



# 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 252 Powell St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-214 & CA3-19-263  
**MEETING DATE:** *June 26, 2019*

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Cabbagetown Landmark District (Subarea 3)    **Other Zoning:** Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** West block face of Powell St., south of Gaskill St., north of Memorial Dr.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New construction

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** *Yes. updated text in italics.*

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-263:** Approval.  
**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-214:** Approval with conditions.

face in question, only the properties located at 260 and 248 Powell St. are considered contributing. As these are both duplex cottages and new duplexes are not permitted in the District per the regulations, Staff finds it inappropriate to base the design of the proposed structure on these structures. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant apply for a variance to base the design of the proposed structure on the west block face of Powell St. Also, as the lot dimensions of the subject property are different than those of 248 and 260 Powell St., Staff recommends the Applicant apply for a variance to base the side and rear yard setbacks of the proposed structure on the west block face of Powell St.

*The Applicant has provided information detailing the allowable side and rear yard setbacks of the properties along the west block face of Powell St. The setback range is as follows:*

- *Left side yard setback: 3' (based on the structure at 249 Powell St.) to 20' (based on the structure at 261 Powell St.)*
- *Right side yard setback: 3' (based on the structure at 253 Powell St.) to 17' (based on the structure at 269 Powell St.)*
- *Rear yard setback: 9' (based on the structure at 241 Powell St.) to 89' (based on the structure at 261 Powell St.)*

*Staff would note that a few of the measurements noted on the Applicant's compatibility study appear to not be taken from the closest point of the contributing structure to the associated lot line. As such, Staff will base their findings on the closest point of the building to the associated lot line. Staff would also note that the side and rear setbacks of the properties located at 260, 256, and 248 Powell St. are no longer comparable for this property due to the variance application.*

*The proposed structure has a right and left side yard setback of 3.4' and a rear setback of 64'. Staff finds this proposal meets the District regulations.*

Staff would note that many of the required compatibility comparisons were not received as part of the Application package. Staff will note many of the missing comparisons that were found in this initial review, but strongly encourages the Applicant to review the requirements of both Sec. 16-20A.006(13) and Sec. 16-20A.009 to ensure all required comparisons have been provided.

#### Site Plan

The proposed structure has a front yard setback of 20' matching the setbacks of the contributing properties at 248 and 260 Powell St. Staff finds the front yard setback meets the District regulations.

Given Staff's recommendations regarding the side and rear yard setbacks, Staff will withhold comment on these elements at this time. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that while the plans currently note "similar" for the side and rear yard setbacks, the allowable range for each side yard and the rear yard will need to be provided before a review can be done of these elements. Additionally, Staff recommends the rear yard setbacks for the contributing structures at 245 and 249 Powell St. be provided.

*Given Staff's findings regarding the proposed variance, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

#### Height and Width.

No compatibility comparisons have been provided for the height of the proposed structure. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility comparisons detailing the allowable height range of the property.

The Applicant's plans call for a parking pad off a rear alleyway. However, both the Applicant's survey and the City's records do not show an alleyway in this location. The Applicant's site plan notes a 15' easement on the rear of the property. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information regarding the details of the easement agreement in question and whether it grants the subject property access from a public ROW across the property lines of neighboring properties.

*After discussing the access issue with Staff from the Office of Zoning and Development, Staff has learned that the lack of an easement would not prevent the City from approving a pad in the location proposed by the Applicant. However, Staff would strongly suggest the Applicant locate an easement agreement that has been recorded with Fulton County to ensure that they do not lose access to this portion of their property in the future.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-263:** Approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-214:** Approval with the following conditions:

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

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1039 White Oak Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-264  
**MEETING DATE:** June 26, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1929

**Property Location:** East of Lee Street and West of Peoples Street

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Exterior Alterations

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** 20M.007

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** On 5/9/2019, a Work Stop Order was placed for working without a permit.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval Upon Conditions

windows be the same in size and shape of the window openings. Staff, thus, recommends the Applicant abide by the regulation and make sure the replacements be the same size and shape of the window openings. District Regulation requires the style of windows should be compatible to windows of contributing windows on the block face. Staff recommends, the Applicant abide by the District Regulations' regarding style. The Applicant shall also provide photos of those compatible properties on the blockface.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall correct the plans to depict accuracy of the principal structure including the trim and accurate columns the front porch per Sec.16-20M.001;
2. The Applicant shall repair or replace in-kind the ceiling of the porch and base of the columns per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);
3. The Staff recommends the missing spindles on the front porch railing be replaced in-kind to match the remaining spindles, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
4. The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence of the windows conditions so that Staff can access their feasibility before removing, per Sec. 20M 0013 (2)(o);
5. The Applicant shall abide by District Regulations, if replacement is grant, replace windows that are the same in size and shape of the openings on the original openings, per Sec.16- 20M.0013(2)(o)(2)(a);
6. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulations regarding style and install replacement windows that mimic windows on the blockface and provide those compatible properties to Staff, per Sec. Sec. 160-20M.0013(2)(o)(2)(c) and
7. 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 851 Springdale Road  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-265  
**MEETING DATE:** June 26, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1925

**Property Location:** East of E. Ponce de Leon and West of The by Way

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

**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. 16-20B.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?**                      No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval



# 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1160 Ewing Place, SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-217  
**MEETING DATE:** June 26, 2019 Deferred from May 22, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1930

**Property Location:** East of Hall Street and West of Oakland Drive

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

**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:** None

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions

***Front Porch Awning and Screening***

***The Applicant has not shown on the plans the existing awning or screened in porch, nor provided in photos to show both the awning and screened on the porch were missing. However, field research shows the awning and screen on the porch are missing. With this being the case, Staff notes that removing the awning and screen from the porch does not remove any significant historic value from the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.***

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant if the original wood window is in the dumpster, that Applicant retrieve it and the Applicant shall repair it in-kind and reinstall it, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o)(1);
2. If the original wood window is not in the dumpster or can not be repaired, the Applicant shall replace in-kind to match the original wood windows, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o)(1);
3. If the existing wood windows need repair, they shall be repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o)1 and
4. 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](http://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:** June 26, 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 June 12, 2019. *Updated text in underlined italics.*

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** *Approval with conditions.*

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.*

*The updated plans show a building with a height of 20' 6" when measured at grade at the front façade to the midpoint of the roof. Staff finds this new building height meets the District regulations.*

#### 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.

***is more compatible with the massing of the neighboring structures. As such, Staff recommends the roof pitch be 10 in 12.***

The revised plans show the structure containing a roof with a pitch of 10 in 12. Staff finds that this redesign meets the recommendations.

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.*

***The updated plans show remove the bump out and gable not associated with the front porch have been removed. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.***

The updated plans have added the front façade bump out back to the proposed structure. Staff recommends the accent gable and bump out not associated with the proposed front porch be removed from the plans.

The updated plans show that the accent gable on the left side of the front façade has been removed but the projection still remains. Staff retains the portion of the recommendation referring to the removal of the bump out on the front facade.

The updated plans show a structure with a front facing gable with cross gables on the side façade. Staff would note that while cross gables are not present on the comparable properties, their inclusion on the subject property is not incompatible if they were made to appear as additions to the structure. As such, Staff recommends a continuous return be added to the side façades of the structure to allow the second-floor area to mimic dormer additions.

### 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.



# 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 654 Woodward Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-267 & CA3-19-268  
**MEETING DATE:** June 22, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** North block face of Woodward Ave., east of Berean Ave., west of Cameron St.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Construction

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** The design of facades not facing the street

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20k

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** In 2015 the Commission reviewed and approved CA3-15-158 & 337 for new construction and side setback variances. After the project was approved, it was discovered that the subject property and neighboring properties had competing surveys and the project was never permitted.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-267:** Approval with conditions.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-268:** Approval.

## **New construction**

### **Site plan**

The subject property has entered into a common boundary, easement, and encroachment agreement with the property owners of 652 Woodward Ave. The subject property has also had its lot boundaries adjusted following legislation by the Atlanta City Council to waive portions of the subdivision ordinance so that the boundary line dispute between the subject property and the owner of 658 Woodward Ave. could be addressed. The resulting lot configuration has been acknowledged by Staff from the Office of Zoning and Development in accordance with this legislation. As such, Staff will proceed with a review of the proposed structure.

Per the R-5 zoning regulations, if a property does not have enough lot area to construct a structure with at least 1,800 sf of heated space, a structure of no more than 1,800 sf can be built provided all other development controls within the R-5 zoning requirements are met unless varied by the appropriate board. As the setbacks are under the purview of the Atlanta Urban Design Commission, and given Staff's recommendation regarding the side yard setback reduction, Staff finds the FAR requirements have been met. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that the FAR requirements are administered by the Office of Zoning and Development and are not under the purview of the Commission.

The R-5 zoning regulations require the lot coverage of the property not to exceed 55% of the lot area. The site plan provided by the Applicant shows the covered surface of the lot with the proposed structures, paving, and the encroachment of the wall and shed belonging to 652 Woodward Ave. will not exceed 54.9% of the net lot area. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that the lot coverage requirements are administered by the Office of Zoning and Development and are not under the purview of the Commission.

### **Design**

The District has both qualitative and quantitative requirements for new construction. Staff has reviewed the Applicant's proposal and has found that the proposed structure meets the design requirements of the Grant Park Historic District. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-268: Approval.**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-267: Approval with the following conditions:**

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

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 645 Queen Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-275  
**MEETING DATE:** June 26, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location** East of Oglethorpe and West of Ralph David Abernathy

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Addition

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions

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

### ***Windows***

#### **Right Elevation**

With the proposed removal and addition on the right elevation, a door will be removed, and a new proposed window will be installed. The District Regulations allow for reconfiguration of windows to allow for kitchen renovations and being that no openings are being lost, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### **Left Elevation**

A window on the left elevation will be lost due to the proposed addition. Unlike the right elevation, with replacement of a door to allow for a window, a window will be lost completely which means an opening will be lost, leading to an unbalance fenestration. However, since this change is not visible from the public-away, Staff is not concern with this proposal. But would suggest the Applicant considering adding the window back for balance.

### ***Siding***

The Applicant proposes to match the proposed siding to the existing siding. From photos, the existing siding appears to be wood clapboard siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall submit 3 sets of to-scale plans that indicate the boundary measurements of the property and FAR information, corrected elevations with chimney shown per, Sec. 16-20G.005;
2. The sharp drop on the rear roof addition shall be removed and replace with an extended hip, per Sec.16-20G.005(2)
3. The valley between the two gable roofs on the left elevation shall be removed and a one continuous gable roof extended up to the proposed hip roof shall be constructed, per Sec. 16-20G.005 (2) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood

File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 346 Peters St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-257 & CA3-19-258  
**MEETING DATE:** June 26, 2019

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Castleberry Hill Landmark District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** East block face of Peters St., north of McDaniel St.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Construction

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20N

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral.

## **New construction**

### **Site plan**

In reviewing the site plan provided by the Applicant, Staff has determined that the lot dimensions provided do not match the City's records. Further, Staff can find no evidence of a lot consolidation application on file with the City. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant either provide evidence, such as a plat signed by City Staff, that the lot dimensions are recognized by the City or apply for a lot consolidation from the Office of Zoning and Development and the Office of Design.

*Staff retains this recommendation. Staff would further note that a lot consolidation would require a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness from the Commission. Staff would add this clarification to the previous recommendation.*

### **Height**

The Applicant is proposing ground floor live/work retail units with 12' ceilings to take advantage of the 10% height bonus permitted by the District regulations. However, Staff finds that this regulation would require the ground floor units to be retail without any attached residential use. As such, Staff recommends the ground floor retail live/work units be changed to a retail use only.

*The updated plans show ground floor retail which is not directly connected to a residential space. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

Given Staff's findings with regards to the building height variance, Staff will not comment on the proposed building height at this time.

*As updated information relating to the variance request has not been provided, Staff will not comment on the proposed building height at this time.*

### **Building Façades**

The District regulations require the fenestration pattern on all 4 façades to meet the compatibility rule. Staff has not received compatibility information for the fenestration patterns. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed fenestration on all 4 façades.

*The Applicant has provided information showing that the side and rear fenestration meets the compatibility rule. Staff would note that a portion of the right side façade will not contain fenestration as it is being built along the property line and IRC prohibits fenestration in this situation. Staff has no concerns with the proposed fenestration pattern.*

The Applicant is proposing recessed balconies on the Peters Street and Bettis Alley façades. Staff is concerned that the inclusion of these voids on the façades of the structure would be incompatible with the contributing structures in the District. Staff finds that the easiest way to eliminate the incompatibility would be to bring the window system forward to make the entire façade flush. However, Staff finds that if a window system, with movable windows that could be opened to provide an open-air space when in use, were added to the railing of the proposed balcony area that the need for façade compatibility could be met while also meeting the Applicant's needs. As such,

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-257:** Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall either provide evidence, such as a plat signed by City Staff, that the lot dimensions are recognized by the City or apply to consolidate the lots with the Office of Zoning and Development and the Office of Design *via a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness*; and,
2. All updated plans and materials shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File