



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: Merritts Park
APPLICATION: RC-19-082
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Atlanta City Park

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-28.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-082 for Merritt Park
March 13, 2019

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

At Merritt Park, proposed work is slated to remove an existing asphalt path and replace it with a paved path, replace one center ADA compliant handrail with two new outside and one new center ADA handrail, and repair any damaged concrete in cheek wall. The Applicant is also proposing four new exercise workout equipment. Each of these exercise equipment is equipped to be utilized for the physically disabled. Staff has no concern with the proposed work set forth. In fact, Staff approve of the project which enhances the overlook and purpose of the park.

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: 2300 Wilson Dr. (Adams Park)

APPLICATION: RC-19-093

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: South block face of Wilson Dr., west of Venetian Dr., east of Willis Mill Rd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demo of existing restrooms and construction of new restrooms

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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

The Applicant is proposing the demolition of two existing restrooms on the property. The existing structures are not historic and are in advanced states of disrepair. As such, Staff has no concern with their demolition. However, no information on the proposed replacement structures has been received. Staff suggests the Applicant provide information detailing the design of the proposed restroom facilities before final sign off my Staff.

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

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Center Hill Park, 2455 Bankhead (Donald Lee Hollowell)
APPLICATION: RC-19-095
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Northwest Quadrant

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-28.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-095 for Center Park
March 13, 2019

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

The City of Atlanta through CDBG funds intends to conduct a full environmental review of the Center Park located in the Northwest quadrant in the City of Atlanta. The intention is to do playground rehabilitation. The proposed work includes moving outdated playground equipment that was not ADA compliant with the installation of ADA compliant equipment; installation of new fitness equipment with safety surfaces and addition of signage as required. Staff has no concerns with the proposed work. Staff suggest that the Applicant abide by the Signage Ordinance (Chapter 28A) set by the City regarding signage installation.

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: 201 Pewyton Rd. (Isabel Gates Webster Park)
APPLICATION: RC-19-096
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-18 (Subarea 10)

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Northwest corner of Peyton Rd. and Peyton Pl.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Park

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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

The Applicant is proposing the removal of play structures which were installed in 1995 and have exceeded their lifecycle. The features will be replaced with new play structures, safety surfaces, and signage. Staff has no general concerns with the proposed scope of work, but does suggest the Applicant clarify whether a master plan for this park exists, and whether the proposed work is in keeping with that document.

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

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Collier Park, 3691 Collier Drive
APPLICATION: RC-19-097
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Northwest Quadrant of the City of Atlanta

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-28.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-082 for Merritt Park
March 13, 2019

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

The City of Atlanta through CDBG funds intends to conduct a full environmental review of the Collier Park site with the intentions to do a playground rehabilitation. The propose work includes moving outdated playground equipment that was not ADA compliant with the installation of ADA compliant equipment; installation of new fitness equipment with safety surfaces and addition of signage as required. Staff has not concerns with the proposed work. Staff suggest that the Applicant abide by the Signage Ordinance (Chapter 28A) set by the City regarding signage installation.

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: 477 Windsor St.

APPLICATION: RC-19-099

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-18 (Subarea 10)

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Southwest block face of Windsor St. and Fulton St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Park

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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

The Applicant is proposing new concrete curbing and a new shade structure for the existing playground facilities. The work will also include ADA improvements to the existing site. In general Staff has no concerns with the work and is in support of the proposed improvements. Staff does suggest the Applicant clarify whether a master plan for this park exists, and whether the proposed work is in keeping with that document.

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

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 634 Delmar Avenue, SE
APPLICATION: CA2-19-069
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West of Marion Avenue and East of Rosedale Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 20K.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to

Retaining Wall

On 26 feet retaining in the front of the main structure, the Applicant is proposing alterations that would include installing 4 inches rebar into the retaining wall for reinforcement. The propose work will include a new facing front. Staff is not concern will the proposal of the retaining wall. The wall will not take away the architectural character in the neighborhood.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes to remove sections of the concrete driveway to install sod—no larger than 24 inches. Staff deems the design of the proposed drive does not take way the functionality of driveway and is does not alter the architectural significance of the main structure. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Railings

The Applicant proposes to remove existing screen on the porch, which appear not to be original to the main structure to install new porch railings. Staff recommends the railing be wood, perpendicular in orientation, be a top and bottom railing with a two-part construction with butt-jointed pickets, be no higher than the bottom seal of the front window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. The railing shall be wood, perpendicular in orientation, top and bottom railing with a two-part construction with butt-jointed pickets and be no higher than the bottom seal of the front window, per Sec. 16-20K.007 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: 728 Pearce Street SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-078
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: East of Mayland Avenue and West of Allene Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations/Converting duplex back to single family

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.005, Sec. 16-20I.006, Sec. 16-20.008

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.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes to convert the existing principal structure from a duplex to its original plan of a single-family structure. The Applicant proposes to use the same footprint except for an added deck in the rear of the existing structure.

Conversion from Door to Window

On the front elevation, the Applicant proposes to remove the door on the right side, converting it into a window to match the existing windows on the right and left sides of the front. Staff is not concerned with the proposal of the door to be converted to a window due to the Applicant converting the principal structure from a duplex. However, Staff has pause with adding a window to the front façade. District Regulations states that to new windows or doors added existing structures shall be located on sides or to the rear of buildings, rather than on the front. However, the new fenestration patterns on the front façade would create an unbalance of wall to openings. The proposed new window would not be visible from the public right-of-way due to the porch construction. And the new proposed window will be in-kind with the material and style of the original windows on the front. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace the windows on the main structure in-kind. From the photos the Applicant provided there are various style of windows on the main structure. All appear to original to the house. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the windows. If any window gets damaged, Staff recommends the Applicant repair or replace the window in-kind to the original. Before replacing Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic images of the damaged window.

Front Door

The Applicant has proposed that all exterior doors be repaired or replaced in-kind. However, from the photograph provided by the Applicant the front door appears to be relatively in good shape. Staff recommends, that if the Applicant can either repair in-kind. If replacing, the Applicant must replace the door with the style of door that is indicative to the 1930's

Side Door

The Applicant also proposes to remove the door on the right elevation and replace it with a window that will match in-kind with the existing window on the right side of the elevation. Floor plans demonstrates an existing kitchen will be replaced with a bedroom. The removal the door is not troubling to Staff, a door coming off a bedroom would be problematic. District Regulations states that new windows or doors added to existing structures shall be located on sides or to the rear of buildings, rather than on the front. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Screen Removals

The Applicant proposes to remove the screens from the front porch arch openings, restoring the porch back to an open-air porch. Staff has no concern for this proposal, 730 Pearce is reflective of the originality of the porch.

Roof Material

The Applicant proposes replacing shingles in-kind with architectural 3-tab shingles. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Roof Rafter Repair

The Applicant has proposed the roof rafter to be repaired in-kind and if the rafters cannot be repaired, the rafters will be removed, and fascia will be applied. Staff recommends the Applicant repair the rafters in-kind to the existing if need be. District Regulation states, that roofing materials shall be of the same size, texture and materials as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure.

Siding on Gable

The Applicant has proposed the Board and Batten siding, soffit and fascia on the front Gable be repaired or replaced in-kind. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

Chimney

The Applicant proposes the brick on the chimney to be repaired. Staff recommends the chimney be repointed or repaired in-kind to the original chimney.

Brick Cleaning

The Applicant proposes cleaning the brick on the house. Staff recommends the Applicant not power wash the brick or use any cleaning agent that will damage the brick.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to construct a 12x12 patio deck on the rear of the house that will not exceed the rear or side yard setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Fence

The Applicant has proposed a 1 foot fence inside the property line. The site plan shows an existing chain link fence. The Applicant has not indicated what material for the proposed fence will be. District Regulations permit chain link fence in the rear of the existing structure. Staff recommends the Applicant state what material the proposed 1 foot fence will be.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall retain the windows on the main structure. If any window gets damaged, Staff recommends the Applicant repair or replace the window in-kind to the original. Before repairing, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence of the damaged window, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
2. If the Applicant keeps the door, it shall be repair in-kind. If replacing, the Applicant shall replace the door with the style of door that is indictive to the 1930's per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);

3. The Applicant shall repair the rafters in-kind to the existing if need be, District Regulation states, that roofing materials shall be of the same size, texture and materials as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure, per Sec.16-20I.006 (4)(f)(1);
4. The chimney shall be repointed or repaired in-kind to the original chimney, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(e);
5. The Applicant shall not power wash the brick or use any cleaning agent that will damage the brick, per Sec.16-20I.005;
6. The Applicant shall state what material the proposed 1 foot fence will be, per Sec.16-20I.005 and
7. Staff shall review, and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 771 Tift Avenue, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-080
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Hugh Street and West of Shelton Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations/Converting duplex back to single family

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.005, Sec. 16-20I.006, Sec. 16-20.008

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.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes a series of alterations on an existing structure.

Gutters and Downspouts

The Applicant proposes to clean and secure gutters and downspouts. Staff is not concerned with the overall principle of cleaning and securing the gutters and downspouts since this is typically general repairs on a house. However, Staff does recommend the Applicant secure the downspouts in a manner that cannot be seen from the public right-of-way.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to replace glass in some of the broken windows and replace damaged sills on windows. The Applicant has also indicated that no windows will be removed and replaced, and all repairs will be-kind to the original windows. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Additionally, the Applicant has indicated to replace the new siding under the window that does not match the existing original siding. The Applicant will replace the siding in-kind with the original wood siding.

Stairs

The Applicant proposes to repair the front hand rails on stairs. Photos of the stairs and hand rails indicate they are metal, which appears to and be original to the main structure. Since the Applicant has not indicated replacing or removing the stairs and hand rails, Staff is not concerned with the proposal. However, Staff does recommend the Applicant repair the hand rails in-kind with the original.

Foundation

The Applicant proposes to re-grout the cracks in the settlement that has become loose on the foundation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Crawl Space Door

The Applicant proposes to replace the crawl space door, however that Applicant has not provided clear photographic evidence of the door and its location on the existing structure. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide photos of the crawl space door and indicate where it is located on the existing structure.

General Maintenance

The Applicant proposes to power wash the siding, paint the foundation, paint the window trim, paint shutters and doors and landscape the yard. Staff have no concern with the proposed work. Staff suggest the Applicant consult The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for further assistance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall secure the downspouts in a manner that cannot be seen from the public right-of-way, per Sec. 16-20I.005;
2. The Applicant shall repair the hand rails in-kind with the original, per Sec.16-20I.005;
3. The Applicant shall provide photos of the crawl space door and indicate where it is located on the existing structure, per Sec.16-20I.005 and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood



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: 1162 St. Augustine Pl

APPLICATION: CA3-19-085

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Atkins Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction:

Property Location: North block face of Saint Augustine Pl., west of Briarcliff Rd., east of North Highland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: American Foursquare / Prairie.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance request

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-200.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approved.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-200 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variance Requests

The requested variance is to increase the allowable lot coverage from 50% to 55.9%.

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

The Applicant states that the subject property is non-conforming with regards to its size. The underlying R-4 zoning requires the property to have a minimum square footage of 9,000 sf. the subject property contains a square footage of 7,409 sf.

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

The Applicant states that the non-compliant square footage would impair the property from being developed to full potential.

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

The Applicant identifies the non-conforming square footage of the property.

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

The Applicant states that the increase in lot coverage would allow for an otherwise compliant pool to be built that would not impact the surrounding properties.

Staff finds that the Applicant's responses have satisfied the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff supports the recommended variance.

Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant and Commission that the design of the pool and related site work will require a separate Type II *Staff Review* Application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 394 Moreland Avenue (Findley Plaza)
APPLICATION: RC-19-115
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: NA **Other Zoning:** NC-1

Date of Construction: Unknown (1980s?)

Property Location: Northwest corner of Moreland Avenue and Euclid Avenue.

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

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: 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 renovations to the existing Findley Plaza, which was created from the northwest portion of the intersection of Moreland Avenue and Euclid Avenue in Little Five Points.

The current plaza consists of concrete and brick paving, with semi-mature trees planted within slightly raised and fenced tree wells.

The project will consist of an entirely new plaza, with new paving, planting beds along the edge of the plaza (next to the street), benches, trash cans, lighting, a slightly pushed out curb line to create more plaza space, relocation of an existing mosaic, the installation of a metal medallion at the center of the plaza, and a as-yet to be designed sculpture.

While the Staff generally finds the proposed design to be appropriate for the location and size of plaza, the Staff does have a couple of comments.

First, the Staff would recommend that any public art installations beyond the relocated mosaic be considered in the new plaza design. Further, the Staff would recommend that any public art installation (including the relocated mosaic) include a brief explanation of its history, artist, and intent.

Second, the Staff is concerned that in the new plaza there appears to be limited shade provided (either by new trees or canopy structures) at the center of the plaza and given the plaza's southern exposure (across Euclid Avenue), the plaza could become very hot and uncomfortable for several months of the year. the Staff would acknowledge, though, that the plaza design with the trees on the edges helps to create an "outdoor room" effect to the space connecting it to the adjacent storefronts.

Third, the location of the as-yet-designed sculpture near the relocated mosaic creates an odd adjacency. Given the size and design of the plaza, the two public art pieces are right next to each other even though the rest of the plaza does not have any art installation or vertical components.

Fourth, the Staff is concerned that the paving system is unique to this project and as such it may be difficult to maintain consistent replacement paving units for future work. In contrast, standard brick (which can be laid in a variety of patterns) is easier to source for future work.

Finally, it is not clear to the Staff is the "storefront concrete sidewalk" and "pedestrian walkway concrete sidewalk" are the same material, which is what the Staff would recommend.

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: 1085 White Oak Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-074
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location: North blockface of White Oak Ave., east of Peeples St. and west of Lee St.

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the project which are not visible from the public street.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The existing structure was heavily altered by a previous owner without permits or a Certificate of Appropriateness. The original character defining features of the structure were lost through these alterations. This issue was further compounded by damage from a treefall in 2018. The Commission reviewed applications (CA2-17- 212 & CA3-18-269) to approve the unpermitted work. Both applications were denied without prejudice after multiple deferrals without response from the Applicant. The current application by a new applicant seeks to restore the property to its condition before the unpermitted work was done.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Interpretation of District regulations

The District regulations allow two options when reviewing alterations and additions to contributing structure. The work can either be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure while complying with the regulations governing new construction, or, the alterations can avoid the destruction of historic materials. As historic materials were removed by the previous owner without permits or approval by the Commission, Staff finds the second criteria is not applicable to this situation. As such, Staff will review the proposed alterations using the first criteria as it relates to the existing structure prior to the work done without permits or approval by the Commission.

Alterations

The new design seeks to recreate the structure as it appeared from the exterior in its entirety before the unpermitted work was done by previous owners. The plans call for the retention of what little original materials of the front portion of the structure are still extant. In general, Staff has very few concerns with this work and is supportive of the Applicant's proposal. Staff notes only a few minor changes that the plans would require to reclaim the original architectural character of this previously contributing building. First, the inside length of the front accent gable on the original structure had a distinctly Tudor style curve and had a more acute angle than the one shown in the Applicant's plan. As such, Staff recommends the front accent gable be redesigned to match the dimensions and style of the original. Second, the proposed chimney contains an S curve flair, matching the style of the original, but which is set much lower than the original. Staff recommends the chimney flair be set higher on the front façade matching the location of the original. Lastly Staff recommends any cementitious siding be smooth faced. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission, that the District regulations do not regulate window material so Staff cannot comment on the vinyl windows proposed by the Applicant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral conditioned upon the following:

1. the front accent gable be redesigned to match the dimensions and style of the original, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
2. the chimney flair be set higher on the front façade matching the location of the original, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
3. any cementitious siding be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1144 Lawton Place, SW

APPLICATION: CA3-19-079

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location Interior Lot, east of Lawton Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction/Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

COMPATIBILITY RULE

This review will be guided by the Compatibility rule of the District which states, the compatibility rule is a method of ensuring that alterations to existing structures and the design of proposed new construction are sensitive to and sympathetic toward existing elements of design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The elements in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face, or where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), shall be no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

The Applicant has provided the follow addresses for compatibility comparisons:

1102 Lawton Place—24ft roof height
1108 Lawton Place—23 ft roof height
1118 Lawton Place—23 ft roof height
1128 Lawton Place—22.5 roof height

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a new 2,500 square feet single-family house that will include four bedrooms and three bathrooms. The new construction will be built on a concrete foundation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Plan Issues:

The Applicant has not provided a site plan with complete setback information to determine if the proposed new construction will meet setback requirements. This information is need for underlining review. Staff recommends that Applicant submit 3 sets of to-scale plans that indicate the setback and FAR information.

Roof

The new construction is proposed with a Gable front roof, a Hip roof for the remainder of the house and a small side Gable roof on the right-side elevation with a pitch of 12/6. The height of new construction is proposed to be 28 feet and 4 inches from grade to roof peak. Roof form and height of the house is governed by the compatibility standard which states the height to no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest on the block face. Assessing the information, the height of the roof the Applicant proposes is higher than the highest on the block face (24ft). Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District and adjust the height of the house to fall into the guidelines of no smaller than the smallest and no larger than the largest. The roof form that the Applicant proposes meets the compatibility standard, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Roof material

The Applicant proposes to install new asphalt shingles on the roof forms. Asphalt shingles are permitted in the District. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

TRIM WORK

The Applicant proposes wood brackets on the front Gable and corner trim on the proposed construction. District Regulations requires compatibility comparisons for trim and trim on new construction. The Applicant has demonstrated that at least one house has brackets on front Gable. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

FRONT PORCH

The Applicant proposes to install 8-inches wood columns, wood/metal railings, and stacked stones on CMU piers. The District Regulation requires that new or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code. Regarding the stacked stones on the CMU piers, Staff recommends Applicant construct the piers with brick to be consistent with the block face. Additionally, Staff recommends the rails be wood, vertical in orientation, the rails be a top and bottom railing with a two-part construction with butt-jointed pickets. Further, Staff recommends the railing be appropriately scaled to the front façade.

Floor

The Applicant has not indicated how the porch flooring will be constructed. Staff recommends the porch flooring be wood, perpendicular to the front with 1' to 4-5" with a tongue and groove construction.

Steps and risers

The plans the Applicant provided demonstrate steps however does not demonstrate risers. District Regulations states that all porches shall have steps and risers to be consistent with contributing porches on the block. Staff recommends the Applicant construct risers to comply with the District Regulations.

Front Door

The Applicant proposes to install a door with a transom glass window. The District states that new or replacement doors shall be made of wood and shall contain a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style to original doors within that block face. The comparable houses the Applicant provides show a variety of doors most wood with rectangular light. The proposed door is a wood Craftsman style door with a rectangular light. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

WINDOWS

With no specific regulations governing window installation for new construction, the District Regulations states, all building materials, which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, are subject to the compatibility rule. For the windows on the front façade of the new construction, Staff compared the windows on houses the Applicant provided for the compatibility standard. There were varying windows styles from the houses provided. The prevalent is one-over one wood sash windows. Staff recommends that the Applicant install one-over one double hung sash windows on the front façade.

Air Vent Area

Three windows have been proposed to be installed for the air vent on the Gable roof in the front. The Applicant has indicated that no living space will be in the attic. Staff recommends an actual air vent be installed instead of the three windows on the Gable roof.

Fenestration

District Regulations for installation of windows are governed by the compatibility rule, which states that the ratio of openings to solid for all new construction (for example, windows to wall) shall be established by the compatibility rule. From the house comparisons the Applicant provided, the houses on the block face fenestration patterns demonstration windows carrying to the end of the house. However, the Applicant has demonstrated a void of windows at the front on the left-side elevation and a void on rear of the right-side elevations. Staff recommends the Applicant install an additional window on the front on the left side of the elevation and one additional window on the rear right side of the elevation to achieve balance.

SIDING

The Applicant proposes to install 6 feet of wood siding with a 4-inch reveal on the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

DECK

A proposed rear deck will be constructed on the rear of the proposed house that does not exceed the side of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The Applicant proposes stack stone as the material on the CMU piers throughout. Staff suggests the material be brick on the columns on the front.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall submit 3 sets of to-scale plans that indicate the setback and FAR information per, Sec. 16-20G.005;
2. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulations and adjust the height of the house to fall into the guidelines of no smaller than the smallest and no larger than the largest, per Sec.16-20G.005(2)
3. The Applicant shall construct the piers with brick to be consistent with the block face, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(e);
4. The porch flooring shall be wood, perpendicular to the front with 1' to 4-5" with a tongue and groove construction, per Sec. 16-20G.006
5. The Applicant shall construct risers to comply with the District Regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(b)
6. The Applicant shall install one-over one double hung sash windows on the front façade, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2);
7. An actual air vent shall be installed instead of the three windows on the Gable front, per Sec.16-20G.006(2);
8. The Applicant shall install an additional window on the front on the left side of the elevation and one additional window on the rear right side of the elevation to achieve balance, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(h);
9. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA3-19-079 for 1114 Lawton Place, SW

March 13, 2019

Page 5 of 5

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: 936 Lawton St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-083

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1935

Property Location: East block face of Lawton St., south of Donnelly Ave., north of Peoples St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional / Tudor

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-200.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing several alterations to the subject property. First, the Applicant is proposing to replace the existing windows and door on the front, sides, and rear of the property. As the District regulations do not prohibit the replacement of historic windows and doors or regulate the allowable replacement materials, Staff has no concerns with this portion of the project. Based on the elevations provided, Staff finds that the replacement windows and door will match the size and placement of the originals per the District regulations.

With regards to the siding, the Applicant is proposing the removal of the existing vinyl siding and lists cementitious siding as the replacement material. Staff has no concerns with the removal of the vinyl siding, but finds that this material is typically installed over original wood siding. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant remove a small portion of the vinyl siding on the rear façade to determine whether any original wood siding remains. If original wood siding is still extant beneath the vinyl siding, Staff recommends the original wood siding be retained and repaired in-kind. If the original wood siding is missing, Staff recommends the replacement material be wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding with a 4 to 6 inch reveal.

The plans call for the alteration of the front accent gable. The existing front gable exhibits a distinctive Tudor style curve on the inside eave line. Staff finds that this is a character defining feature of the otherwise simple structure and should be retained. As such, Staff recommends the front accent gable, including the Tudor style curve on the inside eave line, be retained.

The Applicant proposes replacing the existing metal awning over the front stoop with a shed porch roof supported by 8" squared columns. On the sides of the stoop, the Applicant proposes railing. Staff has no specific concerns with the proposal as it will be formalizing an existing condition which is not inconsistent with the style of the home. Staff does recommend that the stoop railing be comprised entirely wood and be constructed using a two-part butt-jointed method as opposed to deck railing.

Addition

The Applicant proposes an extension of an existing rear addition that will be capped with a hipped roof. Staff has no general concerns with the proposal and finds the design appropriate for inclusion on a historic structure. Staff does recommend the original corner boards be retained in the addition to allow for proper interpretation of the structure's history.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following;

1. The Applicant shall remove a small portion of the vinyl siding on the rear façade to determine whether any original wood siding remains, per Sec. 16-20.009;
2. If original wood siding is still extant beneath the vinyl siding, the original wood siding shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20.009;
3. If the original wood siding is missing, Staff recommends the replacement material be wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding with a 4 to 6 inch reveal, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
4. The front accent gable, including the Tudor style curve on the inside eave line, shall be retained
5. The stoop railing shall be comprised entirely wood and shall be constructed using a two-part butt-jointed method as opposed to deck railing, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);
6. The original corner boards shall be retained in the addition to allow for proper interpretation of the structure's history, per Sec. 16-20.009; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 851 Oakdale Rd.

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

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes. Deferred February 13, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Variance Requests

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

The Applicant has submitted revised responses based on the Staff Recommendations.

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

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

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

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

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

The Applicant has stated that a redesign of the project to satisfy the setback requirements would result in 16 additional mature trees being impacted. Additionally, Staff notes that the stream buffer hugs the southeast extent of the proposed gazebo and pool. This along with the stream buffer limit the footprint of the proposed site features.

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

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

The Applicant additionally cites the stream buffer and the presence of a large number of mature trees, estimated to be the most on a single lot in the District, as the peculiar conditions which are particular to the subject property.

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

The Applicant states that the positioning of the projects behind the principal structure and the site topography will shield the impact of the proposed site work on surrounding properties.

Staff would additionally note that the combination of easements and numerous trees would not make this a precedent setting decision that would automatically apply to all properties in the District.

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

Staff finds the criteria for granting a variance have been met by the Applicant's responses.

Site Work

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

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

The Applicant has provided updated plans showing a mixture of concrete and cut/cast stone pavers proposed for the hardscapes related to the pool and terrace. Staff has no concerns with these materials and finds them compatible with historic materials used on contributing properties in the District.

The Applicant has also provided elevations for all 4 sides of the proposed gazebo. Staff has no general concerns with the design of the structure or the materials proposed. Staff further finds that the design of the gazebo is consistent with the style of the principal structure, in keeping with the historic pattern of relationship between principal and accessory structures in the District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONCA3-19-030: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONCA3-19-029: Approval conditioned upon the following:

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

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: March 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1891.

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes. Deferred February 27, 2019. *Updated text in bold 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. 16-20I 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.

The Updated plans show the square footage of the proposed structure would be 48% of the lot area. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The updated plans address the labeling issue present in the proposed elevations. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The Applicant has provided updated information showing that the ridge height shown in the existing elevations is incorrect. The proposed elevations show the correct roof height and form. The updated plans show two shed roof additions inset from the side facades of the structure. Staff finds this general approach to be appropriate, but finds the proposed design contains issues which must be addressed in order to ensure the addition is compatible with the existing structure and meets the District regulations. First, it is unclear whether the eave line of the existing structure carries through to the rear façade of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the existing eave line of the structure carry through to the rear façade to give the impression the second floor addition is a dormer addition. Second, the rear roof for the proposed addition cantilevers over the rear inset of the addition. Staff finds that the roof form should follow the footprint of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the cantilevered rear roof be revised to follow the footprint of the addition.

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 updated plans do not note the retention of existing corner boards. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

The updated plans show the accent window being removed in favor of a proportional double hung window. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The updated plans show the fenestration pattern of the addition to be consistent with that of the existing structure. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

Staff retains this recommendation.

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.

Staff retains this recommendation.

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 retains this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: *Approval conditioned upon the following:*

1. The site plan shall be redrawn to conform to the noted scale;
2. ***The existing eave line of the structure shall carry through to the rear façade to give the impression the second floor addition is a dormer addition, per Sec. 16-20.009(6);***
3. ***The cantilevered rear roof shall be revised to follow the footprint of the addition, per Sec. 16-20.009(6);***
4. *The rear corner boards of the existing structure shall be retained in the proposed addition, per Sec. 16-20.009(6);*
5. *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);*
6. *All new windows shall be double hung one over one windows made of unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(3);*
7. *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);*
8. *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);*
9. ***Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.***

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File