



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: 82 Hogue St.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-19-193
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1900

Property Location: West block face of Hogue St., south of Irwin St., north of Old Wheat St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Craftsman Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The project received a Stop Work Order in February 2016 for repeated work without permits. Later that year, the Commission approved CA2-16-550 for alterations. In August 2017 the project received another Stop Work Order for failing to clean the site after construction stopped. In October of 2018 a Stop Work Order was posted after all permits were revoked by the Office of Buildings.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

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

Type IV and In-Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a public threat to health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the application. In this particular case, the property has gone through the In Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta. Below is a description of the In Rem process as described by the Office of Code Compliance:

“The In Rem process, as defined is the process “against the property” versus against the individual owner. The cases that are handled by my office are cases where the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) has been unsuccessful in either identifying the owner, the owner is out of state or out of this jurisdiction, the owner is indigent or the owner is deceased and heirs either cannot be identified or fail to bring the property into compliance. The cases are due to code violations of Section 19 of the Atlanta Housing Code. Most remain open and vacant. The properties are problematic as they tend to be a refuge for criminals and or a danger to the public at large. The properties effect the quality of life for the neighbors as well as a safety hazard.

The In Rem board meets once a month to assist in the decision making of the City as to the action that should be taken to bring the properties into compliance either by demolition or cleaning and boarding the house. The resultant is a lien on the property for the expense incurred by the City to correct the non-compliance. The Board consists of individuals who are not City employees, who have been appointed by the Mayor and approved by City Council.”

The Applicant is not the owner and the In Rem process does not allow for repair, renovations or sale of the property. Staff finds the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values are useful for informational purposes but do not always apply in City of Atlanta In Rem cases. Staff finds the most relevant questions in this case are the following:

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists; and
2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives

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

The Applicant has not provided a response, but Staff has located a complaint from February 2016 which cites an abandoned construction site which was not cleaned after work ceased.

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion.

Pictures

In looking at survey pictures taken at the time of the District’s designation and the 2011 update, this structure appears to be occupied and in good condition. The photographs provided by the Applicant confirm that work began at the site but was never completed.

In looking at the inspection form, there are several items both interior and exterior that need to be renovated, repaired or replaced. The form indicates the total cost for repairs as \$47,521. Staff finds the cost of demolishing the existing structure and building an identical new house would far exceed the listed costs of repairing the existing structure. From the photographs provided, it is clear that the house would need significant work to bring it to a livable state. However, Staff finds that the roof structure and the foundation appear intact or without obvious structural issues.

Documentation

In the package submitted by the Applicant, there are several documents regarding the demolition request. There were 5 notices sent to the owner of record at various addresses on September 10, 2018 regarding the public hearing on October 25, 2018. On October 25, 2018, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. In looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, the owner was in attendance to speak at the meeting. The Applicant was notified of the In-Rem Board's decision via a letter sent to the 5 addresses on record on October 25, 2019. It has been eight months since the decision of the board was sent.

Conclusions

Staff finds the existing building has not suffered a fire and is largely intact. Staff finds the cost to demolish the existing house and build a new house would far exceed the estimated repair and renovation costs. Staff acknowledges the City cannot repair, renovate or sell the property. While Staff finds that an open and vacant building is a threat to public health and safety, Staff finds that properly boarding and securing the building should be the first step to rectifying the threat before demolition can be considered.

While the property has been vacant for over a year, Staff would note that several buildings around the City have been vacant for several years due to the down turn in the economy. Staff finds the low value of the property is likely to change in the next few years as the market continues to improve, particularly given the subject properties location. Further, Staff has been contacted by the new owner of the property who has expressed interest in renovating the structure. Staff finds demolishing a building that could potentially be renovated is a detriment to the historic district. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff cannot support the proposed demolition. Staff recommends the existing property is properly cleaned, closed and secured.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1119 Selwin Avenue, NW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-185
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location: West of Arlington Avenue and East of Wilmington Avenue

Contributing (Y/N)? **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Side Gable-Duplex Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: From neighbor's concerns and photos, the Applicant has already changed the house.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferred Until May 22 to allow the Applicant to address the photo issues.

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

PLANS

The Applicant has provided setback information on the proposed site plans, however has not provided FAR information. The scope of the proposed work would not alter the FAR. However, processing for the underlying zoning, FAR information along with setback information are required. Staff recommends the Applicant put FAR information on the site plan.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant done several alterations to the principal structure that includes, a gable roof removed, enclose section of the porch, replace siding, add railing and columns to porch, window alterations, deck addition and add a fence.

GABLE ROOF REMOVAL

The Applicant removed the gable roof over the front left side elevation to allow for an extended porch. By doing so, the Applicant added a shed roof across the front of the principal structure. District Regulations states that front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Staff has concerns with this proposal. Removing the side gable transformed this type of house from the Side Gable Cottage. This is problematic therefore Staff recommends the gable roof be added back to the principal structure..

PORCH ENCLOSURE

The section of the porch on the right-side elevation is proposed to be enclosed so that the Applicant can create an additional interior bedroom. Staff does not deem enclosing the porch area an issue if that enclosure does not push the front beyond the front setback. Staff recommends the Applicant demonstrate the enclosure will not proceed past the front yard setback.

WINDOWS

Windows photos provided by the Applicant show many of the window were boarded-up. The Applicant has stated that there were no windows behind the boards just the shape of where a window should be. The Applicant has installed double-hung vinyl windows in the areas that had no windows and proposes to install the same type of windows on the entire principal structure but not changing the shape and size. Since the Applicant is not proposing to change the shape and size of the original openings of principal structure, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Window on Front

The Applicant proposes to install a new window on the front replacing the door due to the porch enclosure. Staff recommends that the windows be the same size and shape of the original windows on the principle structure.

SIDING

The Applicant proposes to remove the asbestos that is currently showing on the principal structure and replace it with cementitious siding. Cementitious siding is a permitted siding material. However, photos provided by inspectors show the Applicant has applied barn yard siding, which is not a permissible siding. Staff recommends the Applicant changed the current siding to smooth-face cementitious lap siding per the District Regulations.

ADDED PORCH ELEMENTS

Steps

The Applicant proposes to add new steps on the front side left elevation of the front porch. Step originality is based on comparable houses on the blockface. Several homes on the blockface show front facing steps. Staff isn't concerned about this proposal. District Regulations also requires porches to have steps and risers. Staff recommends the have risers.

Railings and Columns

In addition to proposed new steps, the Applicant proposes new porch railings and columns. Porch railings and columns are determined by the compatibility standard. Research demonstrates that several of the existing porches on the blockface have wood railings and columns. Staff recommends the railing be top and bottom railing with a two-part construction with butt-jointed pickets.

DOOR

The existing door shown on photos appears to be covered. However, the proposed door on the plans, show a Craftsman's style door with three lites. Staff recommends the door be wood.

DECK ADDITION

The Applicant proposes a construct a deck on the rear of the principal structure. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

FENCE

A 6ft fence is proposed for the sides and rear of the yard. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

FOUNDATION

Photos provided by inspectors, show the Applicant has installed a stack-stone foundation. District Regulations requires foundation to follow the compatibility standard. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photos of contributing house on the blockface that can support the stack-stone foundation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall put the FAR information on the site plan, per Sec.16-20M.012;
2. The gable reinstalled, keeping the architectural integrity or the principal structure, per Sec.16-20M..001:
3. The Applicant shall provide photographic information showing the proposed enclosed porch will not extend pass the front yard setback, per Sec. 16-20M.012;
4. The windows shall be the same size and shape of the original windows on the principle structure, per Sec.16-.20M.013(2)(O)(2)(a);
5. The steps shall have risers, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(O)(2)(i);
6. The railing shall be top and bottom railing with a two-part construction with butt-jointed pickets, per Sec 16. 20M 013;
7. The door shall be wood, per Sec. 20M.013(2)(r)(9)
8. The Applicant shall provide photos of contributing houses on the blockface that can support the stack stone foundation, per Sec.16-20M 013(2)(r)(10) and
9. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1115 Selwin Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-182
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location: West block face of Lawton St., south of Arlington Ave., north of Wilmington Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Folk Victorian/Gabled Ell Cottage.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior alterations and site work.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues: On March 25, 2019 a Stop Work Order was placed on this property by the Office of Buildings for interior and exterior alterations without permits or a review by the Commission.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

The District regulations allow two methods for reviewing work on contributing structures. The work can either be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure while complying with the applicable architectural requirements of the District regulations, or, the work can be done so as to not destroy historic materials. As Staff finds the completed work removed historic materials without the correct review process, Staff will use the first criterion to review the proposed work. Staff finds the windows and doors shown in the photographs match those which existed on the home previously. As such, Staff will not comment on those portions of the structure.

Alterations

From the photographs provided, Staff notes several alterations on the exterior of the property: replacement of the siding, replacement of the front porch columns, removal of the front porch railing, and application of faux stacked stone on the porch foundation.

With regards to siding replacement in the District, the Zoning Ordinance states that subject to the compatibility rule, wood or smooth finish cementitious lap siding, wood shingles, brick, stone, and true stucco are permissible materials for façades of principal structures. As such, Staff finds that both the board and batten siding and the cedar shingle siding installed on the property do not meet the District regulations. Staff recommends both the board and batten siding and the gable shingle siding be removed and replaced with wood horizontal lap siding or smooth-faced cementitious horizontal lap siding with a reveal of 4-6 inches.

With regards to the front porch, Staff finds the porch columns and railing appear to have been altered. It appears that the top two-thirds of the columns have been stripped and stained. The railing on the structure has been removed. Decorative blocks have been placed at the top and bottom of the stripped columns. The Staff has no concerns with the stripping of the columns but does recommend the decorative blocks at the top and base of the stripped columns be removed.

A faux stacked stone material has been applied to the front façade visible foundation and wraps around the portion of the left side façade associated with the front porch. Front porch materials are based on the compatibility rule in the District. In looking at the block face in question, Staff finds that the historic homes on the block face contain brick foundations and foundations comprised of concrete block with a parge coat of stucco. In looking at the photographic inventory of the property, Staff finds the previously existing foundation material on the subject property was a cmu block with a parge coat of stucco. Staff finds the most likely method used to apply the non-conforming faux stone was to adhere it to the stucco parge coat with mortar. As such, Staff finds it would be possible for the faux stone to be removed without damage to the existing foundation. As such, Staff recommends the faux stacked stone be removed from the cmu foundation and a new stucco parge coat be applied to the foundation.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a new deck in the rear yard and a new 6 wood privacy fence in the side and rear yards. Staff finds both the deck and the proposed fence meet the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. The board and batten siding and the gable shingle siding shall be removed and replaced with wood horizontal lap siding or smooth-faced cementitious horizontal lap siding with a reveal of 4-6 inches, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. The decorative blocks at the top and base of the stripped columns shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);

CA2-19-182 for 1115 Selwin Ave.

May 8, 2019

Page 3 of 3

3. The faux stacked stone shall be removed from the cmu foundation and a new stucco parge coat shall be applied to the foundation, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(10); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant

File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 608 Woodward Avenue, SE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-170
MEETING DATE: May 22, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: East of Boulevard, SE and West of Berean Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior

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 Upon Conditions

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

PLANS

The Applicant has placed on the site plan the setback information but has not provided the FAR information that will be required for R-5 underlying review. Staff recommends the Applicant add the FAR information on the site plan.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a 2,039 square feet new duplex on a foundation with each unit compassing 1019 square feet respectfully. The duplex will not exceed the side or rear setback established by District Regulations. Nor will the proposed construction exceed the height requirement of 35 feet set by the District. Regarding the front yard setback, the District Regulations specifies that the principal structure shall be no closer to the street than the closest and no farther from the street than the farthest contributing structure of like use on that side of the block. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the front setback is meeting the District requirement.

Roof

The proposed roof will be a hip roof with a down sloping roof that extends to the rear of the principal structure. There are two front gable roofs over the front porch. Staff could not discern exactly the roof pitch of the principal structure. District Regulations requires that the pitch of the houses be a minimum of 6 in 12. Staff recommends the pitch of the roof be 6 in 12 to abide by the District Regulations.

Material

The proposed material will be asphalt shingle. Staff has no problem with this proposal.

Dormers

The Applicant proposes two front facing dormers on the principal structures for second-story living. Although not many of the existing principal structures on the block have dormers, Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The District Regulations does not specifically speak to dormers and the second story will be used for living space.

Siding

Horizontal lap siding on the principal structured is proposed by the Applicant. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Front porch

The Applicant proposes to construct a full width porch with columns that has brick foundation and wood upper posts. Applicant has not indicted what type of porch floor or ceiling is proposed. Ornamental wood vertical pickets are proposed for the railing type. Staff can not discern if the stairs have closed risers and closed ends as the District Regulations requires. Staff is not concern with the other porch elements but does recommends the Applicant install close raisers and close ends.

Windows

On the front façade, the Applicant proposes two single lite divided windows. One on the right side and one on the left. On the side elevations the Applicant proposes on the second-level one single lite divided window with two smaller lite divide windows. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Fenestration

District Regulations states that any façades that face a public street shall consist of fenestration that is either: 1) substantially consistent with fenestration on contributing structures of like use in the district, or 2) shall be no less than 15 percent and no greater than 40 percent of the total surface wall area. The fenestration patterns shown on the side elevations illustrates a pattern that is far less than 15 percent of the wall area. Staff recommends the Applicant adding windows in the kitchen and living areas on the respective units, that should help alleviate the fenestration concern.

Deck

The Applicant propose a rear deck. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Walkway

The District requires walkways from the paved sidewalk from the sidewalk be installed. The Applicant has not shown a walkway to be constructed. Staff recommends, a paved walkway from the sidewalk from the sidewalk be installed. Paving material shall not be black asphalt.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall add the FAR information on the site plan, per Sec. 16-20K.007;
2. The Applicant shall provide information showing the front setback is meeting the District requirement, per Sec.16-20K.007(1)(a);
3. The pitch of the roof be 6 in 12 to abide by the District Regulations, per Sec.16-20K.007(2)(b)(6);
4. The Applicant shall install close raisers and close ends, per Sec.16-20K..007(2)(b)(7);
5. The Applicant shall add windows in the kitchen and living areas on the respective units, that should help alleviate the fenestration concern, pec Sec.16-20K.007(2)(b) (11);
6. A paved walkway shall be installed from the sidewalk. Paving material shall not be black asphalt, Sec.16-20K.007(2)(b)(2) (15) 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: 730 Lillian Ave.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-19-179
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Early 1900's

Property Location: South block face of Lillian Ave., east of Allene Ave., west of Tift Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Queen Anne.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:.

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.

Type IV and In-Rem Process

Generally, if an Applicant is applying for a demolition based on a public threat to health and safety, the Applicant is required to provide information and documentation for all the questions in the application. In this particular case, the property has gone through the In Rem process and the Applicant is the City of Atlanta. Below is a description of the In Rem process as described by the Office of Code Compliance:

“The In Rem process, as defined is the process “against the property” versus against the individual owner. The cases that are handled by my office are cases where the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) has been unsuccessful in either identifying the owner, the owner is out of state or out of this jurisdiction, the owner is indigent or the owner is deceased and heirs either cannot be identified or fail to bring the property into compliance. The cases are due to code violations of Section 19 of the Atlanta Housing Code. Most remain open and vacant. The properties are problematic as they tend to be a refuge for criminals and or a danger to the public at large. The properties effect the quality of life for the neighbors as well as a safety hazard.

The In Rem board meets once a month to assist in the decision making of the City as to the action that should be taken to bring the properties into compliance either by demolition or cleaning and boarding the house. The resultant is a lien on the property for the expense incurred by the City to correct the non-compliance. The Board consists of individuals who are not City employees, who have been appointed by the Mayor and approved by City Council.”

The Applicant is not the owner and the In Rem process does not allow for repair, renovations or sale of the property. Staff finds the questions regarding cost, taxes, alternative uses, and property values are useful for informational purposes but do not always apply in City of Atlanta In Rem cases. Staff finds the most relevant questions in this case are the following:

1. Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists; and
2. Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives

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

The Applicant cites a complaint received in May 2015 for an open and vacant structure and property maintenance.

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

The following is the Applicant’s answer to this question:

“There are no alternatives feasible to rectify the threat to public safety and welfare. No evidence of an established estate according to extended research by Staff; no response to any certified letters sent to the owners nor did the owner or representative attend the Public In Rem hearing July 19, 2018.”

Pictures

In looking at survey pictures taken at the time of the District’s designation, this hipped roof house appears to be occupied and in good condition. The photographic update from 2010 shows the structure vacant and

damaged by fire. In looking at pictures submitted by the Applicant, the condition appears to be a continuation of the issues present in the 2010 inventory update.

In looking at the inspection form, there are several items both interior and exterior that need to be renovated, repaired or replaced. The form indicates the total cost for repairs as \$65,777.96. Staff finds the cost of demolishing the existing structure and building an identical new house would far exceed the listed costs of repairing the existing structure. From the photographs provided, it is clear that the house would need significant work to bring it to a livable state. However, Staff finds that the roof structure and the foundation appear intact or without obvious structural issues. The photographs do show some of the exterior walls missing on the rear, but the overall form of the structure remains intact.

Documentation

In the package submitted by the Applicant, there are several documents regarding the demolition request. There was a notice sent on June 14, 2018 regarding the public hearing on July 19, 2018. On July 19, 2018, the In-Rem board approved the demolition of the property. In looking at the sign-in sheets for the meeting, the owner was not in attendance to speak at the meeting. While no letter was included in the Application, the standard process for these cases is for the Office of Code Compliance to notify the owner or their heirs of the decision of the In Rem Board. It has been ten months since the decision of the board was sent.

Conclusions

Staff finds the existing building has not suffered a fire and is largely intact. Staff finds the cost to demolish the existing house and build a new house would far exceed the estimated repair and renovation costs. Staff acknowledges the City cannot repair, renovate or sell the property. While Staff finds that an open and vacant building is a threat to public health and safety, Staff finds that properly boarding and securing the building should be the first step to rectifying the threat before demolition can be considered.

While the property has been vacant for over a year, Staff would note that several buildings around the City have been vacant for several years due to the down turn in the economy. Staff finds the low value of the property is likely to change in the next few years as the market continues to improve, particularly given the subject properties proximity to the recently completed Westside Trail section of the Beltline. Staff finds demolishing a building that is in good condition and could potentially be renovated is a detriment to the historic district. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff cannot support the proposed demolition. Staff recommends the existing property is properly cleaned, closed and secured.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

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: 1105 St. Charles Pl.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-181
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920.

Property Location: South block face of St. Charles Pl., east of North Highland Ave., west of Briarcliff Rd..

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: English Vernacular Revival.

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. 16-20 & Sec. 16-200

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

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. 16-200 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The District regulations state that alterations to contributing structures should either be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and comply with the Architectural Standards of the District regulations, or the work shall not destroy historic materials and be compatible with the massing, size, scale, materials, and architectural features of the property and environment.

The Applicant is proposing a new walkway and site steps leading from the front porch to the sidewalk. In looking at the site, Staff finds that a walkway and site steps may have existed in this location previously. The proposed walkway and steps would be comprised of brick steps and knee walls with stone landings. Staff finds the proposed site steps are consistent with the materials and architectural features of the property and environment and has no concerns with the proposed work.

The Applicant is also proposing a concrete parking area with cobblestone border. Staff has no concerns with this proposed work.

With regards to the lot coverage, Staff would note that the District regulations govern this development control and state the maximum lot coverage should be 50% of the total lot area. The existing lot coverage on the property exceeds this by 16% for a total lot coverage of 66%. The proposed work would reduce the total lot coverage by 2% to 64%. Staff finds that this reduction in lot coverage brings the property closer to compliance with the 50% lot coverage requirement and has no concerns with this aspect of the development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

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

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Martin Luther King Jr. Corridor—Art projects
APPLICATION: RC-19-190
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: N/A

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-190 for Martin Luther King Corridor—Art projects
May 8, 2019

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

City of Atlanta Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs proposes to install 8 public art projects along the Martin Luther King's Jr. Corridor between I-285 and Northside Drive. 325 feet from Northside Drive in the median, a 12 feet statue, a monument to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr with a granite base will be installed. On benches four bronze statues of seated Civil Rights leaders will be constructed in Mozley Park: Dorothy Lee Bolden, Hosea L. Williams, Dr. Rita Samuels and William A. Scott. Under I-20 a perforated metal fencing will be installed.

This project will incorporate lighting and include a mural installation and a linear park water feature. Additionally, the proposed project will allow for pedestrian and bicycles to intermingle on a friendly and lighted corridor with access to the Atlanta Beltline and Marta bus service.

Staff finds the corridor projects to be exceptional, paying homage to less-known past Civil Rights leaders in the Atlanta who too deserves recognition for work that helped paved the way for future Civil Rights leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr.

Staff fully supports this project.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 3295 Northside Parkway—Northside Library Renovation

APPLICATION: RC-19-188

MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: N/A

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

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: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-188 for Northside Library
May 8, 2019

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

For a library renovation, The City of Atlanta purposes to stripe an existing asphalt parking lot, construct a new sidewalk and provide a pavement for a trash storage area. Additionally, the repair and replacement of an existing wood retaining wall is proposed. And storm pipes will be replaced.

Staff has no concerns for the proposed site alterations that will continue improvement to the site.

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: 782 Lowndes St.
APPLICATION: RC-19-192
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Atkins Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: South block face of St. Charles Pl., east of North Highland Ave., west of Briarcliff Rd..

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

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vcant

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. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

RC-19-192 for 782 Lowndes St.
May 8, 2019
Page 2 of 2

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.

The Applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the 7' required side yard setbacks to 3.5'. The lot in question does not meet either the frontage or square footage requirements of the underlying R-4A zoning. In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposed variance. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that the design of the proposed structure will still be required to meet the Historic District regulations and will require a review by the Commission prior to permitting. Staff finds that the approval of this variance will not inhibit the Commission's ability to enforce the Historic District regulations on the proposed structure.

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: 285 Sheridan Dr.
APPLICATION: RC-19-199
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** R-4.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Southeast corner of Sheridan Dr. and Delmont Dr.

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

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Institutional/Educational

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues: .

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

RC-19-199 for 285 Sheridan Dr.
May 8, 2019
Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing a modest addition to an interior section of the school buildings to accommodate an elevator. In looking at the floorplans, Staff has no concerns with the placement and finds the proposed design would allow for minimal impact to the public viewshed. As such, Staff supports the proposed alteration.

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: 979 Crescent Ave. (Windsor House Apartments LBS)
APPLICATION: RC-19-178
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Landmark Building/Site **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1899

Property Location: The southeast corner of Crescent Ave. NE and 10th St. NE.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Transfer of Development Rights

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: N.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Several applications have been applied for TDR at this address. Staff will discuss these applications and their effect on the current application in the findings below.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the Applicant and the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission at this time for Review and Comment is the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) which would sever 185,000 square feet of unused residential development rights from the sending property at 979 Crescent Ave. (Windsor House Apartments/Crescent Apartments), Parcel A, to the receiving property at 1138 Peachtree St.

Several Applications for TDR's have been reviewed in the past, including RC-16-431 on U-16-026 which would have severed 180,000 square feet of residential development rights from the sending property at 979 Crescent Ave., Parcel A, to the receiving property at 1138 Peachtree St. This TDR was approved but the transaction was never completed and expired by operation of law with no development rights transferred. The current application would essentially renew the previous approval of the residential development right transfer with the addition of 5,000 additional square feet of residential development rights transferred from the sending property to the receiving property at 1138 Peachtree St.

The Applicant has submitted detailed calculations that indicate the sending property holds 231,600.9 square feet of residential development rights. The proposed transfer would leave the sending property with 52,600.9 square feet of residential development rights remaining for future transfers.

Staff would add that the proposed TDR will not result in any physical alteration to the existing building located on the sending property and will decrease the development pressure on the site. Staff finds that the proposed TDR would provide additional benefit to the sending property in that the residential development rights which would otherwise be unused given the limitations regarding development on the sending property would be sold to the receiving property providing income to the sending property and additional density to the receiving property. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed TDR.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the Applicant and the Zoning Review Board.

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: 2372 Armand Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-19-222
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** R-4.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: West block face of Armand Rd., south of Lindbergh Dr., north of Cardova St.

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

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition of City Owned Property

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the July 11, 2018 the Commission approved with Conditions the Application CA3-18-219 for a new single family residence.

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

RC-19-222 for 2372 Armand Rd.
May 8, 2019
Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is applying for demolition of this single-family residence due to its location in the 100-year floodplain. Due to repeated flooding, the property has become uninhabitable and will continue to experience material loss as a result of its proximity to Peachtree Creek. Staff finds the demolition of the structure to be necessary, but suggests the Applicant conduct architectural photography to document the existing structure in detail. Staff further suggests the photographs be printed on archival quality photo paper and transmitted to the Office of Design to be kept in the casefile for this application.

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: AKA 231 Eugenia—400 Formwalt—Mechanicsville Library
APPLICATION: RC-19-187
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: N/A

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

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: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-187 for Mechanicsville Library
May 8, 2019

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

For a library renovation, The City of Atlanta purposes to stripe an existing asphalt parking lot, construct a new ADA curb ramp. In doing this work, the Contractor will sawcut and remove existing concrete. Flared curb ramp with tactile warning truncated domes will be applied. As well, the Contractor will add painted directional arrows.

Staff has no concerns for the proposed site alterations that will continue improvement to the site.

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: 3295 Northside Parkway—Northside Library Renovation
APPLICATION: RC-19-188
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: N/A

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

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: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-188 for Northside Library
May 8, 2019

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

For a library renovation, The City of Atlanta purposes to stripe an existing asphalt parking lot, construct a new sidewalk and provide a pavement for a trash storage area. Additionally, the repair and replacement of an existing wood retaining wall is proposed. And storm pipes will be replaced.

Staff has no concerns for the proposed site alterations that will continue improvement to the site.

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: 1056 Allene Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-19-204
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline
Date of Construction: 1928 but remodeled in 1978
Property Location: Corner of Catherine and Allene
Contributing (Y/N)? No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Build (Craftsman)
Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Fence and Shed
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

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

FENCE CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a horizontal wood picket fence around the perimeter of the property. In the front of the yard the Applicant has proposed a 4 feet fence. In the rear and on the sides of the principal structure between neighboring properties the Applicant proposes a 6-foot fence. District Regulations states that fences are permitted in the rear and front of the principal structure if the fence does not obscure the front façade. From the photo the Applicant provided, the front facing fence will not obscure the front. The openings provided by the slats allow enough light so that is not possible. Regarding the fence orientation, District Regulations does not specify whether fences must be vertical or horizontal. Taken this all-in account, Staff is not concerned with the Applicant's proposal.

SHED

The Applicant proposes a shed to be construct at the rear of the principal structure that be in the buildable area of lot and will not project beyond the front. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1129 Alta Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-136 & CA3-19-195
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: South block face of Alta Ave., east of Harralson Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Portions of the project not visible from the public right of way.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred April 10, 2019. *Updated text in Italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: *Approval with conditions.*

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

CA3-19-195

Variance

The requested variance is to allow a 7' rear yard setback which is not based on the Compatibility rule.

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 lot size as the primary condition contributing to the need for a variance. In looking at the lot in question, Staff finds it is considerably smaller than the comparable properties on the block face.

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 the unique lot size would create a hardship in that the lot contains the smallest setback on the block face therefore creating a situation where the property could not be added to.

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

The Applicant again cites the small lot size compared to the neighboring properties. Staff would note that while smaller lot sizes are not uncommon in the District with several lots containing a much smaller lot size than that of the subject property, the subject property does constitute the smallest lot on the block face in question.

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 cites neighborhood support as evidence. Staff would note that the issuance of the requested variance would not automatically grant other smaller lots the same relief. Staff further notes that the issuance of the variance would not prevent the Commission from applying the Historic District regulations to other portions of the subject properties proposal.

Staff finds that the request meets the criteria for granting a variance.

CA3-19-136

Alterations

On the proposed elevations. Staff notes that the elevations have a call-out stating that areas will "match existing brick." Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their intentions regarding the retention or replacement of the original brick facades on the structure. Staff also notes an unused callout labeled as "#16 Replace screen with insulated glass," which, from the plans provided, appears to be intended to denote the window installation in the original side porch openings. Staff will review the project with this assumption but suggests the Applicant revise the proposed elevations to confirm this project element.

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of all windows on the property. The District regulations do not prevent the replacement of original windows in the District and do not regulate the replacement materials. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed window replacement.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing to enclose an existing screened in side porch to create a new kitchen. The proposed enclosure would retain the character defining brick balustrade and columns on the front and rear façade. The left side façade will be enclosed with a stucco board and batten cladding matching the gable finishes on the existing structure. In general, Staff finds the proposal would allow for increased interior space while remaining easily recognizable as a porch. Further, Staff finds that the work would be reversible allowing for the area to be converted back to a side porch in the future. As such, Staff has no concerns with this portion of the proposal.

A two-story rear addition is proposed and would allow for a rear extension of the building footprint and additional living space in the new partial second floor. In general, Staff has no concerns with the design of the structure as the character and finishes of the addition will be consistent with the existing structure. However, the site plan shows the addition following the R-5 zoning regulations for setbacks as opposed to the Inman Park Historic District regulations. As the side yard setbacks of the addition come no closer to the side lot lines than the existing structure, Staff finds this portion of the addition meets the regulations. The District regulations require the rear yard setback to be no closer than the closest and no further than the farthest rear yard setback belonging to contributing structures on the block face. This compatibility comparison information has not been received by Staff. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable rear yard setback range for the proposed addition.

Given Staff's recommendation in reference to the variance request, Staff withdraws this recommendation.

With regards to the point where the addition meets the original structure, Staff finds that a control/expansion joint would allow for distinct identification of the original and new portions of the structure. As such, Staff recommends a control/expansion joint be used where the brick from the new addition meets the original portions of the structure.

Site Work

The Applicant proposes a new fence in the side yard and new paving to access the proposed addition using the existing front yard site steps. Staff has no concerns with either portion of the proposed site work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-195: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-136: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant clarify their intentions regarding the retention or replacement of the original brick facades on the structure;
2. A control/expansion joint be used where the brick from the new addition meets the original portions of the structure, per Sec. 16-20L.005(1)(b)(i); and,
3. All updated plans and documentation shall be submitted no later than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 898 Rose Circle
APPLICATION: CA3-19-102
MEETING DATE: April 24, 2019 deferred to May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location West of Lee Street and East of Joseph E. Lowery

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: Deferred to May 8th to allow the Applicant to provide compatibility information

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

NEW INFORMATION IS IN ITALICS

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 10 houses for comparisons for the compatibility rule.

844 Rose Circle

858 Rose Circle

864 Rose Circle

868 Rose Circle

874 Rose Circle

880 Rose Circle

884 Rose Circle

890 Rose Circle

904 Rose Circle

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a new 1,846 square feet single-family house that will include three bedrooms and two bathrooms. The new construction will be built on a concrete foundation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Roof

The 23'8 feet new construction is proposed with a gable front roof, a hip roof for the remainder of the house. District Regulations require the Applicant provide compatibility comparisons for the roof form of the proposed new construction. As well, District Regulations require the Applicant provide compatibility information for the height. Staff recommends the Applicant abide provide the compatibility information for the roof form as well as provide information regarding the height of comparable houses on the block face and construct the height of the house to fall into the guidelines of no smaller than the smallest and no larger than the largest.

The information the Applicant provided states the lowest roof is 23' 6" and the highest roof is 35 '. The 23'8" height the Applicant proposes meets the District Regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Of the 10 comparable provided by the Applicant five have a front gable /hip roof combination. Staff is not concern with the proposed roof form.

Roof material

The Applicant has not provided any information on the proposed roof material. Staff recommends the proposed roof material be consistent with material on the blockface, asphalt shingles. For energy efficiency, Staff also recommends, the Applicant install a vent ridge on top of the roof.

The Applicant has now proposed asphalt shingles on the new construction. Staff is concerned with this proposal.

TRIM WORK and GABLE FRONT ROOF

The Applicant has not indicated any detail for the trim or front gable roof on the proposed house. This does not concern Staff. However, Staff suggest that the Applicant install trim and gable details that match what is compatible with the other comparable houses on the blockface.

FRONT PORCH

The Applicant proposes the porch have 4x4 columns and railings under the gable front roof but does not provide any other discerning information. The District Regulation requires that new or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with the architectural style of the houses or other original porches in that block. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District Regulations and have the proposed porch contain balustrades, columns and other features that will be consistent with the architectural style of the houses or original porches in that block. District Regulation also requires, 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. Additionally, Staff recommends the rails be wood, vertical in orientation, 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 compatible to the porch flooring of contributing houses on the blockface.

Ceiling

Also, the Applicant has not indicated what material the ceiling of the proposed porch will be. Staff recommends, the ceiling on the porch be bead-board.

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 three rectangular light Craftsman style door. 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. Staff is not concerned with this door 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. The Applicant has proposed one over one double-hung sash windows on the front façade. On the side elevations, the Applicant proposes various sizes single one over one sash windows and one double-hung one over one sash windows. Research indicates that the contributing houses on blockface show wood windows. Staff recommends the proposed windows be wood. Staff could not discern the style of the windows and recommends the Applicant provide photographic information of the contributing houses to determine the window patterns to replicate.

Information the Applicant provides of the compatible windows on the blockface, illustrates a varying of window styles, all vertical with multiple. For example, 844 has four over one wood windows, 864 has 9 over 1 wood windows. There was no evidence to support the one over one wood windows the Applicant proposes. Staff continues to recommend the Applicant shall install wood windows. However, Staff recommends, the Applicant install either four over one wood sash windows or windows that will match those are present on the blockface.

Fenestration

The proposed fenestration patterns on the front façade give Staff pause. The lack of a window near the front door, where a living room will be makes the ratio of window to solid appear imbalanced. 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. Research on other contributing houses on the blockface show houses with more window on the front façade. Likewise, on the Elevation 2, the window to solid near the rear of the house demonstrate an imbalance of window to solid. Staff recommends the Applicant install one additional window on the front façade near the front door and install either a double window or single on Elevation 2 near the rear of the house.

SIDING

The Applicant has not indicated the proposed siding on the house. District Regulation permits wood, horizontal cementitious or brick siding. Staff recommends the Applicant install either wood lap-siding with a 4 to 5-inch reveal or horizontal smooth cementitious siding with a 4 to 5-inch reveal or brick siding.

DECK

A proposed rear deck that will extend to the side of the main structure. District Regulations requires decks to be constructed in the rear of the house and not extend pass the sides. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the side deck and only construct the deck to the rear of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the May 8th Meeting

1. Staff recommends, the Applicant install a vent ridge on top of the roof, per Sec. 16-20G.005;
2. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulations and have the proposed porch contain balustrades, columns and other features that will be consistent with the architectural style of the houses or original porches in that block, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
3. 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., per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
4. The rails be wood, vertical in orientation, 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, per Sec.16-20G.006(9);
5. The porch flooring shall be compatible to the porch flooring of contributing houses on the blockface, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(h);
6. The ceiling on the porch shall be bead-board, per Sec.16-20G.006;
7. The Applicant shall construct risers to comply with the District Regulations, per Sec.16-20G.006;
8. The proposed windows shall be wood and match windows that are present on the blockface. Windows such as four over one or eight over one, per Sec. 16-20G.006;
9. The Applicant shall install one additional window on the front façade near the front door and install either a double window or single on Elevation 2 near the rear of the house, per Sec.16-20G.006;
10. The Applicant install either wood lap-siding with a 4 to 5-inch reveal or horizontal smooth cementitious siding with a 4 to 5-inch reveal or brick siding, per Sec.16-20G.006;
11. The Applicant shall remove the side deck and only construct the deck to the rear of the house and
12. 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: 389 Hopkins St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-157
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: West block face of Hopkins St., north of Greenwich St., south of the Sells Ave.

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

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred April 24, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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

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

The District regulations permit contemporary design for new construction if the design is compatible with the adjacent and surrounding structures on the block face. Staff finds that the design of the structure in general is not compatible with the adjacent and surrounding structures on the block face. Staff's specific concerns with the proposed design are discussed in the analysis below.

Site plan

Per the District regulations, the front yard setback is based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons showing the allowable front yard setback range of the block face is a minimum of 16' and a maximum of 39' based on the contributing structures located at 393 and 373 Hopkins St. respectively. Staff has located a survey from a previous review performed at 393 Hopkins St. which shows the front yard setback of this property measured at 14.8'. While Staff finds that the Applicant's proposed placement of 16' meets the District regulations, Staff would note for the Applicant's benefit that the setback range for this block would allow a 14.8' front yard setback.

Building height

The Applicant has provided compatibility information regarding the proposed height. Based on this information, the allowable block face height range is a minimum of 22' and a maximum of 27' based on the contributing structures at 393 and 383 Hopkins St. respectively. The stated height of the proposed structure is 26' 9", however Staff finds this measurement does not take into account the foundation height of 1' 6". This gives the proposed structure a total height of 28' 3" which does not meet the compatibility range provided by the Applicant. The information provided also does not specify the method of measurement used. The District regulations state that the height of buildings measured for the compatibility rule should be measured at grade on the front façade. The District regulations do not specify how the height itself is measured, so Staff finds it appropriate to apply the standard City measurement point of the midpoint of the roof to be appropriate. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the compatibility comparisons have been taken from grade at the front façade to the midpoint of the roof. Staff further recommends the height of the proposed structure as measured grade on the front façade to the midpoint of the roof meet the compatibility rule.

The Applicant has provided information showing the compatibility comparisons were made from grade to the midpoint of the roof. The Applicant has also revised the plans to show the height measurement being taken from grade to the midpoint of the roof. Staff finds these recommendations have been met.

Building facades

Per the District regulations, the first-floor elevation above grade is based on the compatibility rule. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information showing the allowable first floor elevation.

The Applicant has provided information showing the proposed finished floor height meets the compatibility rule. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Proposed design shows both horizontal lap siding and board and batten siding. Siding material in the District is based on the compatibility rule. For this measurement the compatibility rule specifies the element in question should be based on the predominate building material on the block face. Staff finds that the predominate building material on the block face is horizontal lap siding. As such, Staff recommends the board and batten siding be removed from the proposal.

The revised plans contain only horizontal lap siding. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Windows and doors

The Applicant proposes a two-story structure with three over one windows. On the front façade, 4 different window sizes are proposed. On the left side façade the Applicant proposes a fenestration pattern that leaves a large area of blank wall space and which involves three different window sizes, including transom/accent windows. On the right side façade, the Applicant proposes two different window sizes, with accent/half-lite windows on the first floor. The District regulations require both the ratio of openings as well as the scale, size, proportion, and location of new openings to be based on the compatibility rule. For this measurement the compatibility rule specifies that the element in question is to match what predominates on the block face. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the ratio of openings to solid on the front and side façades meets the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide information showing the scale, size, proportion and location of the proposed fenestration on the front and side façades meet the compatibility rule.

The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons showing that the proposed fenestration meets the ratio of open to solid. Staff finds this recommendation has been met. However, Staff retains the recommendation regarding the scale, size, proportion and location of the propose fenestration on the front and side façades.

Roofs

The District regulations require the roof shape and pitch to be based on the compatibility rule. For these measurements the compatibility rule specifies that the element in question should match what predominates on the block face. No information detailing the allowable roof pitch, or the proposed roof pitch has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the proposed roof pitch and provide compatibility information detailing the predominate roof pitch on the block face.

The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons for the heights of all 4 comparable properties on the block face. However, the Applicant appears to be applying the standards for quantifiable elements to this building element. Staff finds that roof form and pitch are required to be based on the predominate element on contributing buildings on the block face. Applying the roof pitch of a hipped roof structure on a gable roofed structure would lead to a design that is internally inconsistent. As the predominate roof form is a front facing gable, Staff finds it appropriate to base the roof pitch off those structures with a front facing gable. Each of the three front facing gable properties contains a different roof pitch, so the Applicant may select any of these three remaining properties for their revised design. Staff recommends the roof pitch be based off one of the three contributing structures with a front facing gable.

In looking at the block face in question, Staff finds that the predominate roof shape is a front facing gable and a gabled front porch without cross or side facing accent gables. The subject property is defined by side facing gables with two accent gables on the front façade. Staff finds that the proposed roof shape does not meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the proposed roof form be redesigned to show a front facing gable primary roof with gabled porch roof, without cross or side facing accent gables.

The updated plans still show the primary roof form has been changed to a front facing gable, but still shows two accent gables on the front façade. The comparable properties contain a maximum of one accent gables over the front porch if an accent gable is present at all. As such, Staff recommends the accent gable and bump out not associated with the proposed front porch be removed from the plans.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a ½ width gabled front porch. In looking at the block face in question, the comparable properties on the block face contain full width and ¾ width porches and a 1/3 width inset front porch. The porch belonging to the property at 383 Hopkins St. was removed before the District was designated, however, based on the extant porch foundation Staff finds that the porch would have likely been a full width front porch Staff finds that the proposed 1/3 width gabled front porch does not conform to one of the porch forms on the block face. Given Staff's recommendation regarding the porch roof form, Staff finds it is appropriate for the porch to be consistent with the gabled front porches on the block. This would require either at ½ width or full width front porch. As such, Staff recommends the front porch be redrawn to show either ½ width or full width front porch.

In reviewing the proposed drawings against the recommendations, Staff finds both the previous plans and the new plans show a ½ width front porch. This is due to a typographical error in the previous Staff report. The Compatibility Rule requires either a full width or a ¾ width front porch. As such, Staff revises the previous recommendation to require either a ¾ width front porch or a full width front porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral conditioned upon the following;

1. The Applicant shall provide information showing the scale, size, proportion and location of the proposed fenestration on the front and side façades meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(h);
2. *The roof pitch shall be based off one of the three contributing structures with a front facing gable, per Sec. 16-20G.006(7)(d);*
3. *The accent gable and bump out not associated with the proposed front porch shall be removed from the plans, per Sec. 16-20G.006(7)(d);*
4. The front porch shall be redrawn to show either a ¾ width or full width front porch, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
5. The Applicant shall submit all updated materials no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

CA3-19-157 for 389 Hopkins St.
May 8, 2019
Page 5 of 5

File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1085 Arlington Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-172
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Lee Street and East of Princess Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations: new siding, windows doors, roof repair.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to do several alterations which are new siding, install new windows, deck and new exterior doors. On the rear right elevation is missing and the Applicant is proposing to rebuild the rear right elevation of the principal structure.

Siding

Photos provided by the Applicant shows the principal structure has vinyl siding. The Applicant proposes to install new cementitious on the entire house. Cementitious siding is a permissible siding material in the District along as it is smooth-finish cementitious lap siding. Staff recommends the cementitious be smooth-finish cementitious lap siding.

Windows

The Applicant has proposed new one over one vinyl windows on the entire house. District Regulations does not speak of permissible window material but states the replacement window must maintain the shape and size of the original windows, which the Applicant proposes to do. District Regulations also states that "alterations and additions shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property." The photos provided of the existing windows are wood four over one windows with wood trim. These windows appear to be in good shape and is an historic architectural character of the Craftsman house of the period. Staff deems that to remove these windows and install vinyl one over one windows stripe and destroy material that is an essential to the principal structure. Therefore, Staff recommends the Applicant retain all of the existing four over one wood windows with trim and repair in-kind any components that needs repairing or replacing. For the rear right elevation that is missing, Staff recommends the new windows on the rear right elevation, the Applicant mimic the windows on the existing the principal structure, which appears to be two windows to make the windows consistent.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to install a deck on the rear of the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Door

The only door deemed for review is the front door. The Applicant proposes to install a Craftsman style door with three lite. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend it be wood.

Walkway

Research demonstrated the walkway is missing from site. District Regulations requires paved walkways from sidewalks. Staff recommends the walkway be installed or cleared if one is there.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The siding shall be smooth-finish cementitious lap siding per, Sec.16-20M.0013(2)(q);
2. The Applicant shall retain all of the existing four-over-one wood windows with the trim and repair in-kind any components that need repairing or replacing, per Sec.16-20M.017(1)(b);
3. For the new windows on the rear right elevation, the Applicant shall mimic the existing windows on the principal structure, which appears to be two windows, per Sec.16-20M.013 (2)(l)(1)(2);
4. A paved walkway shall be added from the sidewalk or be cleared if one is there, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-8145 – 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: 736 Lillian Avenue, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-197
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Tift Avenue and East of Murphy Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Fence Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

CA2-19-for 736 Lillian Avenue, SW

May 8, 2019

Page 2 of 2

FENCE

In the rear of the principal structure the Applicant proposes to construct a 6-foot horizontal wood fence that will meet up with an existing 6-foot horizontal wood fence. On the front and side of the principal structure the Applicant proposes to construct a 4-foot horizontal fence that will connect an existing iron fence.

Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1121 Oakland Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-19-196
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location:

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: roof form, porch, siding, windows

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Applicant was nearly finished with the renovations when he received a Stop Work Order. The Applicant originally received permits for only interior work, thinking he had permission did exterior work as well.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

ALTERATIONS

The Minimalist Traditional Cottage has been transformed into a Gable roof cottage. In doing the work, the Applicant has changed the roof, windows, sidings and added a porch. The Applicant is also requesting a fence to be constructed.

ROOF

The original roof on the principal structure appears to have a hip/flat 2/12 pitch roof. The Applicant transformed the roof to a 6/2 pitch gable roof with cedar shake. District Regulations state that the compatibility rule shall apply to the form and pitch of the primary roof of the primary structure. As well the District Regulations states that alterations and additions shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The District Regulations also states that Alterations and additions shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations set forth in subsection 16-20M.013(2). While the Applicant may not have destroyed any materials, the Applicant has not done alterations that has been consistent or reinforce the historic architectural character of the contributing structure. By transforming the roof, a new style home has been created. And while the current house is consistent with other houses on the blockface, the historic character of this particular house has been destroyed. Staff recommends the roof be restored to its originality.

PORCH

The Applicant had constructed a full-width porch when there wasn't one before on the principal structure. District Regulation states that the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends. Research shows that there are many full porches with front facing steps on the blockface. The Applicant is proposing a front porch with railing with a top and bottom rail with balusters nailed between using a butt joint without the use of rail runners. This will remove the crossed railings the Applicant has applied. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

SIDING

The Applicant has installed smooth-face cementitious lap siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

WINDOWS

The Applicant has changed the windows shape and size on the principal structure which is a violation of the District Regulations and have installed vertical one over one trim vinyl window. The Applicant has also removed a window on the right front elevation. Staff is not has concerned with the removed window, however changing the shape and size of the original window is problematic, Staff recommends the windows be return to their original shape and size, abiding by District Regulations

DECK

The Applicant proposes a deck on the rear of the house that is not wider than the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

FENCE

The Applicant installed a 6 ft wood privacy fence on the sides and the rear of the property. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The roof form shall return to it originality per Sec.16-20M.017(2)(q) (1)(a);
2. The windows shall return to their originality, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o)(1) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-8145 – 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: 628 Glenwood Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-19-198
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Berean Avenue and East of Boulevard

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 20K.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

CA2-19-198 for 628 Glenwood Avenue, SE
May 8, 2109

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to do the following porch alterations: front porch steps, porch railings, porch pillars

Porch Steps

The Applicant proposes to replace cinder block steps that are deteriorating and replace these steps with wooden steps that will be the same dimensions of the cinder block steps. Being that the porch floor is also wood, Staff has not concern with this proposal.

Porch Railings

The photo provided by the Applicant shows the porch railing is warped along the edge of the porch. As well, two railings are unstable and unsafe. The Applicant proposes to replace the warped railing with in-kind wood railings. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Porch Pillars

Shown pillars on the principal structure are pillars that are used in the interior of a house, possibly pillars for a stairway. The Applicant proposes to install simple square pillars that are conducive to exterior pillars on a Craftsman house. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1252 Sells Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-200
MEETING DATE: May 8, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Southeast corner of Sells Ave. and Atwood St.

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

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Vacant

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved plans.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?:

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the July 11, 2018 the Commission approved with Conditions the Application CA3-18-219 for a new single family residence.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CA2-19-200 for 1252 Sells Ave.

May 8, 2019

Page 2 of 2

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

The Applicant is proposing to revise the original plans to allow for both a brick foundation and to remove the previously proposed chimney. The original design had a stucco finished foundation. Staff has no concerns with either of the proposed changes and finds they meet the related regulations for each. Staff does recommend all Conditions of Approval adopted under CA3-18-219 be retained as part of this approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. All Conditions of Approval adopted under CA3-18-219 shall be retained as part of this approval; and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File