



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: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 3029 Humphries Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-062
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: East of Brown Mills and West of Jonesboro Road

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

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

RC-19-062 for 3029 Humphries Drive
February 27, 2019

The City of Atlanta proposes alterations and added space to Humphries Elementary School located at 3029 Humphries Drive in Atlanta GA 30354 a two story 28,910 square foot brick building. The Applicant has stated the school had roof issues and has proposed a new roof. The Applicant has noted to “see roof plans” however, Staff cannot locate the roof plans in the larger plans submitted. New gutters and downspouts will be installed New windows are proposed on the school with tinted storefront windows. The brick surfaces will be stained. The 10 percent of brick on the school will be repointed and all exterior light fixtures will be replaced. Wood trim and soffit will be replaced. 10,397 square foot two story will be added off the main entrance to the school metal coping expansion joint precast panels will be installed on the new addition to match the metal coping that is on the school. Proposed work will also include new sidewalks in certain locations and the existing sidewalks be graded to match.

Staff supports the proposed work on the school and encourages the City of Atlanta retain a qualified architect to ensure quality design. Staff also suggest the Applicant research the original Architect of the building for record keeping. Staff does wonder why the windows are being replaced. The Applicant has not indicated the reasoning for this. alteration. Never-the-less, the Staff does support the overall project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 24 Northwood Avenue, NE

APPLICATION: RC-19-060

MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills

Other Zoning: Conservation

Date of Construction: 1927

Property Location: East of Huntington Road and West of Palisades Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior Alterations

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

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.

The Applicant proposes to remove existing brick steps along the existing concrete driveway and expand the driveway to where the steps currently exist, replace the concrete on the existing driveway in-kind and add concrete to the expansion and repoint the existing brick retaining wall. Nothing in the proposed work concerns Staff. Staff finds that the alterations to the site is done in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the site will not be impaired.

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: 800 Cherokee Ave. (Grant Park)
APPLICATION: RC-19-071
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1895

Property Location: East block face of Cherokee Ave., at the Ormond St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A.

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: Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments.

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

The Applicant is proposing revisions to the Erskine Memorial Fountain site. Per the plans provided by the Applicant, the work is limited to hardscape and paving revisions, and the original fountain and seatwalls will not be affected by the proposal. The work involves the removal of the asphalt drive and the addition of cobble, granite, and concrete hardscapes. The proposed work would formalize the area as a pedestrian entrance to the park, remove the automobile infrastructure, and reuse the existing materials where possible. In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposed work and finds the design of the hardscapes appropriate for the property. Staff does suggest the Applicant give clarification as to whether the existing temporary bollards/planters will be removed as part of this work and whether they will be replaced with any new feature.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 775 Tift Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-016

MEETING DATE: February 27, 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)?: Yes. Deferred February 13, 2019. *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. 16-20I 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.

After reviewing the submitted materials and past precedent set by the Commission, Staff finds it appropriate that the addition be compatible with the existing structure. As such, Staff finds this recommendation unnecessary and withdraws their recommendation.

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.

Staff has not received an updated to-scale site plan for this project. Staff would note that the issues are likely with the copy of plans Staff received for this review, and are localized on the side lot lines. The right side lot line is shown as 122.42', but measures to 119'. Likewise, the left side lot line is shown as 131.91', but measures to 127'. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

The Applicant has provided updated plans which show the proposed lot coverage would be 44% of the lot area. As such, Staff finds this portion of the condition has been met. However, Staff has not received information regarding the existing and proposed FAR of the property. As such, Staff retains this portion of the recommendation.

Plan issues

The revised plans provided by the Applicant have mislabeled the existing and proposed left and right side façade elevations. As such, Staff recommends the plans be updated to accurately label the left and right side façades on both the existing and proposed elevations.

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.

The Applicant has provided updated plans which retain the original proposed design, with the exception of extending the ridge of the existing structure to meet the new ridge height established by the addition. As before, Staff does not find this second story portion of the addition to be compatible with the existing historic structure. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

In considering alternative design solutions which would meet the Applicant's desire for second story space while meeting the zoning regulations in place for this property as stated in the Adair Park Historic District regulations, Staff finds that a second story addition could be massed on the property which does not exceed the existing ridgeline of the structure. Per the Applicant's drawing, the existing structure has a height of 20' from grade to ridge at the highest point. The current roof structure would allow for 8' of head height if the main ridge were extended parallel with the plate towards the rear of the structure. The required egress windows could then be provided via shed roof dormers which extend from the 20' ridgeline.

Staff finds it is appropriate for the new addition to be differentiated from the original structure. The retention of the original corner boards would allow for proper differentiation of the new and old portions of the structure while also minimizing the loss of historic materials. As such, Staff recommends the rear corner boards of the existing structure be retained in the proposed addition.

The proposed addition does not appear to have a visible foundation as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends a visible foundation be added to the proposed drawings matching the height and materials of the existing foundation on the historic structure.

With regards to the proposed fenestration, Staff has a few concerns. First, the rearmost window on the left side façade, appears to be either a half-lite or accent window. The District regulations require all new windows to be proportional to the existing windows on the structure. As such, Staff recommends the accent window on the rearmost portion of the left side façade be replaced with a window which is proportional to the original windows on the structure.

With regards to the fenestration pattern on the right-side façade, Staff finds that the proposed elevation contains a large amount of blank wall space which is not compatible with the existing structure. As such, Staff recommends the right-side façade be revised to show additional fenestration consistent with the fenestration pattern on the existing structure.

With regards to the new windows, the Applicant has not provided information on the proposed materials. The District regulations require the windows to match the size, style, and materials of the original windows on the structure. Per the photographs provided by the Applicant, it appears that the original windows were replaced at some point in the past. However, Staff finds the original windows would have been unclad wood windows with true divided lites. For this project, as the style and lite divisions of the original windows is unknown, Staff finds it appropriate for the new windows to be one over one without lite divisions. It also appears that the proposed windows are to be single sash casement windows. Staff finds this would not be compatible with the original

windows which would have been double hung windows. As such, Staff recommends all new windows be double hung one over one windows made of unclad wood.

With regards to the proposed front door, Staff finds the design of the proposed front door does not meet the District regulations. The original door for this structure would have been a wood door with a rectangular lite division between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ the length of the slab. As such, Staff recommends the proposed front door be wood with a rectangular lite division between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ the length of the slab.

With regards to the proposed siding, no information is given in regards to the proposed materials. As such, Staff recommends the proposed siding be wood or smooth faced cementitious siding with a reveal matching the reveal of the original wood siding.

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

1. The site plan shall be redrawn to conform to the noted scale;
2. The Applicant shall provide a site plan which notes the existing and proposed FAR;
3. *The plans shall be updated to accurately label the left and right-side façades on both the existing and proposed elevations*
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);
5. *The rear corner boards of the existing structure shall be retained in the proposed addition, per Sec. 16-20.009(6);*
6. *A visible foundation shall be added to the proposed drawings matching the height and materials of the existing foundation on the historic structure, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(c)(2);*
7. *The accent window on the rearmost portion of the left side façade shall be replaced with a window which is proportional to the original windows on the structure, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(c)(2);*
8. *The right-side façade shall be revised to show additional fenestration consistent with the fenestration pattern on the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(5);*
9. *All new windows shall be double hung one over one windows made of unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(3);*
10. *The proposed front door shall be wood with a rectangular lite division between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ the length of the slab, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(3);*
11. *The proposed siding shall be wood or smooth faced cementitious siding with a reveal matching the reveal of the original wood siding, Per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(3);*
12. *All updated plans and 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: 697 Delmar Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-061

MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927.

Property Location: Southeast corner of Delmar Ave and United Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: craftsman bungalow

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Façades of the structure which are not facing the public street.

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

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

The proposed addition would replace a non-historic shed roof porch addition to the rear of the structure. The proposed addition would be massed such that the ridge height falls below the ridgeline of the existing structure. In general, Staff has few concerns with the proposed work. However, Staff finds that a hipped roof for the rear façade of the addition would allow for a softer impact of the massing of the addition, while allowing for greater compatibility with the existing roof form. As such, Staff recommends the rear roofline of the proposed addition be hipped.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The proposed addition shall contain a hipped roof, per Sec. 16-20.009; and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1077 Alta Avenue, NE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-042
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Inman Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: East of Harlson Avenue and West of Degrass Avenue

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work and renovations not visible from the public street or park.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L.006 (5)(b)(1), Sec. 16-26.003.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

REVIEW

The existing structure sits on a corner lot; therefore, this review will focus on all sides of the existing structure.

PLANS

The front elevation depicted on the plans is different than the photo submitted by the Applicant. This may be due to programming issue. Staff recommend the Applicant correct the discrepancy of the roof shown on the plan and match it with the roof shown in the photo.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to build an attic build-out that will create two bedrooms and one bathroom. The Applicant proposes to remove windows, doors and walls that appear to be non-historic and installing new windows and doors. A new roof line will be formed due to the proposed build-out.

Roofline

On the Rear/Southside elevation a Gable roof will be created. However, it will not exceed the Hip portion that will remain. Staff is not concern with the roof proposal.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to install two Silestone Wood windows on the proposed built-out. District Regulations states the size and shape of individual window openings is governed by the Compatibility Rule. On the existing house the Applicant have shown one over one windows. Staff recommends the windows on the new Gable addition be one over one windows to be consisted with the other windows on the existing house, abiding by the District Regulations.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to install cementitious siding on the new build-out, District Regulation permits cementitious siding. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Trim

The proposed trim on the new built-out is 5/4 x 8 with a Rake and trim to match the existing trim on the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Siding

The Applicant proposes to replace damaged vinyl siding with cementitious siding at side and rear to match existing wood siding at the front of the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Vinyl siding is not permitted in the District.

Porch Enclosure

The Applicant proposes to enclose the existing rear non-historic laundry room. New trim, windows, door and new concrete or stone stairs be removed and will be repositioned. Staff is not concerned with the trim, it matches the trim on the existing structure. The proposed windows match in style (one over one with the same trim) however, they are smaller due to the new enclosed porch will act as a laundry room and bathroom. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The new proposed door will be repositioned to accommodate for the enclosure. The doors will either wood or fiberglass. The doors on then lower basement level will be flushed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The proposed stairs' will be repositioned under the new proposed door with metal handrail. The stair's material or metal handrails does not present a problem with Staff. On the plans, the existing stairs remain. Staff recommends the existing stairs be removed.

Roof

The Applicant proposes to install skylights and install new asphalt shingles. Staff is not concerned with the asphalt shingles. Regarding the skylights, District Regulations states that skylights are permitted if they are not visible from a public street or park wherever possible. Protruding bubble skylights are prohibited. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence that show the skylights are not visible from the public street or park and that skylights will be placed in the most obscure location on the roof.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to scrap and prep all trim and windows for paint. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall correct the roof discrepancy shown on the plan and match it with the roof shown in the photo, per Sec.16-20I. 005;
2. The windows on the new Gable addition shall be one over one windows to be consisted with the other windows on the existing house, abiding by the District Regulations, per Sec.16-20I.006(1)(n)(ii);
3. The existing stairs in the rear of existing structure shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20I.006;
4. The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence from all sides of the house that show the skylights will not visible from the public street or park and that skylights will be placed in the most obscure location on the roof, per Sec.16-20I.006 (1)(x)
5. Staff shall review final plans if appropriate the final photography documentation

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1131 Montreat Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-19-045
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location East of Hall Street and West of Lawton Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PLAN ISSUES

The site plan submitted does not provide setback information. This information is required for the R4-A underlying zoning that is also required for a review. Staff recommends that Applicant submit three to-scale site plans that includes setback information.

The Applicant has shown a new roof plan but has not provided existing roof plan for comparison. When Staff compares the existing left elevation with new left elevation, it appears as if the Applicant has removed the Gable roof and created new to hip/pyramid roof. Staff finds this problematic. District Regulations states that “the compatibility rule shall apply to the form and pitch of the primary roof of the primary structure.” Staff recommends that Applicant provide compatibility comparisons of the roof form on the blockface.

ADDITIONS

Rear

The Applicant proposes to add 148 square feet to the left of principal structure. This will accommodate a new master suite and bedroom. The new proposed addition does not exceed the side and rear setback or property line shown on the plans but not stated. This rear addition will remove previous addition in rear. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Side

The Applicant also proposes to add a 50 square feet side porch addition on the right elevation of the principal structure which will come off of an expanded living room. The expanded living room was constructed from what appears to be an enclosed carport made into a sunroom at one point that did not extend over the side setback and followed the existing carport foot print. The roof will slope at 3:12. The existing roof slope is 6:12. The proposal side porch will have butt-jointed picket rails that attached to the top and bottom of the rail system. The propose column will be a 1-inch column cover, with stairs that will require threads. Staff is not concern with the proposed 3:12 slope roof. It acts a shed roof and is compatible if not exact to the 6:12 roof. Staff is also not concerned with the railing system or stairs. Staff is not concerned with the new proposed side added.

ALTERATIONS

Roof Chimney

The Applicant proposes to remove the chimney on the principal structure. District Regulations state that “alterations and additions shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property”. The chimney is an integral and historic part of the house style that characterize the property. Staff recommends the chimney not be removed.

Porch

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing stoop and handrail from the principal structure and build a new porch and butt-joint wood picket railings attached to a top and bottom rail system with a Gable roof. On the blockface of this particular street, there are stoops and porches present. So, Staff has no concern with removing the stoop and replacing with a porch. However,

the porch construction is governed by the compatibility standard. The Applicant has not provided photographic information regarding compatibility. Research have shown 1136 and 1118 Montreat both have concrete porch foundation and stairs. 1118 had rod iron railings and 1136 has no railings. Houses on across the street do have wood picket railings. The Gable roof is wider than the smaller Gable roof over the roof, but both compatible houses on the blockface have Gable roof over their porch. Nor will the new Gable roof proceed over the principal structure roof line. Staff is not concern with the new proposed porch on the front façade.

Windows

Front Facade

The Applicant is proposing to replace an existing 9 over 9 double-hung vertical with 9 over 9 double wood windows. The photo the Applicant provides of the windows on the front façade show the windows boarded. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the boards from the windows, provide photos so that Staff can see the feasibility of the windows as to determine why the replacement. District Regulations states that “replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening. The Applicant proposes to add an additional 9 over 9 double-hung vertical wood window to the front façade. The Applicant also proposes to replace the double-hung vertical 6 over 6, window on the once carport enclosure with a 9 over 9 double hung vertical wood window. The plans show the Applicant has moved the proposed new window and existing windows down to meet the window on the once carport enclosure. Staff is not concern if the 9 over 9 window replaces 6 over 6, however, to abide by the District Regulation, Staff recommends the Applicant not shift the new proposed windows to meet the height of the window on the carport enclosure, nor add an additional window on the front façade.

Left Elevation

The Applicant proposes toe remove an existing 9 over 9 window at the front the left elevation and remove a smaller 1over 1 window. The Applicant also plans to install 3 feet 4 inches 4 over 4 double-hung vertical wood window centered on the left elevation. This appears to accommodate a bathroom. Next to that window, the Applicant plans to install a 9 over 9 double-hung vertical wood window. The movement of the window are problematic however, the fenestration change the Applicant has proposed is due to interior changes. As well, the smaller window placement is due to interior changes. Staff deems that the Applicant proposed size and movement meets the District Regulations that states, compatibility standard should apply to the overall pattern of fenestration as it relates to the building façade. Staff deems this does fit the overall pattern of building façade. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes a complete overall of the existing siding with cementitious siding. However, the photos the Applicant provided does not give a clear indication of why this should be done. Staff recommends the Applicant provides clear photographic evidence of the siding on all sides of the principal structures for determination for its feasibility.

Door

The current front door on the principal door is not indicative of the Minimalist Traditional Style house. The Applicant proposes to replace it with a wood panel door. However, the Applicant has not provided photographic evidence what that door will look like. Staff recommend Applicant provide evidence of the proposed door as well as any other wood door that will be installed on the exterior of the principal structure.

Walkway

The District Regulation states the “a paved walkway from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure shall be provided.” The Applicant has not demonstrated this on the site plan. Staff recommends a paved walkway to be installed from the front of the sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure.

Fence

Research has shown a chain-link fence encompasses the property. Chain-link fences are prohibited in the front yard in the District. Fences in the front yard can only be 4 feet in height. Fences on the side and rear yards can be 6 ft in height. Material permissible for fences in the front yard can be brick, stone, ornamental iron or wood. The Applicant has plan has not provide a proposal for the fence. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District Regulations, remove the chain-link fence in the front yard and construct a 4 feet fence that utilize the acceptable material stated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall submit three to-scale site plans that includes setback information, per Sec16-20M.001;
2. The Applicant shall provide compatibility comparisons of the roof form on the blockface, per Sec 16-20M. 013(2)(f);
3. The Chimney shall not be removed, per Sec. 16-20M.017
4. The Applicant shall remove the boards from the windows, provide photos so that Staff can see the feasibility of the windows as to determine why the replacement, per Sec.16-20M.013 (2)(o);
5. The Applicant shall not shift the new proposed windows to meet the height of the window on the carport enclosure, nor add an additional window on the front façade, per Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(o) (a);
6. The Applicant shall clearer photographic evidence of the siding on all sides of the principal structures for determination for its feasibility, per Sec.16-20M.013 (2)(q);
7. The Applicant shall provide evidence of the proposed front door as well as any other wood doors that will be installed on the exterior of the principal structure, per Sec.16-20M.013;
8. A paved walkway shall to be installed from the front of the sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d);

9. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulations, remove the chain-link fence in the front yard and a construct a 4 feet fence that utilize the acceptable material stated, pec Sec.16-20.013(2)(i)(1)(2) and
10. 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: 836 Oakhill Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-19-054
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Gillette Avenue and West of Lillian Avenue

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

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. 16-20I.006 (2)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order was placed on this project, November 8, 2018 for unpermitted work.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ADDITION

From Inspection photos, the Applicant constructed a one-level platform-1 feet in height on the rear of existing structure. The site plan provided by the Applicant illustrates this new platform does not exceed the rear or side yard setbacks. However, the Applicant as of February 26, 2019 that their intentions are to remove the platform off the existing house. Staff had no concern with the platform for it does not exceed the setbacks set forth in the District Regulations.

ALTERATIONS

Doors/Windows

The Applicant had replaced the front door with French doors. District Regulations states, "architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trim work, and framing, shall be retained." French doors are not architecturally significant to this style house. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the French doors and return the existing door and return any windows back to their original state. The Applicant of February 26, 2019 has indicated returning the door and any windows back to their original state.

Porch Stairs

The Applicant had repaired in-kind the porch stairs. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

It is to be noted, the Applicant has agreed to return the existing structure back to its original state and not do any exterior work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall remove the French doors and return and keep the original door on the house and return any window back to its original state, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(1) and
2. Final plans and photos to be reviewed by Staff for final approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2930 Eleanor Terrace
APPLICATION: CA2-19-065
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1963

Property Location: East of Kings Grant Drive and West of Eleanor Court

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant has proposed new windows on the entire house. The photos of the existing windows provided by the Applicant, demonstrates viable windows. The Applicant has also indicated on the plans the new proposed windows will have 5.7 Sq. feet clear egress in each bedroom. Egress windows are permitted one per Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend that the Applicant present more photographic evidence that indicate new windows are warrant on the entire house.

Doors

As with the windows, the Applicant proposes to install new doors on the entire house with a Craftsman door for the front of the existing house. As with windows, the District requires original doors to be retained. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a door schedule of each door with a photo demonstrating its feasibility. The proposed Craftsman door is not compatible with Ranch style houses. Staff recommend the Craftsman door not be installed. Instead, the Applicant shall select a door that is conducive to Ranch Style houses.

Roof

The Applicant proposes to repair existing roof as needed. However, the Applicant does not detail what that means. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify exactly what repair as needed constitutes.

Front Stoop

Roof

On the front stoop of the existing house, the Applicant proposes to replace the shed roof with a Gable roof over the front stoop. District Regulations states that "Replacement porches or stoops or their component features shall be permitted only when the original or historic porch or stoop or their component feature(s) cannot be rehabilitated. If the original or historic porch or stoops or their components cannot be rehabilitated, the replacement porch or stoop or their component features shall match the original in shape, size, internal proportions, and materials. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the shed roof on the existing house and repair in-kind if needed.

The Applicant reference 2900 Eleanor Terrace as an example the replacement of the shed to Gable roof, the Applicant wants to do. However, 2900 is a Split-level house with a Colonial façade. The comparisons are not equal.

Columns

The Applicant also proposes to install new columns on over the front stoop. District Regulations states, if the original or historic porch or stoops or their component features shall the original in shape, size, internal proportions, and materials. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the existing columns and repair in-kind if needed.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to install new cementitious siding on the existing structure. The siding on the existing house appears to be wood lap siding. From the appearance, it appears as if the wood lap siding can be repaired in-kind. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a clear photo of the siding on the existing house to demonstrate replacement. If the siding is to be replaced, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed cementitious siding provided.

French Doors

The Applicant proposes French doors leading from the dining area onto the new proposed deck addition. Staff has no problem with this proposal.

Fence

The Applicant proposes to install a 6 feet privacy fence in the rear and sides of the house and a 3 feet fence in the front of the house. District Regulation states fences, and walls are not permitted between the principal structure and any public street, any yard adjacent to a public street, or any yard adjacent to the space between the principal structure and any public street. To abide by District Regulations, Staff recommends, the front yard 3 feet fence not be included in proposal. Staff also recommends the fence be either metal chain link, metal picket or wood picket.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to install a deck at the rear of the house. On the plans, the deck does not exceed upon the sides of the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide a door schedule of each door with a photo demonstrating its feasibility, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(2)(a);
2. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the replacement doors if they are not in-kind to the existing door, per Sec. 16-20Q.005(2)(d);
3. The Craftsman door shall not be installed, and the Applicant shall select another door conducive to Ranch style houses, per Sec.16-20Q.005(2);
4. The Applicant shall clarify exactly “what repair as needed” constitutes for the roof proposal, per Sec.16-20Q.006(6);
5. The Applicant shall retain the shed roof on the existing house and repair in-kind if needed, per Sec. 16-20Q.006 (10);
6. The Applicant shall retain the existing columns and repair in-kind if needed, per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(c);
7. The Applicant shall provide a clear photo of the siding on the existing structure to demonstrate replacement, per Sec.16-20Q.006(1);
8. If the siding is to be replaced, the Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the proposed cementitious siding, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(1)(g);
9. To abide by District Regulations, the front yard 3 feet fence shall not be installed, per Sec.16-20Q.006(16)(a);
10. The fence shall be either metal chain link, metal picket or wood picket, per Sec.16-20Q.006(16)(b) and
11. 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: 884 Oakhill Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-19-066
MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: West of Lillian and East of Pearce Street

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

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. 16-20I.006 (2)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to demolish an existing deck in the rear on the lower level of the existing structure and construct a new rear deck and porch addition above the deck. The existing deck exceed the 7 feet side setback on one side. The Applicant proposes to use the same foot print of existing deck to construct the deck and porch and extend the deck and porch to the other side of the elevation but will not exceed the side setback. The Gable roofline for the porch added does not exceed the roofline of the existing structure's roof. The asphalt shingle proposed for the new Gable roof will match the existing roof material. Staff is not concerned with the proposed.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace all windows on the existing structure in-kind. The Applicant proposes to remove non-historical glass blocks from existing windows. Staff is not concerned with this proposed work.

Fenestration Patterns

The Applicant proposes to relocate windows on the existing structure to accommodate for interior renovations to allow for more kitchen counter space and added light into the living room. The Applicant started with five windows and continues with five windows. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace 5-inch wood siding on all sides of the existing structure if applicable. The Applicant proposes if it becomes difficult to match the siding exactly, the Applicant will repair and replace siding with a 5-inch cementitious siding that will match the existing siding. District Regulations permits this scope of work. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Chimney

The Applicant proposes to repair the existing brick chimney veneers and match it in-kind. District Regulations states, "chimneys shall match original materials, mortar, color and pattern whenever possible." Inventory photo shows the original material is brick. Staff recommends the Applicant, repair the chimney to its original material.

Door

Front Door

The Applicant proposes to replace in-kind the front entry door. District Regulations states, replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Replacement windows and doors shall match the original in style, materials, shape and size with no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size. Staff recommends the Applicant determine what would be the original door for this type house and the replacement door match it in style, material, shape and size abiding by the District Regulations.

CA3-19-066 for 884 Oakhill Avenue
February 27, 2019

Rear and Entry Access Doors

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace in-kind the rear door and the entry access door. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall repair the chimney to its original material, brick per Sec. 16-20I.006 (4)(e)(1);
2. The Applicant shall determine what would be the original door type for this house. The replacement door shall match it in style, material, shape and size abiding by the District Regulations, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(3) and
3. Final plans and photos to be reviewed by Staff for final approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 384 Peachtree St. (Medical Arts Building LBS)

APPLICATION: CA2-19-063

MEETING DATE: February 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1926-1927

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: High Rise Office / Skyscraper

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to the primary office tower and sitework in the area immediately adjacent to the tower.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work proposed for the two parking garages.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Boundaries and authority

The extent of the Landmark Building/Site designation on the property is localized to the Medical Arts Building itself, and the drive/parking area to the north of the building. The two parking garages on the property are not included in the designation. As such, Staff will only be reviewing the proposed changes to the Medical Arts Building and the hardscaped area to the north of the building.

Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that this property is seeking tax credits through the State Historic Preservation Office/National Park Service and that a façade easement has been secured by Easements Atlanta. Changes to the structure will require review by both of these organizations in addition to the review and approval by the Commission. While the reviews performed by these organizations would likely lead to the same conclusions by the Commission's review, Staff finds it would be best to ensure that any changes which meet the standards for landmark buildings in the City of Atlanta could be approved by Staff administratively without the need for additional reviews by the Commission. As such, Staff recommends any changes required by other agencies be approved by Staff if said changes meet the Further Standards section of Chapter 20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Repairs and alterations

The proposal currently involves the cleaning and repair of the façade materials. With regards to the cleaning methods, no information has been given. As such, Staff recommends the building be cleaned using the gentlest means possible following the Secretary of Interior's standards for the treatment of historic properties. Staff further recommends the Applicant clean a small minimally-visible portion of the façade using the chosen cleaning method and provide photographs of the area to Staff to confirm the method does not damage the historic façade materials prior to proceeding with cleaning the remainder of the façade.

Staff has no general concern with the repair of the historic façade materials, but finds an itemized work list noting the areas in need of repair along with a list of standardized methods of addressing those repairs would be necessary to ensure each issue is addressed appropriately. As such, Staff recommends that after an initial assessment of the façade is made, the Applicant submit an itemized work list noting the areas and materials in need of repair. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide a palate of standardized repair methods to address those issues for Staff to review and approve.

It is likely that after the initial assessment of the building that façade materials which require replacement could be found. Staff finds it necessary to have proper documentation of these conditions and for mock-ups of the proposed replacement materials to be reviewed and approved to ensure that the replacement material adequately replicates the original materials. As such Staff recommends that after the initial assessment of the building, the Applicant document any façade materials which require replacement. Staff further recommends a mock-up of any replacement façade material be provided to Staff for approval prior to installation on the building.

With regards to the windows, the Applicant's proposal is complete replacement of the existing windows with new single hung metal windows matching the style and design of the originals. Staff has received photographs of a representative sample of the original windows still extant on the property. These photographs show the

existing steel windows to be rusted and in a state of disrepair. Given Staff's knowledge of this window material, repairing the windows would likely be infeasible. As such, Staff has no general concerns with replacing the original windows. Staff does, however, recommend that the Applicant provide a mock-up of the proposed replacement window for Staff to review and approve prior to installation of the proposed windows on the building.

New storefront systems are proposed for the Peachtree St. and north side façades of the structure. The storefronts will be constructed of metal and glass and be installed in the original openings. Staff finds that the design of the storefronts are appropriate for the style and age of the building, and has no concerns with this proposal

The plans have designated locations for signage or lighting which is still to be determined. Staff recommends any signage or lighting added to the building in the locations noted for such on the plans be reviewed and approved by Staff for compliance with the requirements of the Preservation Ordinance and the sign ordinance as applicable.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing a new stair addition on the south side of the building. This portion of the building is a projection with a single-story façade along Peachtree St. The addition will be for a new stair tower enclosure and will be set back 10' from the Peachtree St. façade. As the addition is for egress purposes, Staff has no general concerns with the proposal but finds that the plans do not provide adequate information on the proposed design or materials of the projection for Staff to review. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the design and materials proposed for the stair addition on the south side building projection. Staff further recommends the design and materials of the projection meet the requirements of the Preservation Ordinance.

Signage

The Applicant is proposing a monument sign at the northeast corner of the property. As this sign could not be placed in the right of way, it would likely be placed on a portion of the property bearing the LBS designation. This sign would need to meet the sign requirements for both the underlying SPI-1 zoning as well as the *Additional Standards for Signs in Landmark and Historic Areas* in the General Regulations of the Sign Ordinance. As the design of this sign is not yet finalized, Staff cannot review this portion of the project. Staff would note for the Applicant's benefit that this sign will require an additional review by the Commission prior to permitting.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing to repave the area to the north of the property and install two seating areas on either side of the automobile ramp. While this area is within the boundaries of the Landmark Building/Site designation, historic materials will not be disturbed. Staff finds it appropriate for new additions to the site which are not directly related to, or physically attached to, the principal structure to allow for proper visual differentiation of the old and new. As such, Staff has no concerns with the work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. Any changes required by other agencies be approved by Staff if said changes meet the Further Standards section of Chapter 20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta;
2. The building be cleaned using the gentlest means possible following the Secretary of Interior's standards for the treatment of historic properties;

3. The Applicant clean a small minimally-visible portion of the façade using the chosen cleaning method and provide photographs of the area to Staff to confirm the method does not damage the historic façade materials prior to proceeding with cleaning the remainder of the façade, per Sec. 16-20.009;
4. After an initial assessment of the façade is made, the Applicant submit an itemized work list noting the areas and materials in need of repair, per Sec. 16-20.009;
5. The Applicant provide a palate of standardized repair methods to address those issues for Staff to review and approve, per Sec. 16-20.009;
6. The Applicant provide a mock-up of the proposed replacement window for Staff to review and approve prior to installation of the proposed windows on the building, per Sec. 16-20.009;
7. Any signage or lighting added to the building in the locations noted for such on the plans be reviewed and approved by Staff for compliance with the requirements of the Preservation Ordinance and the sign ordinance as applicable, per Sec. 16-20.009 and Sec. 16-28A.007(v);
8. The Applicant clarify the design and materials proposed for the stair addition on the south side building projection, per Sec. 16-20.009;
9. The design and materials of the projection meet the requirements of the Preservation Ordinance per Sec. 16-20.009; and,
10. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1021 Sparks Street SW
APPLICATION: CA3-18-508 (addition, alterations)
MEETING DATE: February 27, 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 February 13, 2019. *Updated text in underlined 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.

The updated site plan shows a rear deck on the property. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The Applicant has provided information showing that the height of the comparable structures is 27' and has provided revised designs for the structure. As such, Staff finds the recommendation regarding the compatibility comparisons has been met and withdraws all previous recommendations regarding the design of the structure and will focus their comments on the revised design.

The Applicant has submitted revised designs which bring the structure closer to conforming with the two Queen Anne structures on the block face. However, the juxtaposition of competing architectural styles between the minimal traditional cottage and the Queen Anne cottages create a structure with odd proportions that do not fit with one another. First, the proposed structure attempts to re-create the 11' façade contained by the two comparable properties. This is made difficult by the comparably short windows on the subject property. The two Queen Anne structures contain taller windows consistent with the style. Further, by making the façade taller and cladding the resulting wall with siding as opposed to the stucco used on the existing façade the proportions of the resulting structure are thrown into stark contrast with one another. Staff finds that the simplest means of addressing the proportion issues on this property are to lower the eave line 3' 3" to meet the tallest point of the existing stucco façade. As such, Staff recommends the eave line be lowered 3' 3". Staff further recommends the structure be clad entirely in either stucco or smooth faced cementitious lap siding.

The two comparable Queen Anne structures contain a full width front porch. As such, Staff finds the proposed ¾ width front porch incompatible with the comparable properties. Staff recommends the front porch be the full width of the front façade.

The two comparable Queen Anne structures have their front door situated to the right side of the front façade. As such, Staff recommends the front door be relocated to the right side of the front façade.

The proposed structure contains an accent gable consistent with the Queen Anne Style. However, the proposed gable contains both a round top gable vent and a window which are not consistent with the comparable properties. Staff recommends the window on the accent gable be removed,

and a rectangular gable vent proportional to the accent gable and consistent in style to the two comparable properties be added to the accent gable.

The proposed addition introduces a good deal of blank wall space on the side façades. Staff recommends the addition contain a fenestration pattern consistent with the existing structure.

On the side roof plane, a shed dormer has been proposed to allow for second story living space. Staff has several concerns with the design of this dormer, some of which will be alleviated by Staff's previous condition regarding the lowering of the eave line 3' 3". As currently designed, Staff finds that the dormer engages both the roof plane and the side façade in an awkward manner. With the eave line lowered, the shed dormer would meet the roof at a higher point on the roof plane thus allowing the dormer to fit better on the roof plane. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that while the elevations appear to show the dormer being directly attached to the side façade, the roof plans show the eave line will continue the full length of the façade. This will allow for a break in the façade and create a more proportional rhythm that would be expected for a dormer addition. Staff still has concerns with the fenestration proposed for the dormer. Staff recommends the dormer windows be consistent in style, size, and proportion with the existing windows on the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The eave line shall be lowered 3' 3", per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a);
2. The structure shall be clad entirely in either stucco or smooth faced cementitious lap siding, per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a);
3. The front porch shall be the full width of the front façade, per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a);
4. The front door shall be relocated to the right side of the front façade and the windows be relocated to a pattern consistent with the comparable properties, per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a);
5. The window on the accent gable shall be removed, and a rectangular gable vent proportional to the accent gable and consistent in style to the two comparable properties shall be added to the accent gable, per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a);
6. The addition shall contain a fenestration pattern consistent with the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a);
7. The dormer windows shall be consistent in style, size, and proportion with the existing windows on the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.0017(1)(a); and,
8. 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: 686 Kirkwood Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-18-555

MEETING DATE: January 9, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Pre 1911

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

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, Deferred February 13, 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. 16-20A of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Plan Issues

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

The revised plans have addressed Staff's previous concerns with the property. However, Staff notes that the second window on the right side façade is mislabeled on the proposed floor plans. Staff recommends the window labeling be corrected on the proposed floor plans.

Addition

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

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

Alterations

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

The Applicant has provided information relating to the materials of the proposed windows and doors, but not the condition of the existing windows and doors. As such, Staff retains its previous conditions. Staff would note that the proposed wood windows and doors would meet the District regulations if replacement of the original elements were found to be appropriate.

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

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

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

No updated information relating to the condition of any original siding beneath the existing siding has been received. As such, Staff retains these recommendations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

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

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
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 27, 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)?: Yes, deferred February 13, 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 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.

The Applicant has provided a revised compatibility study based on the contributing structure on the block face which contains the information needed for review. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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 Applicant has provided a string line drawing to show where the front property line is located. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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

The Applicant has noted the Lot Coverage and FAR on the site plan. Staff finds that the proposed structure meets both requirements. As such, Staff finds that this recommendation has been met.

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.

The Applicant has clarified that the structure will have a front yard setback as measured from the property line to the front porch. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether the comparison measurements for the front yard setback were taken from the property line to the front porch or

from the property line to the front façade. Staff recommends the method of measurement used for the front yard setback comparisons be applied to the proposed structure.

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

A walkway leading from the front door to the sidewalk has been provided. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The proposed roof structure has been changed to a hipped roof with an accent dormer on the front roof plane. With regards to the proposed accent dormer, the plans appear to show this element as a shed roof dormer on the front façade, while the side facades show it as an accent dormer. To avoid confusion regarding this element Staff recommends the proposed accent dormer have a hipped roof.

Staff further recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

The Applicant has provided an updated compatibility study showing the allowable roof pitch range is 10:12 and 12:12.

Staff further recommends the proposed roof pitch meet the compatibility rule.

Staff has not received information detailing the proposed roof pitch. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

The Applicant has provided an updated compatibility study showing the allowable first floor height range as between 1' and 3'. Staff finds the proposed 3' first floor elevation meets this requirement.

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.

The revised drawings show brick as the primary foundation material. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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

The revised drawings note a 1x4 tongue and groove material for the porch flooring. Staff retains the recommendation regarding the porch floor being 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.

The revised drawings show the front door being moved to line up with the front door. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The revised drawings show the front porch columns as simple squared columns without ornamentation. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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 revised plans show the front door on the left side of 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. *The revised plans show a wood door with a rectangular lite division proposed. Staff recommends the lite division be enlarged to ¼ the length of the door slab.*

With regards to the proposed windows, Staff recommends the proposed windows be unclad wood.

While the revised plans show wood windows being installed, Staff retains the recommendation that the proposed windows be unclad wood.

Staff recommends the proposed cementitious siding be smooth faced.

The revised drawings clarify that smooth faced cementitious siding is proposed for the primary façade material. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The revised drawings show a brick chimney meeting the District regulations. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. *Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether the comparison measurements for the front yard setback were taken from the property line to the front porch or from the property line to the front façade.*
2. *Staff recommends the method of measurement used for the front yard setback comparisons be applied to the proposed structure.*
3. *Staff recommends the proposed accent dormer have a hipped roof, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(d);*
4. *The proposed roof pitch shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006(12)(d);*
5. *The front porch flooring shall be installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);*
6. *The front door shall contain a rectangular lite opening which is ¼ the length of the door slab, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);*
7. *The windows shall be unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);*
8. *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 27, 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)?: Yes, deferred 02.13.2019. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Defer.

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.

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.

The Applicant has provided a fire report assessment from a licensed engineer. This letter speaks to the structural integrity of the existing building and the feasibility of renovations. Based on this analysis the structure is heavily fire damaged and the majority of the floor structure has been excessively damaged. The Engineer states in their assessment that the only area that may be salvaged is the rear left portion of the building.

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.

The Applicant cites the engineer's letter stating that rehabilitating the existing structure would not be cost effective. However, information relating to the cost effectiveness of rehabilitation, such as estimates and information detailing the amount of work needed to rehabilitate the existing structure, has not been received by Staff. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

The Applicant has provided information showing the home was purchased for \$99,986.73.

- (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.

As the property was recently purchased in the current fire damaged condition, this criterion would not be applicable to the project.

- (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.

From the information received, it appears the house was purchased with cash and then refinanced for \$14,025.00. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify, in writing, whether any mortgage or loan was secured for the purchase or renovation of the home and the amount of said mortgage or loan.

- 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.

The Applicant has provided tax information addressing this criterion.

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.

Staff has not received information relating to this recommendation. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

Staff has not received information relating to this request. As such, Staff retains this recommendation. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that the District was designated in 1994, and the Fulton County Tax Assessor should have information relating to the fair market value of the property at this time period.

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.

The Applicant has provided information showing that the property is owned by a sole proprietorship.

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.

The Applicant has provided tax information for the property for the last several years.

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.

The Applicant has provided a letter from a licensed engineer stating that repairing the existing structure would not be cost effective. However, Staff has not received information relating to estimates for rehabilitating the existing structure as mentioned in the next criterion to confirm this recommendation.

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.

Staff has not received information relating to this criterion. As such, Staff retains the previous recommendation.

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.

The Applicant has provided information showing the properties current fair market value, according to the Fulton County Tax Assessor, is \$66,000.00.

- 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.

The Applicant has provided a letter from an engineer speaking to the structural soundness of the building. As such, Staff finds this criterion is not applicable and withdraws the previous recommendation.

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.

The Applicant has provided a copy of the economic incentives form from the Certificate of Appropriateness Application packet.

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.

Given the Applicant's responses to the application, Staff finds that additional information is needed in order to review the request. Specifically, estimates relating to the cost of rehabilitating the existing structure. Additionally, while the engineer's report states the existing structure is unsound, the Applicant has not submitted information detailing the amount of work required to rehabilitate the home. Staff would note that the Zoning Ordinance treats the demolition of historic properties as an avenue of last resort and these recommendations are central to ensuring that all methods of addressing the threat to public health and safety are exhausted before demolition takes place. As this analysis has not been received by Staff, Staff cannot support the demolition request at this time.

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

1. 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);
2. The Applicant shall clarify, in writing, whether any mortgage or loan was secured for the purchase or renovation of the home and the amount of said mortgage or loan, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);

3. 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);
4. 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);
5. The Applicant shall provide a copy of the demolition estimate for this property, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
6. The Applicant shall provide estimates for additional alternatives including a detailed estimate for renovations and new construction, per Sec. 16-20.008(d)(1);
7. All updated materials shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
File