of the main structure and is not visible from the public right-away.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1150 Oak St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-035

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: South block face of Oak St., east of Holderness St., and west of West End Pl.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Vacant

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New construction of a SFR

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: Defer.

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

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

Compatibility Comparisons

Several issues exist with the comparisons provided by the Applicant. First, these comparisons consider non-contributing structures as well as contributing structures. Second, these comparisons consider the property at 528 Holderness, which is not on the same block face as the subject property as well as the property at 846 Oakhill Ave., which is not located in the District. Third, these comparisons appear to assume that the quantitative measurements are to be averages of the measurements taken as opposed to a range based on the highest/longest and shortest measurements of the contributing structures on the block face. Fourth, many of the required measurements are missing from the analysis. Staff recommends the Applicant revise their compatibility comparisons to include all comparisons required by the body of the District's Specific Regulations using the methods described in the District's General Regulations. Staff further recommends all comparisons be taken from the properties located at 1154, 1156, 1178, and 1184 Oak St. only.

Site Plan

In reviewing the site plan received from the Applicant, it is difficult to determine where the front lot line for this drawing is. Staff recommends the site plan be redrawn to more clearly display all 4 property boundaries.

The site plan does not note the proposed lot coverage. Staff recommends the proposed lot coverage be noted on the site plan.

The compatibility information received from the Applicant shows the contributing structures have a front yard setback range with a minimum of 30' 4" based off 1184 Oak St., and a maximum of 37' 9" based on 1178 Oak St. No information detailing whether these measurements were taken from the front façade or the front porch was provided. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the method of measurement used for the front yard setback comparisons. Due to the issues mentioned above, Staff could not accurately measure the front yard setback of the proposed structure. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the front yard setback meets the allowable range using the same method of measurement used for the compatibility comparisons.

Staff recommends a walkway leading from the front steps to the sidewalk be provided.

New Construction

The Applicant is proposing a new Victorian style shotgun home on the subject property. The subject property is 35' wide, matching the width of the contributing Queen Anne cottages directly adjacent to the subject property located at 1156 and 1154 Oak St. In general, Staff finds that the structure conforms more with the hipped roof with accent gable home on the opposite block face than with the contributing structures on the same block face. The homes on the block face are all wider than the proposed structure, which has been designed to accommodate the 7' side yard setback requirements of the R-4A underlying zoning. This smaller width makes conformity with the cross-gable Queen Anne Cottages impractical. Staff finds the most appropriate roof form based on the block face is a hipped roof. There are two contributing structures with hipped roofs on the block

face, both of which contain an accent dormer. This, along with the narrow width of the home, makes a hipped roof without an accent dormer the appropriate form for the proposed roof. As such, Staff recommends the proposed roof form be hipped with an accent dormer on the front roof plane. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch. Staff further recommends the proposed roof pitch meet the compatibility rule.

The first-floor height above grade is based on the compatibility rule. No comparison information for this building element has been provided. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the first-floor height above grade.

Per the regulations, the porch foundation materials are based on the compatibility rule. In looking at the block face, Staff finds that three of the four contributing houses contain their original porch foundations. The homes at 1154 and 1156 Oak have had their front porches removed, but the original porch foundation and column bases are still extant at 1156 Oak. All of these original porches contain a continual masonry wall. As such, Staff finds the proposed wood pier and lattice foundation proposed by the Applicant does not comply with the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the front porch foundation be masonry installed in a manner consistent with the District regulations for foundations.

Staff recommends the front porch flooring be a wood, 1x4 or 1x5, tongue and groove material installed perpendicular to the front façade.

Front porch steps on the contributing homes on the block face lead directly to the front door. As such, the proposed front porch step offset is not compliant with the District regulations. Staff recommends the front porch steps be moved to directly lead up to the front door.

With regards to the front porch columns, Staff finds that the only extant front porch columns are located on the partially enclosed front porch of 1178 Oak St. This porch contained squared columns with no ornamentation such as is proposed for the new structure. As such, Staff recommends the columns be squared with no ornamentation.

In looking at the proposed front façade fenestration, Staff has several concerns. While the fenestration on the contributing structures has been overwhelmingly altered, the original pattern of fenestration pattern and door placement remains. The block face has two different front door locations: two with the door located to the left side of the front façade and two with the front door centered on the front façade. As such, Staff finds the right-side façade door location inconsistent with the block face. Staff recommends the door be oriented to the left side of the front façade or centered on the front façade. The Applicant proposes a fiberglass or steel front door. The District regulations require new doors to be wood. As such, Staff recommends the front door be wood and contain a rectangular lite opening with a scale, size, proportion, placement, and style meeting the compatibility rule. With regards to the proposed windows, Staff recommends the proposed windows be unclad wood.

Staff recommends the proposed cementitious siding be smooth faced.

The Applicant is proposing a metal chimney. Their compatibility comparisons note several metal mechanical exhaust stacks as support for this design choice. The District regulations require chimneys to be comprised of brick or masonry with stucco. As such, Staff recommends the proposed chimney meet the District regulations.

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

1. The Applicant shall revise their compatibility comparisons to include all comparisons required by the body of the District's Specific Regulations using the methods described in the District's General Regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.005(2) and Sec. 16-20G.006;
2. All comparisons be taken from the properties located at 1154, 1156, 1178, and 1184 Oak St. only, per Sec. 16-20G.005(2);
3. The site plan shall be redrawn to more clearly display all 4 property boundaries;
4. The proposed lot coverage shall be noted on the site plan;
5. The Applicant shall confirm the front yard setback meets the allowable range using the same method of measurement used for the compatibility comparisons, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(b);
6. A walkway leading from the front steps to the sidewalk shall be provided, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(a);
7. The proposed roof form shall be hipped with an accent dormer on the front roof plane, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(d);
8. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(d);
9. The proposed roof pitch shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(d);
10. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the first-floor height above grade, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(f);
11. The front porch foundation shall be masonry installed in a manner consistent with the District regulations for foundations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(5)(b);
12. The front porch flooring shall be a wood, 1x4 or 1x5, tongue and groove material installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
13. The front porch steps shall be moved to directly lead up to the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
14. The columns shall be squared with no ornamentation, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
15. The front door shall be wood and contain a rectangular lite opening with a scale, size, proportion, placement, and style meeting the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
16. The windows shall be unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
17. The proposed cementitious siding shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
18. The proposed chimney shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(6)(b); and,
19. All updated plans and materials shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT **February 13, 2019**

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-047) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Briarcliff Plaza at **1027 and 1061 Ponce de Leon Avenue, NE**. Property is zoned R-4.

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored by the property owner and the nomination materials were prepared by consultant Regina Brewer. The district is bounded by Ponce de Leon Avenue NE to the north of North Highland Avenue to the east.

Analysis: The Briarcliff Plaza shopping center was constructed in 1940. It is part of the busy retail and commercial area known as Ponce Corridor. Comprised of two separate buildings 1027 and 1061 Ponce de Leon Avenue and the parking lot is dedicated to the buildings. Briarcliff Plaza shopping center is the first automobile-oriented shopping center in Atlanta and Georgia that included dedicated off-street parking for its customers. This new type of community shopping center broke away from the development patterns of Atlanta's traditional commercial nodes that were designed for pedestrian and streetcar shoppers. It's automobile-centric design was the forerunner for the larger regional shopping centers such as Lenox Square. It's architecture significance is notable for a Streamline Moderne style in Atlanta. In addition, the Briarcliff Plaza design incorporated Art Deco elements with illuminated neon signage which created a vibrant shopping destination in a predominately residential area.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's community planning, development and commerce and significant architecture. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, specifically Criterion A and C

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-047) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Briarcliff Plaza at **1027 and 1061 Ponce de Leon Avenue, NE**.



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT February 13, 2019

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-048) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Whitehall Street Retail Historic District, **a multi-block area centered on Peachtree Street (formerly Whitehall Street) and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive (formerly Hunter Street) located in downtown Atlanta, Fulton County. Principle streets include Forsyth Street, Broad Street (formerly Market Street), Peachtree Street and Mitchell Street.** Property is zoned SPI-I, SA-1.

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored by the Newport US RE, L.P and nomination material were prepared by Ray, Ellis and LaBrie Consulting, LLC. The district is bounded Alabama Street, Pryor Street, Peachtree, properties on Mitchell Street and Forsyth Street.

Analysis: The Whitehall Street Retail Historic District is the intact core of the larger historic commercial urban areas in downtown Atlanta. When the tracks of Georgia, Macon & Western and the Western & Atlantic Railroads reached what was to become Atlanta in the 1840's, they formed the structure around which is the rest of the city would be developed and divided. The district is characterized by the late-19th and early 20th century single and multiple retail buildings, and retail & office buildings that line its street. The district quickly developed into a commercial shopping corridor for the city and its continued role as a major retail area in the "Heart of Atlanta" throughout the period of significance as well as events that took place within the district that directly targeted and affected retail businesses, such as the 1960 student sit-ins at the counters during the American Civil Rights era. The District is an example of a retail commercial district that has changed over time. Most of buildings were constructed in the latter decades of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. Buildings types are one-part, two-part and three-part block commercial, single and multiple retail. Elements of Italianate, Neoclassical Revival, Italian Renaissance Revival, Art Dec, Art Moderne and International are present in the district. Well-known architects such as Morgan and Dillion, A. Ten Eyck Brown , Walter Downing and Hentz, Adler and Schutze were involved in firms that helped develop the district.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's community planning, development and commerce and architecture. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, specifically Criterion A and C

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-048) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Whitehall Street Retail Historic District a **multi-block area**.



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT February 13, 2019

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-050) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the First Presbyterian Church, **1328 Peachtree Street, NE**. Property is zoned SPI-16, SA1.

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored, and nomination material were prepared by The First Presbyterian Church of Atlanta. The property boundary is the current legal boundary, which is also the historic boundary.

Analysis: Founded in 1848, congregation of First Presbyterian Church of Atlanta (originally Presbyterian Church of Atlanta acquired a lot at the corner of Peachtree and 16th Streets in 1914 on which to build a larger church in a then more residential area of Atlanta than the original Marietta Street location. Walter T. Downing was selected to design the first phase of the church in 1915 in the Late Gothic Revival style. First Presbyterian Church is an intact example of a Late Gothic Revival-style church and is known for its association with prominent Atlanta architects such as Walter T. Downing, E.C Wachendorff and A. Ten Eyck Brown. The Late Gothic Revival style, popular in ecclesiastical, educational and commercial architecture during the early twentieth century is demonstrated in the church's repeated use of the pointed arch, emphasis on vertically, utilization of stone as primary building material and detailing such as window tracery and crenellations. The church also is reflective of it beautiful art. It's exceptional stained-glass windows by three master stained glass designers and studio are showcases for the church.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's architecture and art. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, Criterion C and Criteria Consideration A

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-050) on the National

Register of Historic Places nomination of the First Presbyterian Church at **1328 Peachtree Street NE, Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia**



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT February 13, 2019

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-049) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Collier-Perry-Bentley House, **1649 Lady Marian Lane**. Property is zoned R-3.

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored by the property owners and nomination material were prepared by Dr. Ray Luce. The property boundary includes the intact land associated with the historic property.

Analysis: The Collier-Perry-Bentley House was constructed in 1823 by Meredith Collier. It is a three bay, two-story, central hall I-house with end chimneys. It is a rare extant example of early development in what would become the city of Atlanta. It is one of the oldest documented houses in the city limits. The Collier Family owned the house for years. George "Wash" Collier owned the property until his death in 1903. The house evolved over time and had a major addition and rehabilitation completed in 1952. R. Kennon Perry, an Atlanta-based architect and owner of the house, who was known for designing numerous schools, churches and residences, rehabilitation of house is noteworthy. This rehabilitation is hailed as an early example of historic preservation in Atlanta when there was little organized or private interest in preservation. The Collier-Perry-Bentley House is associated with political and government figure-head James L. Bentley (Jimmy) Jr. Mr. Bentley was a significant Georgia political leader who was the state Comptroller General for many years beginning in 1962 then switching from the Democratic Party to the Republican in 1968.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's exploration/settlement, politics/government and architecture. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, specifically Criterion A, B and C

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-049) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Collier-Perry-Bentley House at **1649 Lady Marian Lane, Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia**.



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT **February 13, 2019**

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-051) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the F.H Ross & Company Laundry Warehouse, **833 Memorial Drive**. Property is MRC-3-C

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored by The First Presbyterian Church and nomination material were prepared by Consultant firm, Morrison Design. The property boundary for the nominated property comprises the footprint of the building.

Analysis: F. H. Ross & Company was a southeastern regional laundry supply warehouse and distribution centered originally headquartered in Charlotte North Carolina with several offices and distribution locations throughout the southeast including Atlanta GA by the late 1950's. In 1936, the company opened downtown Atlanta offices and relocated to 215 Chester Avenue in 1942 less than a block from Memorial Drive. In 1949, due to rapid industrializing after the construction of the nearby Atlanta & West Point railroad line in the 1920's, the company open on 833 Memorial Drive until 1965. F.H Ross & Company Laundry Warehouse is representative and relatedly late example of the Streamline Moderne style in Atlanta. Steamline Moderne style was applied to buildings with a transportation-related function or design such a bus station, drive-in restaurant and gas stations. Varsity restaurant (61 North Avenue, NW), the Atlanta Constitution Building (143 Alabama Street, SW) and Briarcliff Plaza (1027 and 1061 Ponce de Leon) are examples of Moderne styles in Atlanta. This style moved away from historic form and ornament, taking its cues from industrial design, technology and a factory ethic. The F. H. Ross and Company Warehouse expressed restrained Streamline Moderne features appropriate for a utilitarian commercial building. The building's horizontal form and planar facades; rounded corner accent; ribbon windows; restrained, smooth case stone door and window surrounds and minimalist horizontal detailing all contribute to a feeling of motion that is a hallmark of the Streamline Moderne aesthetic.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's architecture. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, specifically Criterion C

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-051) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of F.H.Ross & Company Laundry Warehouse at **833 Memorial Drive, Atlanta GA, Fulton County**



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT **February 13, 2019**

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-052) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Hotel Clermont, **789 Ponce de Leon Avenue, NE**. Property is MRC-2-C.

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored by the property owner and nomination material were prepared by Ray, Ellis & LaBrie Consulting. The boundary for the nominated property comprises the intact historic and current legal acreage of the property.

Analysis: The Georgian Revival-style Hotel Clermont was completed June 17, 1924. It was constructed as the Bonaventure Arms Apartments with 85 units and common area occupying eight stories. The exterior is clad with Flemish Bond brick. Floors and ceilings are poured concrete piers and embedded in the hollow clay corridor walls that frame the central hallways of the parapet wall. It was one of several large apartment buildings built to house Atlanta's growing population during a time of significant change in residential development. Rapid growth of the white middle-class population, raising property values, expansion of streetcar lines, and the rise of the automobile led to construction of apartments north and east of downtown Atlanta. The Bonaventure Arms represented the height of modernity for its time and is a good representative example of the apartment development that proliferated in Atlanta during the 1920s. The hotel services offered by the Bonaventure Arms provided every type of domestic services, as well as private package delivery. Since 1943 the hotel has been recognized for the entertainment venues located in the building's basement. The building has long been a focal point of Atlanta nightlife and demonstrates the changing patterns of the city's entertainment industry. Since 1968, the building has gained notoriety as the home of the Clermont Lounge, a now-internationally known adult entertainment venue. The Clermont Lounge is the oldest running, and only documented historic, nightclub business in Atlanta.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's architecture, community planning and development; entertainment/recreation. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, specifically Criterion A and C

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-052) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Hotel Clermont at **789 Ponce de Leon NE, Atlanta GA, Fulton County**



CITY OF ATLANTA

Keisha Lance Bottoms
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
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

STAFF REPORT **February 13, 2019**

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-19-053) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Westview Cemetery, **1680 Westview Drive, SW** Property is C-1.

At the Request of: Dr. David Crass, Division Director, Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2610 Georgia Highway

Facts: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of a building's or districts architectural and historical significance.

This nomination was sponsored by Westview Cemetery, Inc and the Atlanta Preservation Center. The nomination material were prepared historian and author Jeffrey Clemmons. The proposed boundary includes the entire, intact property associated with Westview Cemetery, including Rest Haven and God's Acre and undeveloped areas of the property.

Analysis: Westview Cemetery was established in 1884. Westview was initially designed as a lawn-park style cemetery, a style characterized by curvilinear roads, ornamental plantings and family plots marked with a single monument surrounded by footstones. Then in 1942, Asa Candler Jr, Coca-Cola Executive, transitioned the cemetery to a memorial-park style cemetery which is characterized by burial sections known as gardens with a central religious sculpture or piece of art surrounded by flat markers. The numerous forms of decorative burial monuments reflect funerary traditions from the mid-nineteenth century to 1976. The cemetery houses several architectural styles such as Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, High Victorian Gothic, and Egyptian Revival. The 1890 gate house is an excellent example of Romanesque-Revival style is significant in landscape architecture. The cemetery is recognized for its style of cemetery design. The cemetery is significant in black ethnic-heritage because it includes a segregated section for blacks' burial. And in Irish ethnic heritage the annual burial practices of Irish Travelers on the property for more than a century has been erected. Asa Candler Jr. dramatic impact on the property by making the cemetery a profitable business venture and greatly expanding the cemetery build environment.

The Staff agrees that this property is a good example of the City's architecture, art, landscape architecture, ethnic heritage/Black, ethnic heritage/Irish and Commerce. The Staff finds the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Staff is in support of the proposed nomination.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the following:

- a) The nomination meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria, specifically Criterion A, B and C and Criteria Consideration D.

The Staff recommends that the Commission send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff via support for Review and Comment (RC-19-052) on the National Register of Historic Places nomination of the Westview Cemetery at **1680 Westview Drive, SW, Atlanta GA, Fulton County**



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: 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)?: Yes, at the Applicant's request. *Updated text in italics.*

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.

The Applicant has provided updated information relating to evidence of termite damage found in windows on other facades during previous alterations. The Applicant has also provided photographs of several of the existing windows showing different issues. However, the information provided does not establish the need for all original windows on the structure to be replaced. Further, the issues shown in the photographs appear to be repairable with either repairs to the sash itself or re-glazing of individual window lites. As such, Staff retains its previous findings and recommendation.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2884 Macaw Street, NW
APPLICATION: CA3-19-015
MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Whittier Mill Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/A

Date of Construction: 1900

Property Location: End of the interior lot, west of Whittier Avenue

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-28.008 (5)

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 with Chapter 20 and Chapter 20J of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Site Plans

The Applicant has provided plans without setback and FAR information for the R-4A zoning review. Staff recommends the Applicant provide 3 sets of to-scale plans that will include setback information and FAR information. Additionally, the Applicant has reversed the left and right elevations on the plans. The east elevation should be on the right side of the house and the west elevation should be on the left side of the house. Staff recommends the Applicant correct the elevations discrepancies on the new set of to-scale plans.

ADDITION

On a double frontage lot, the Applicant proposes to construct a side and rear addition to the west side of the house to compensate for a new master suite and four-bedroom suites constructed on the inside of the house. The rear addition patio extension will proceed beyond the front however, it follows in the same foot print as the existing patio. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The side addition will proceed beyond the front of the main structure and must meet the compatibility standard to determine if this addition will be compatible with other houses on the block. For the compatibility review, the District Regulation states that when elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor heights, they shall equal the **statistical average** of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block. The Applicant has provided front yard setback for three properties that fronts Maco Street, which will be the side yard for the main structure on Macaw. The properties are 2092, 2896 both historic and 2890 non-historic for comparisons. The statistical average for the compatibility is 15.5. The proposed addition for the side does not exceed this set setback. Staff is not concerned with the side yard proposal.

Roofline

The District Regulations state that all new construction or new additions' roof lines shall not exceed the existing house's roofline. The plans demonstrated the proposed roofline on the additions will create an extended Hip but will not exceed the kick-out roofline with a pitch of 12:12 and lower 4:12 on the rear section of the addition. Staff is not concerned with the proposed roofline on additions.

ALTERATIONS

Siding

The Applicant proposes to install smooth side exposed cementitious siding lap siding and match existing trim and window casing with the siding and trim on the existing main structure. District Regulation states that other horizontal siding is permitted if window trim, corner boards, and fascia/bargeboards are left in place or replaced with new material to match the original. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

District Regulations states new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and design to existing windows and doors. Due to bathroom additions, the Applicant proposes to install 2'x 4'x 6" one over one mullion window on the side addition. On the rear addition, the Applicant proposes to install three 3'x5'x6" one over one mullion windows. Although, the proposed new windows are compatible in scale and proportion and placement to the existing windows on the main structure, they are not the same size as the existing windows. Staff recommends, the Applicant install all windows that are not due to the bathroom construction be the same size as the existing windows on the main structure.

Trim

The Applicant has proposed to match the trim, caps and corner boards on the new additions to all the trim, caps and corner boards on the main structure. Staff is not concern with this proposal

Foundation

The Applicant proposes to install continuous concrete foundation that matches the concrete foundation on the existing main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

- 1) The Applicant shall provide three to-scale site plans for review per Sec. 16-20J.001(i);
- 2) The Applicant shall provide plans that orientation the left and right elevations correctly, Sec.16-20J.001;
- 3) The Applicant install all windows that are not due to the bathroom construction be the same size as the existing windows on the main structure, per Sec.16-20J.006(b)(3); and
- 4) Staff shall review and approval if appropriate, approve all final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 775 Tift Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-016

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1891.

Property Location: West block face of Tift Ave., south of Shelton Ave., north of Gillette Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition

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

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

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

Compatibility information

Staff has not received any of the required compatibility information for the proposed addition. As such, Staff cannot properly review the proposed changes. Staff Recommends the Applicant provide all compatibility comparisons for the proposed addition required by the District regulations.

Site Plan

In checking the accuracy of the site plans provided by the Applicant, Staff noted that the plans were not properly drawn to scale. Staff found that all four lot lines were several feet shorter than what was noted on the plans. As such, Staff recommends the site plan be redrawn to conform to the noted scale.

The Site plan provided by the Applicant does not note the existing/proposed FAR or Lot Coverage. Staff is required to confirm the project meets these underlying zoning requirements as part of the Commission's review of the project. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a site plan which notes the existing and proposed FAR and Lot Coverage.

Massing

The Applicant is proposing a two-story rear addition to the existing one story structure. In general Staff finds the design of the structure is not compatible with the character of the existing contributing structure. The proposed changes would overpower the structure and drastically alter the spatial relationships of the structure and require several design variances. Staff finds the appropriate method for adding to a historic structure such as the subject property is to mass the addition to the rear of the structure and place the ridge no higher than the ridge of the existing structure. As such, Staff recommends the addition be redesigned to be entirely behind the historic structure with the ridge placed no higher than the ridge of the existing structure.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide all compatibility comparisons for the proposed addition required by the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20I.005(1) and Sec. 16-20I.006(4);
2. The site plan shall be redrawn to conform to the noted scale;
3. The Applicant shall provide a site plan which notes the existing and proposed FAR and Lot Coverage;
4. The addition shall be redesigned to be entirely behind the historic structure with the ridge placed no higher than the ridge of the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20.009(6).

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: 717 Joseph E Lowery Blvd.

APPLICATION: CA2-19-017

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1924-1926

Property Location: West block face of Joseph E Lowery Blvd., south of Oglethorpe Ave., north of Matthews St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Duplex converted to Single Family.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to side facades.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Project components on the rear façade.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve with conditions.

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

Site Plan and Plan Issues

Staff has not received a Site Plan for the proposed work. As the area where work is proposed has more than 50% of the wall surface above grade, this area is considered a first floor and not a basement. As such, the floor area is subject to the FAR limitations of the R-4A regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a site plan detailing the existing and proposed FAR conforms to the R-4A requirements.

Staff noted an issue with one of the doors on the provided floorplan which could have been a drafting error. However, if not an error, this notation would indicate that the plan is to possibly create an independent attached living unit which is prohibited by the R-4A underlying zoning. As such, Staff recommends the interior floorplans be redrawn to accurately reflect the proposed work.

Alterations

With regards to the proposed changes, Staff has three concerns which relate to fenestration. Firstly, the material of the proposed door is not specified. The District regulations require new doors to be made of wood and contain a rectangular lite opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style. Staff recommends the proposed door be wood and contain a rectangular lite opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style.

The District regulations require new windows to be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows. On the north side façade, the Applicant is proposing a 3x3 window. While Staff is not opposed to a smaller window, Staff finds the District regulations would require it to be proportional and appear to be an operable double hung window. As such, Staff recommends the proposed north side façade window be changed to be proportional to the original windows and appear to be an operable double hung window.

Lastly, the District regulations require building materials visible from the public right of way to meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the proposed north and south side façade windows be unclad wood. If simulated divided lite windows are used, Staff recommends the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide a site plan detailing the existing and proposed FAR conforms to the R-4A requirements;
2. The interior floorplans shall be redrawn to accurately reflect the proposed work;
3. The proposed door shall be wood and contain a rectangular lite opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style, Per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
4. The proposed north side façade window shall be changed to be proportional to the original windows and appear to be an operable double hung window, Per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(g);
5. The proposed north and south side façade windows shall be unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
6. If simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, Per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(d); 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: 2708 Cresendo Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-19-025
MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1963

Property Location: Corner of Ozburn and Cresendo Drive

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

PLANS

The Applicant has not provided to-scale site plans with setback and FAR information for required underlying review. Staff recommends the Applicant provide 3 sets of to-scale site plans that includes setback and FAR information.

SCOPE OF WORK

WINDOWS

The Applicant installed new vinyl windows on the existing house without coming to the Urban Design Commission or acquiring proper permits from the City. District Regulations requires that original windows be retained if possible. If the original windows were on the existing structure and are still available Staff recommends the Applicant reinstall those windows. If the windows are not available, the District Regulations permits 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. Vinyl windows were indicative on this type of style and period.

SHUTTERS

The Applicant has installed barn shutters on the existing house without coming to the Urban Design Commission or acquiring the proper permits from the City. While many of the Ranch style houses have shutters, the barn shutters are not representative of the shutters of the Ranch house or period. Staff recommends that shutters be removed and reinstalled with shutters that are representative of this style and period or leave the shutters off.

PAINTING OF EXTERIOR

Without review from the Urban Design 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 submit 3 sets of to-scale site plans that includes setback and FAR information, per Sec.16-20Q.005
2. Original windows shall be reinstalled if available, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(a);
3. The shutters shall be removed and reinstalled with shutters that are representative of the Ranch style house and period or leave the shutters off , per Sec. 16-20Q.006 (18);
4. The paint on the main structure shall be removed with a method that will not damage the brick, pressure washing is not permitted, per Sec. 16-20Q.
5. 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: 767 Tift Ave.

APPLICATION: CA4PH-19-038

MEETING DATE: February 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Pre-1911

Property Location: West block face of Tift Ave., south of Shelton Ave., north of Gillette Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Double Shotgun

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition of the existing structure

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.

Staff Response to the Application Submitted

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

No Independent analysis or supporting information has been submitted. The Applicant has noted, however, that the property has received a Demolition Order by the Office of Buildings. Staff finds that the Demolition Order does not satisfy the requirement that an independent analysis of the structure be performed. Further, the Demolition Order does not negate the need to comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for demolition in the Historic District. In general, Staff finds that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists when the building is in danger of collapsing and harming someone in the public right of way. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit an independent analysis and supporting information to document a major and imminent threat to public safety.

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

The Applicant has not submitted information on reasonable alternatives to demolition for rectifying the threat, and states that no reasonable alternatives exist. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation that alternatives to demolition, such as renovation of the existing structure, are not reasonable.

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

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

The property owners are aware of the historic designation.

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

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

No information regarding the purchase price of the property was provided. However, the Applicant has noted that the seller was an investor with no relationship to the Applicant or the owner of record. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information on the amount paid for the property and the date of purchase.

- (2) The annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.**

No information was received regarding relating to this criteria. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.

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

No information was received regarding relating to this criteria. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the remaining balance on any mortgage or other financing secured by the property and annual debt service, if any, during the prior three (3) years.

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

The Applicant has stated that this criteria is not applicable to this property. However, Staff finds that As a property located in the City of Atlanta and Fulton Count, tax records would exist for this property and could be accessed by the Applicant through the Fulton County Tax Assessor. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the real estate taxes for the previous four (4) years and assessed value of the property according to the two (2) most recent assessed valuations.

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

The Applicant has provided an appraisal for the structure after renovations and a 600 sf addition, which Staff would note has not been reviewed by the Commission via a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness. This appraisal shows that the existing property with a 600 sf addition would have a fair market value of \$383,000.00.

However, it is unclear whether this appraisal was obtained for the purchase, financing or ownership of the property. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether the Appraisal provided is connected with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property.

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

The Applicant has stated the property has a fair market value of \$99,000.00. No information on how this assessment was reached has been received by Staff. No information on the fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation has been provided. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation.

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

Staff has not received information detailing the form of ownership or operation of the property. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the form of ownership or operation of the property, whether sole proprietorship, for-profit or not-for-profit corporation, limited partnership, joint venture, or both.

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

According to the Applicant, there are not tax records available.

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

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

According to the applicant, no real estate broker or firm has been engaged to sell or lease the property.

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

According to the Applicant the property is not for rent or for sale.

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

According to the Applicant, no advertisements have been placed and the property has not been listed.

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

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

The Applicant has stated that they have plans from a licensed engineer. However, Staff finds this criteria is requests an assessment of the structural soundness of the existing structure and its suitability for rehabilitation. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a report from a licensed engineer or architect with experience in rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures on the property and their suitability for rehabilitation.

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

According to the Applicant demolition of the structure would cost between \$160,000.00, but Staff has not received a copy of this estimate. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a copy of the demolition estimate for this property. The Applicant did not provide information regarding other alternatives besides demolition of the structure. Staff recommends the Applicant provide estimates for additional alternatives including a detailed estimate for renovations and new construction.

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

As mentioned before, the Applicant has provided an appraisal of the structure's worth after a renovation and a 600 sf addition. That appraisal lists the structure's value at \$383,000.00 after construction.

However, the Applicant has not provided information showing the fair market value of the property in its current condition. As such Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the fair market value of the property in the current condition.

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

The Applicant cites the appraisal showing the property at a value of \$383,000.00 after a renovation and addition of the structure.

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this question. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer of development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances.

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

The Applicant has stated that they have not investigated economic incentives and/or funding available to them through federal, state, city, or private programs. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the economic incentives and/or funding available for the rehabilitation of a historic property through federal, state, city, or private programs.

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

The Applicant has provided pictures.

Comment on Application Materials by the Bureau of Buildings

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

Overall Comments

Based on the pictures provided, Staff finds that the existing building is in a state of disrepair. It is clear that the front porch requires replacement, and the original brick under the vinyl siding will require extensive cleaning to abate the fire damage, and that much of the interior has been burned as a result of the fire. However, Staff would note that from the photographs provided by the Applicant and the appraiser the majority of the structure appears intact.

While Staff finds that the building in its current condition is unsafe and a nuisance, Staff does not find the Applicant has proven the property is an imminent and major threat to public health and safety. As previously mentioned, a major and imminent threat to public health and safety exists when the building is in danger of collapsing and harming someone on the public right of way. Based on the information submitted, Staff finds a major and imminent threat has not been proven.

As discussed above, the Applicant has not submitted any alternatives to demolishing the structure. Staff finds further documentation is required regarding the infeasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the property. Given the information we have at this time, Staff cannot support the application for demolition.

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

1. The Applicant shall submit an independent analysis and supporting information to document a major and imminent threat to public safety, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation that alternatives to demolition, such as renovation of the existing structure, are not reasonable, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
3. The Applicant shall provide information on the amount paid for the property and the date of purchase, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
4. The Applicant shall provide information showing the annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
5. The Applicant shall provide information showing the real estate taxes for the previous four (4) years and assessed value of the property according to the two (2) most recent assessed valuations, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
6. The Applicant shall provide information showing the remaining balance on any mortgage or other financing secured by the property and annual debt service, if any, during the prior three (3) years, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
7. The Applicant shall clarify whether the Appraisal provided is connected with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);

8. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the form of ownership or operation of the property, whether sole proprietorship, for-profit or not-for-profit corporation, limited partnership, joint venture, or both, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
9. The Applicant shall provide information showing the fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
10. The Applicant shall provide a report from a licensed engineer or architect with experience in rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures on the property and their suitability for rehabilitation, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
11. The Applicant shall provide a copy of the demolition estimate for this property, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
12. The Applicant shall provide estimates for additional alternatives including a detailed estimate for renovations and new construction, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
13. The Applicant shall provide information showing the fair market value of the property in the current condition, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
14. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer of development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
15. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the economic incentives and/or funding available for the rehabilitation of a historic property through federal, state, city, or private programs, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
16. All updated materials shall be submitted no less than 8 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: 935 Oglethorpe Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-447

MEETING DATE: February 13, 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)?: Yes, January 23, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

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. 16-20G 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.

The Applicant has provided updated plans showing the proposed addition and site work will conform with both the lot coverage and Far requirements. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The Applicant has provided updated plans and a narrative describing the original roof pitch of 5 in 12 as shown on the original plans was inaccurate. The updated plans and narrative explain the structure has a roof pitch of 7 ½ in 12. Staff finds this measurement is more in line with what would be expected of a Queen Anne cottage's principal pyramidal roof. The previously proposed addition will be reworked to be placed to the rear of the principal pyramidal roof thereby retaining the primary roof form and the cross gable accents. A dormer will be placed on the right side façade, to the rear of the chimneys to allow additional interior square footage. The rear roof form will be re-worked to a gable extension to allow the desired interior head height while only extending the building's depth by 4'. In general Staff finds this proposal to be appropriate for use on this property. Staff would recommend the rear corner boards be retained in place to allow accurate interpretation of the structure's history. Staff recommends any cementitious siding used on the project be smooth faced. Staff further recommends the new window on the side façade gable be unclad wood. If SDL windows are used, Staff recommends the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

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.

Based on the information provided, Staff finds that it is unlikely any original or historic accessory structures are still in existence on this block face. While not under the purview of the Commission, Staff has worked with Applicants in the past to determine the appropriate height for accessory structures based on block faces in close proximity to the subject property. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant work with Staff to determine the appropriate height of the proposed accessory structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. *The rear corner boards shall be retained in place to allow accurate interpretation of the structure's history, per Sec. 16-20.009;*
2. *Any cementitious siding used on the project shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d);*
3. *The new window on the side façade gable shall be unclad wood, per Sec.16-20G.006(2)(c);*
4. *If SDL windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec.16-20G.006(3)(d);*
5. *The Applicant shall work with Staff to determine the appropriate height of the proposed accessory structure, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(f); and,*
6. *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: 1021 Sparks Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-18-508 (addition, alterations)
MEETING DATE: February 13, 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, and Door and window replacements

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck, and 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 23, 2019. *Updated text in bold Italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: STOP WORK ORDER – Working outside scope of permit. Deferred January 23, 2019.

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.

The Applicant has provided updated floorplans which show the proposed deck. However, Staff has not received a revised site plan which shows the deck on the rear of the property. The most recent plan revisions received by Staff in advance of the January 23, 2019 Commission meeting show a front porch addition on the proposed structure, but do not depict the proposed deck. This feature will be required for permitting of the project. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

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). 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

The Applicant has provided measurements of 1003 and 1005 Sparks St. This information shows the height of the two contributing structures as 32’ 7” which is roughly the same height as the proposed structure with the second story addition. However, Staff finds this information to be inaccurate for several reasons. Firstly, the structures at 1003 and 1005 Sparks street are both one story Queen Anne cottages. Fulton County shows the livable space for these properties as 960 sf and 1,126 sf respectively and shows that neither property has a recorded attic, though space for such is likely available. The Applicant has stated in conversations with Staff that the ceiling height of the two properties is approximately 12’. Both properties have foundations which, upon visual inspection, appear to range between approximately 1’ and 4’ high. With this in mind, the subject properties would need to have a plate to ridge height of between 16’ 7”, and 19’ 7” in order to meet the Applicant’s measurement. This, along with these properties 7 in 12

roof pitch identified by the Applicant, lead Staff to find the supplied building height to be inaccurate. Staff's experience with historic homes of this style a height of approximately 18', but no more than 20', is expected.

After a visual inspection of the properties on the block face, Staff finds a second story would not be compatible with the historic homes, all of which are single story cottages and bungalows. As such, Staff recommends the second story addition be removed from the design. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide measurements of the tallest and shortest contributing structures on the block face. Staff further recommends that the compatibility measurements for the proposed height be performed by third party entity who is not associated with the proposed project or property.

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 second story addition shall be removed from the design, per Section 16-20M.005;*
4. *The Applicant shall provide measurements of the tallest and shortest contributing structures on the block face, per Section 16-20M.005;*
5. *The compatibility measurements for the proposed height shall be performed by third party entity who is not associated with the proposed project or property; and.*
6. All updated documents and information shall be submitted no less than 8 days prior to the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File