



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: 396 Cherokee Ave.

APPLICATION: RC-19-073

MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1992

Property Location: East block face of Cherokee Ave., south of Bryan St, north of Glenwood Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

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. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the BZA.

RC-19-073 for 396 Cherokee Ave.

March 27, 2019

Page 2 of 2

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 Applicant is requesting a variance to allow a two story 24' by 24' garage with an ADU space on the second floor. Staff has previously reviewed the request and found the setbacks and height of the proposed structure to be consistent with the Grant Park Historic District regulations. The request would allow for hidden density to be added to the site with minimal impact to the lot coverage. In general, Staff supports the request and finds it to be consistent with the intent of the recent legislation permitting accessory dwelling units.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 69 Randolph Street NE
APPLICATIONS: CA3-19-012
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1999, per District Inventory.

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

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Any variances related to a new accessory structure and related site work

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Any new accessory structure that complies with all the District regulations

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA3-18-251, CA3-18-285, and CA3-18-517

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: DEFFERAL

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

Applications and Review Process(es)

After the original submission last year for the construction of a two-story, attached garage (which is not allowed by the District regulations), the project was revised into a two-story detached garage with upper level living space and rooftop access. If no variances are needed, the design of a District compliant new accessory structure (vs. an addition) is subject to review by the Commission Staff. What is subject to Commission review are any variances that are required to build a new accessory structure.

With the proposed new accessory structure design last year, several variances were needed and requested by the Applicant: a rear yard accessory structure to have a height of 24' where no more than 20' height is allowed; to have a lot coverage of 32% where no more than 25% is allowed; and have an equal floor plan percentage for total square footage of the principal structure where no more than 30% is allowed. After several discussions, both the accessory structure and variance applications were denied by the Commission. This means that neither application is related to, can be applied to or can be used in support the current application.

At this time, the Applicant has submitted revised design for a new two-story accessory structure with living space above a two-bay garage / workshop area. No variance requests, explanations or arguments were submitted with the current application for the accessory structure. As noted above, a new accessory structure that complies with the District regulations is not subject to review by the Commission, but rather the Commission Staff.

In response to the current application, the Staff has completed an analysis of the proposed project, with the anticipation that variance requests / applications will be required. As noted later in this Staff Report, these variance requests could be similar to what was denied by the Commission under the previous applications (CA3-18-251, CA3-18-285, and CA3-18-517) but would be required to build the current design, nonetheless.

If the Applicant elects to retain the current design, then the variances outlined in this Staff Report would need to be applied for by the Applicant and approved by the Commission. If the variances are approved by the Commission, then the accessory structure itself would be reviewed by the Commission Staff within the conditions (if any) of the Commission's approval of the variances. In the alternative, the Applicant can revise their design to eliminate the need for any variances outlined in this Staff Report, at which time the District-compliant accessory structure would be reviewed by the Commission Staff and the Commission review would not be necessary.

Potential Variances

The District regulations have several requirements related to the size of the proposed accessory structure in relation to the main house and the rear yard, its overall height, and its setbacks.

- The accessory structure cannot have more the 30% of the floor area of the main house. In the proposed design, it has at least 60% of the floor area of the main house. This deviation from the District regulation requires a variance request.
- The accessory structure cannot occupy more than 25% of the rear yard. In the proposed design, it occupies 28% of the rear yard. This deviation from the District regulation requires a variance request.
- The accessory structure cannot be more than 20 ft. tall. In the proposed design, it is 19 ft. 8 in. tall, in compliance with the District regulations.
- The accessory structure must be least 5 ft. from the side and rear property lines. In the proposed design, it is 5 ft. from the side and rear property liens, in compliance with the District regulations.

The District also have requirements related to the overall lot coverage for a property, which is based on the compatibility rule. In this case, however, the proposed accessory structure will be built on top of an existing parking pad, meaning that the proposed design will not increase the lot coverage on the property. In fact, with the installation of pervious pavers in the driveway area, the lot coverage could go down slightly.

Design and Materials

As noted above, the final design review of the accessory structure (once any variances are resolved), would take place with the Staff. However, given the connection between the variances and the design itself, the Staff offers a design assessment in this Staff Report. The Staff finds that the gable roof form, the use of the side dormers, siding (as yet unspecified), and brick meet the compatibility rule and meet the District regulations. The Staff does have concerns about the proposed design, as follows:

- The garage door (while allowed to face the street due to it being in an accessory structure vs. an addition) is a dominant feature of the design and is unspecified in the drawing.
- Similarly, as noted above, the siding material and finish is not specified in the drawings.
- The windows appear to have a generic trim package with no materials specified.
- There is a triple window included in the upper level on the west (interior façade), which the Staff finds that not meet the compatibility rule or District regulations (triple window groupings are highly unusual in the District.)

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

1. Submit an application for the following variances: an accessory structure with more than the 30% of the floor area of the main house (from 30% to 60%) and an accessory structure that occupies more than 25% of the rear yard (from 35% to 28%), per Section 16-20C.005(4)(b);
2. Revisions to or additional information about the proposed design, including all materials, garage door, window grouping and design, and window trim, per Section 16-20C.008(1); and
3. The variance documentation shall be submitted at least 20 days before a Commission meeting date so as to allow for the variances to be properly advertised and heard by the Commission;
4. The revised design plans and drawings (and the required number of copies) shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the scheduled meeting date (based on the variance advertising requirements).

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 Euclid Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-105

MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2012

Property Location: Northeast block face of Euclid Ave and Druid Circle.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CA3-19-105 for 836 Euclid Ave.

March 27, 2019

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing a new addition enclosing a portion of the front porch that wraps around the side of the house. This space was previously screened in with wire mesh. In general, Staff finds the design of the addition appropriate for use on an in-fill structure in a Historic District, and has no concerns with the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: 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: Various Addresses
APPLICATION: RC-19-153
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Zoned Variously

Other Zoning: Zoned Variously

Date of Construction: Dates of construction range between 1920 and 1972

Property Location: Various Locations

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes (11 properties)

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Various

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

In Rem Review Board Demolition Orders Programmatic Agreement (executed 9/10/98).

Review of Proposed In-Rem Demolition Actions for December 20, 2018 and January 17, 2019:

11 Historic / Contributing Properties – Per Stipulations II and IV

10 Non-Historic / Non-Contributing Property – Per Stipulations II and III

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

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

CONCLUSIONS: The subject properties were recommended for demolition by the City of Atlanta's In Rem Review Board at its December 20, 2018 and January 17, 2019 meetings. The properties are located across the City in various zoning categories, some in National Register of Historic Places-eligible neighborhoods and National Register-listed neighborhoods. Twenty of the properties are single-family houses. One property is a multi-family building.

Through the Administration In Rem proceeding set forth in Article III, Section 30 of the Atlanta Housing Code, the Atlanta Police Department-Code Enforcement Section can proceed with demolition or clean and close action against private property. When a property owner fails to bring his/her property into compliance with the Atlanta Housing Code or the Atlanta Commercial Institutional Building Maintenance Code, a review/inspection of such property is conducted by the Code Enforcement staff to determine if the property (structure) is eligible for demolition or clean and close abatement.

Generally, properties that are unsecured, fire damaged, collapsing, or severely dilapidated are eligible for In Rem proceedings. However, the Atlanta Housing Code states any property (structure) that cannot be repaired at cost less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundation and lot) it can be demolished. If the structure can be repaired at less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundations and lot) it can be cleaned and closed.

Once the inspection assessment (determination of demolition or clean and close) of such properties is completed, an In Rem hearing is scheduled and evidence is put forth before the In Rem Review Board. Evidence includes, but not limited to, the number of complaints filed with the APD-Code Enforcement Section, the types of violations noted, the progression of notification to property owner(s), photographs, and the inspection assessment.

When an Order of demolition or clean and close is issued by the In Rem Review Board, the APD-Code Enforcement Section has authorization to access that private property and abate the nuisance. Once the abatement is completed, a lien is filed against the property for the cost of the abatement.

While the Staff is always concerned about the loss of historic or potentially historic buildings in the City of Atlanta, the properties in the In Rem review process are either in very poor condition, the City is unable to find the legitimate property owner, or the property owner cannot or will not address the situation. Further, the properties have often been in the City of Atlanta's code compliance system for some time meaning that there are been additional opportunities at which the property was made aware of the problems and given an opportunity to address the situation.

Regardless, the Staff finds that given the volume of properties proposed for demolition, digital images of a representative sample of the properties in the best condition should be prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Section of the Atlanta Police Department and the Office of Design's historic preservation staff.

Based on the information provided to date by the Code Enforcement Staff, the Staff would suggest the following four (4) properties have digital images prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Staff:

625 Elinor Place, NW
135 Isa Drive, SE
1223 Oakland Drive, SW
1340 Westmont Road, SW

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission deliver comments at the meeting regarding Review and Comment (RC-19-153) for In-Rem demolition applications from December 20, 2018, and January 17, 2019 In Rem hearings.

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: 4050 Roswell Road—Blue Heron Nature Preserve
APPLICATION: RC-19-104
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North of Atlanta

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

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

Through grant money received from Park Pride, The Blue Heron Nature Preserve, a property of the City of Atlanta, proposes to construct two bridges—one 6 feet wide and 35 feet fiberglass and the other 6 feet wide and 50' feet long (Upstream and Downstream Bridges)—to connect three main properties that are linked through a variety of easements. The Applicant presents the scope of work as “Mill Creek runs through the property and drains into Nancy Creek. To connect the Emma Lane property to the main Preserve, property at 4055 Roswell Road and the Land O’Lakes Property at 3931 Land O’Lakes Drive, trail bridges are needed to cross Mill Creek.” The Applicant has purported that due to the Mill Creek area not having a FEMA report, the longevity of the bridges was paramount to the construction and will sit way above floodplain level. The abutments will consist of wood pilings. Plans are being made now to ensure that bridge and the abutment/stair connections into the flood model to ensure there are no adverse effects to the floodplain.

Staff has no concerns with the purposed work and applauded the Applicant for construction of the bridges to allow for a seamless and safe trail path. Staff does wonder two things, 1) are the trails and the bridges ADA accessible and 2) with the construction of the bridges how will this impact the trees or natural habitats that currently are there. Otherwise, Staff as mention, has no concern with this proposal.

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: 503 North Highland Avenue, NE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-088
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location West of Albion Avenue and East of Cleburne

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions and Added elements

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

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.

PLANS

From reading the proposed work and reading the narrative of the proposed extension, the Applicant has not provided FAR information. Staff recommends the Applicant submit three new site plans, that will also include the FAR requirements.

ADDITION

Using the same footprint of the main structure and not extending beyond of sides of the main structure, the Applicant proposes to expand on a two-story new addition for interior renovation of a family room and kitchen. Additionally, the Applicant proposes to demolish the existing rear yard two-story deck and construct a new deck beyond the new addition, extending the deck an additional 13 feet. Although the proposed addition will mimic the existing footprint, the addition will extend the footprint 11 foot along with the additional 13 with the deck, thus proposing an additional 24 feet. Since the added space tucks under the existing, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ADDED ELEMENTS

On the proposed new addition, the Applicant proposes to add in elements that will be reflective of what is existing on the main structure. Elements such as windows, siding and columns

Windows

East Elevation and North Elevation

On the east elevation (rear of the main structure, not visible from a public street) and north elevation, the Applicant proposes to install new windows in a closet from the interior renovation. The Applicant has indicated in a narrative that the proposed windows will match the existing windows on the main structure in finish and material. On the plans, the windows appear to match the existing windows in style. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Chimney

The Applicant proposes to install a new chimney. However, the Applicant does not provide information on the chimney and its construction. To abide by the District Regulations, Staff recommends the Applicant construct the chimney from original grade.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to install siding in-kind on the new addition to siding on the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Columns

On the front west elevation on the main structure are decorative columns. The Applicant has proposed to add decorative columns that copies the decorative columns on the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall construct the chimney from the original grade, per Sec. 16-20I.006 (1)(k);
2. Staff shall review final plans if appropriate the final photography documentation

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CA3-19-088 for 503 North Highland Avenue
March 27, 2019



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: 298 Grant Park Place
APPLICATION: CA2-19-298
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Hill Street and West of Grant Street

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

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

Siding

The Applicant proposes to replace damaged wood siding with horizontal wood siding. The Applicant has provided two pictures of houses, one blue and one yellow that look very similar except for one house has wood siding and the other has asbestos siding. After clarifying, which house will be under review, Staff was able to make an assessment. The house under review will be the blue house with the asbestos siding. Replacing the asbestos siding would not be problematic. The second house demonstrated a wood-lap siding that Applicant intends to mimic. District Regulation permits wood siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

Front Window

The front right façade window is smaller than the window on the left side. The Applicant proposes to change the right window to make it the same size and replace it in-kind to the left window, allowing for more symmetry. Staff is not concern with this proposal for this alteration does not take away the architectural style of the principal structure. However, Staff does recommend the longer and larger window be shortened so that the window seal meets the top rail of the railing. From the photo provided, it appears as that window had been changed from the original windows over time.

Door

The Applicant has proposed replacing the front door on the principal structure. However, the Applicant has not provided any photographic evidence indicating the feasibility of the front door. Staff recommends before replacing the door, the Applicant provide photos of the existing front door. If replacement is warrant, Staff recommends the Applicant select a door that will reinforce the architectural style of the period (1920's) in keeping with the style of the principal structure.

Porch Elements

The Applicant proposes to replace handrails and columns, purporting to match the originals. The photo the Applicant provided of the handrails and columns appear that they are original to the structure and in good condition. Staff recommends the Applicant repair in-kind the columns and railings.

Trim Elements

The Applicant purposes to install soffits, fascia and gutters on the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. The longer and larger window shall be shortened so that the window seal meets the top rail of the railing, per Sec. 16-20K.007;
2. The Applicant shall provide photos of the existing front door. If replacement is warrant, the Applicant shall select a door that will reinforce the architectural style of the period (1920's) in keeping with the style of the principal structure, per Sec.16-20K;
3. The Applicant repair in-kind the columns and railings, per Sec.16-20K and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CA2-19-107 for 298 Grant Park Place
March 27, 2019



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: 551 Oakland Avenue, SE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-101
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: West of Orleans and East of Milledge Avenue Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION: 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.

ADDITIONS

The Applicant proposes to convert a quad house back to a single-family house. The main structure experienced a fire and in converting the house back to a single-family house a roof addition, deck and pool with a deck are proposed.

Roof Addition

The Applicant proposes to add more volume to rear roof allowing for expansion in the interior. This expansion will not pier over the principal structure's roof line. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; the Commission does not have purview over this scope of work.

Deck

The proposed deck will be constructed directly behind the existing structure. It will not exceed the side yards or rear setback. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Pool and Deck

The Applicant proposes to build a pool and pool deck in the rear of yard. This proposed construction will be in the buildable area of the property and will not exceed beyond the side of the house, a required by the District Regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Garage

The proposed garage will be constructed directly on the property line due to the alley protruding into the rear yard 10 feet. The Applicant has requested a variance to permit the setback. The proposed garage will be in the buildable area of the property and will sit in the rear. It will not exceed beyond the front yard. Staff is not concern with the proposed garage.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

South Elevation

On the south elevation in the rear of the main structure, the Applicant proposes to remove two windows replacing them with new windows due to interior renovations and conversion. The Applicant proposes to replace these windows with windows that match the existing windows on the main structure. From the photos of the windows provided by the Applicant, the windows on the main structure are one over one wood, double hung. However, the two-proposed windows are smaller in size and grouped. While, the District regulations permits grouped windows, these windows are smaller in size and do not match any window that are currently on the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Additionally, the Applicant proposes to remove two existing windows on the lower level and replace with windows that mimic what is on main structure. Staff is not concerned with the fenestration pattern, essentially the Applicant has not deviated from the existing pattern. Staff is also not concerned with this proposal. The interior renovation dictated a single window configuration.

North Elevation

As on the south elevation, the Applicant proposes to remove two windows, this time the Applicant proposes to replace one window with new wood doors. Once again, Staff is not concerned with the fenestration pattern or overall proposal

Siding

The Applicant proposes to replace in-kind damaged siding with existing siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch Elements

Columns and Balusters

The Applicant proposes to remove columns and balusters damaged from fire and repair in-kind. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch Decking

The Applicant proposes to replace fire damaged decking and repair in-kind. Staff is not worried about this proposal.

Chimneys

The Applicant has proposed to remove the chimneys and replace them with ventless system. Photo provided, nor research has indicted if the stacks are visible from the public-right-away. Nevertheless, removing the chimneys would not preserve the district's historic pattern of the main structure where chimneys were a major characteristic of the build. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the chimneys.

Screened in porch

The Applicant proposes to screen east elevation section of the wrap around porch plus add a screened in door. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

- 1.) The Applicant shall retain the chimneys, per Sec.16-20K.007(D)(1) and
- 2.) 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: 551 Oakland Avenue, SE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-101
MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: West of Orleans and East of Milledge Avenue Street

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

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. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION: Approval

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

VARIANCE

The Applicant request a variance to allow the side yard setback of the accessory building to be outside the range of the compatible block face setbacks based on the block face to the rear of the property as there are no accessory buildings on the property block face.

Extra and Exceptional Conditions

The Applicant states due to the 20 feet wide alley at the rear of the property, the 10 feet wide alley at the front and the 10 feet that jarts into the rear of the property cause an unusual pattern thus would cause the accessory structure to be constructed further on the property reducing the amount of useable yard space. Additionally, the Applicant has stated that there are no accessory structures on the property block face for the Applicant to reference.

Unnecessary Hardship

The Applicant purports, the 10 feet that extends into alley would cause a hardship to the Applicant to build further into the property, leaving little space.

Peculiar Conditions

The adjacent alley, which is both 10 feet and 20 feet wide, 10 feet extends into the Applicant's yard is a peculiar condition, the Applicant states.

Additionally, there are no accessory structures on the block face.

Granted Relief/No substantial Damage

Applicant states, "Allowing the accessory structure to be completed with the side yard setback reduction will add to the stability of the neighborhood by taking a dilapidated and fire damaged structure, repairing the structure and adding a new garage structure to create a new home for a family."

Staff Analysis

Compatibility

Since the Applicant doesn't have any comparable on the block face to govern the build of the accessory structure, the Applicant has no other choice but to use another block face to attain the information he needs. No variance is needed for this compatibility standard.

Rear Yard setbacks

Rear year setbacks should be no more than 7 feet

Comparable:

546 Grant Street rear yard setback is 1 feet and 6 inches

560 Grant Street rear yard setback is 9 feet and 0 inches

The Applicant is requesting a 3 feet rear set back. This fall into the range of the comparable properties.

Side Yard setback

There are four criteria that side yards setback can be determined,

- 1.) conform to the setback of the previously existing contributing building of like use; 2) conform to the setback of the existing building; 3) conform to any existing pattern of unequal side yard setbacks previously established by a majority of the contributing buildings of like use on that side of the block; or 4) be of a width of not less than seven feet.

546 Grant has a side yard setback for the accessory structure at 8 feet to 8 inches.

560 Grant Street side yard setback back is from 6 feet to 6 inches.

The Applicant is requesting the proposed accessory structure side yard setback be 1 feet, deviating from the unequal side yards of the comparable properties. The Applicant has reasoned the departure from the side yard setback standard is due to the unusual way the alley protrudes 10 feet more into the Applicant's property line. This intrusion causes the proposed accessory structure to be built close to the property line or inward, leaving little room for yard use. This inability to use the yard would create a hardship on the Applicant. Staff agree with the Applicant. The comparable houses the Applicant cites do not have this unusual configuration of an alley. So their accessory structures are not as close to the property and still allow for a great deal of the back yard to be utilize.

Staff finds the Variance request has been meet.

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: 1155 Lawton St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-106

MEETING DATE: March 27, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1923 - 1924

Property Location: North block face of Lawton St., east of Holderness St., west of Dargan Pl.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Multi-family / Quadruplex

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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.

Application of Use Regulations and Design Regulations

The proposed project is to renovate an existing non-conforming quadruplex in the single-family R-4A zoning category. Due to the age of the structure, it is likely that the property is legally non-conforming. However, Staff can find no evidence of a Zoning Verification Letter or a Letter of Legal Non-Conformity being issued by the Office of Zoning and Development for this property. Without these documents the project could not move forward in the proposed multi-family configuration. While this documentation does not effect the Commission's review of the project, the lack of these letters would prevent Staff from signing off on any final plans and would likewise prevent the Office of Zoning and Development from completing their review of the project. As such, Staff strongly encourages the Applicant to contact the Office of Zoning and Development to discuss what is needed to verify whether the existing structure is legally non-conforming before producing any final plans for approval by Staff.

Alterations

In comparing the existing and proposed elevations with both the District photographic inventory and the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the elevations do not accurately reflect the as built conditions of the property. An example of this includes, but is not limited to, the absence of the original brick column on the left side of the front façade and inaccurate window sizes and locations. As such, Staff recommends the existing elevations be re-drawn to accurately reflect the existing conditions.

From the floorplans provided, Staff notes that alterations to the front porch second-story access stairs are proposed. However, Staff cannot determine what specific changes are proposed in the current project scope. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their plans for the changes to the front porch access stairs including the materials and design of the component project elements. Staff also notes that the plans appear to show the removal of the existing porch railing on the second floor of the front façade. Based on photographic evidence, Staff finds that this material is original to the structure and should be retained. As such, Staff recommends the second-floor porch railing be retained and repaired in kind. Staff further recommends any additional height needed for code compliance with regards to the second-floor porch railing be achieved through a simple plane extension.

The Applicant is proposing to replace the existing vertical bead board sheathing on the front and rear additions with horizontal lap siding. The Applicant proposes a cementitious lap siding or a masonite shingle. As these areas are non-historic additions to the structure, Staff does not have concerns with the loss of historic materials. Staff would note, however, that smooth faced cementitious siding is one of the permitted replacement materials for additions to historic structures. As such, Staff recommends the lap siding be a smooth faced cementitious product with a 4" to 6" reveal.

It is unclear from the plans what the Applicant's intention for the existing windows will be. For example, the plans do not specify if any windows and doors are to be replaced, and what materials they are to be replaced with. Staff would note that while the photographs provided by the Applicant show the existing windows and doors are boarded up, no photographic documentation showing the condition of the windows and doors or whether the existing windows and doors are original to the structure has been received. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their plans with regards to window and door repair and replacement. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide detailed photographic documentation which has been keyed to a floor plan for any window and door proposed for replacement for Staff to review. If any of the windows and doors shown in the photographic documentation are found by Staff to be original, Staff recommends those windows and doors be retained and repaired in-kind. Staff further recommends that only those windows and doors which are determined by Staff to be non-original/non-historic or beyond repair be replaced with unclad wood windows and wood doors containing a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule.

The Applicant is proposing adding a shed roof over the front stairs. Staff finds this alteration to be inconsistent with the original architecture and not in keeping with the original front porch stairs on the block face. As such, Staff recommends the shed roof over the front porch steps be removed from the plans.

With regards to the rear porch addition, Staff has no general concerns with the design of this project element.

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

1. The existing elevations shall be re-drawn to accurately reflect the existing conditions;
2. The second-floor porch railing shall be retained and repaired in kind, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(a);
3. Any additional height needed for code compliance with regards to the second-floor porch railing shall be achieved through a simple plane extension;
4. The lap siding shall be a smooth faced cementitious product with a 4" to 6" reveal, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d);
5. The Applicant shall clarify their plans with regards to window and door repair and replacement, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3);
6. The Applicant shall provide detailed photographic documentation which has been keyed to a floor plan for any window and door proposed for replacement for Staff to review, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3);
7. If any of the windows and doors shown in the photographic documentation are found by Staff to be original, those windows and doors shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
8. Only those windows and doors which are determined by Staff to be non-original/non-historic or beyond repair shall be replaced with unclad wood windows and wood doors containing a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
9. The shed roof over the front porch steps shall be removed from the plans, per sec 16-20G.006(9);
10. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File