



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: 560 Edgewood Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-19-300
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King's Landmark District (subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction 1940

Property Location: Across from Bradley Street, East of Howell Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve with conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

On an existing 53,000sf two-story industrial building and accessory building and structure, the Applicant proposes to make alterations to allow for an adaptive re-use. 35,000sf will be for retail and restaurant on the street level. 18,000sf will be for office space on the second floor. The accessory structure is non-historic, and the Applicant proposes to demolish it for site parking and green space. Staff is not concerned with the removal of the non-historic accessory structure, therefore will focus on the section of the building that is historic.

It is to be noted, that Applicant has propose the built spaces will be a “white box” with tenants’ improvements done at later due under separate permit. As well, the Applicant notes that exterior of the existing building will be maintained and repaired in-kind.

COMPATIBILITY RULE

The Compatibility rule shall govern the proposed work set forth. The District Regulation states, the compatibility rule shall apply to a principal structure's general façade organization, proportion, scale, roof form, pitch and materials, door and window placement, and other architectural details including but not limited to brackets, decorative trim, corner boards, bottom boards, fascia boards, columns, steps and attic vents.

PROPOSE ALTERATIONS

Recess Store Front

The Applicant proposes a new recessed storefront with an industrial style to mimic the existing window on the principal structure. The propose recessed store front would remove significant historic brick and could be problematic. However, since there is a recession already presented on the existing structure, would like to know how much recession? Staff can't discern how far that would be. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify how far the recession will be.

Windows

The Applicant proposes the existing windows be replaced by new-prefinished aluminum storefront windows to mimic existing windows on all sides of the structure. Aluminum storefront windows with divides are prominent in the subarea, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Canopy

A new metal canopy is proposed for the front elevation. The District Regulations requires original canopies be retained. Photo of the canopy shows the canopy be in good condition. Staff cannot determine if the canopy is original. Therefore, Staff recommends the canopy remains to abided by District Regulations. If the Applicant can provide additional photo illustrating a different condition of the canopy or that the canopy is not original, District Regulations then requires the canopy to be installed 8ft above the sidewalk level and not encroached more than five feet over the public sidewalk. Additionally, canopies shall be designed in a manner that is indicative of the time of significance of the structure.

Fence

The Applicant proposes a new wood fence beyond a graphic wall that will not be visible from the public right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

The Applicant proposes new storefront simulated lite overhead doors on the front façade to match the windows on the principal structure. These doors will not be operational. Staff is not concern about this proposal since the design of the doors meet the compatibility standard.

Staircase

On the front elevation on the left- hand side, the Applicant propose to remove an overhead door and add a New CMU staircase leading to the roof top deck. Since there is an opening already, utilizing that open to build CMU staircase that will not be visible from the public right-away, Staff is not concern with the proposal. From the plans Staff could not determine if the staircase will be camouflaged or will be left as is.

Loading Dock

The proposed loading dock will be at the rear of the principle structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Signage

The Applicant proposes a total of two signages and one sign band on the principal structure. District Regulation governing signs, allow the Applicant to have three signs. On sign will be projecting from the principal structure along the frontage and one sign will be on the canopy. On the west elevation the sign band will be placed. Staff is not concerned with these signage proposals. They all meet the regulations set for SPI-1 governing signs.

Landscaping and Parking

The Applicant has proposed adding trees and a Pocket Park to soften the concrete surrounding on the sidewalk and parking areas. Staff is not concerned with these proposals.

Painting

The Applicant proposes to paint the existing concrete wall. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Only the masonry cannot be painted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall how far the recession for the front entry will be, per Sec.16-20C.001
2. The original canopy shall remain per, Sec.16-20C.008(3)(f)(i);
3. If the canopy is not original, the new canopy shall abide by the District Regulations which states that new canopies shall be installed 8 feet above the sidewalk level and cannot encroach more than 5 feet on to the sidewalk level per, Sec.16-20C.008(3)(f)(iii);
4. New canopies shall be designed in a manner that is indicative of the time period of significance of the structure per, Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(f)(iv) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

CA2-19-300 for 560 Edgewood Avenue
July 10, 2019
Page 4 of 4

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: 627 Moreland Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-289
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-7 (Subarea 2C).

Date of Construction: 2017

Property Location: East block face of Moreland Ave. south of Fairview Rd., north of North Ave.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New fence

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-18G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-18G of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

In subarea 2 of SPI-7, no project may apply for a building permit before the work has been issued a "Certificate of Compliance" by the Commission. The current proposal is for a new 4' fence in the front and side yards of the property. The SPI-7 requirements allow for 4' high fences comprised of one of the following materials: brick, stone, ornamental iron, or wood pickets. The regulations further state that the fence should be constructed in a style which is substantially consistent with the architectural style of the principal structure. Staff has not received information detailing the material or style of the proposed fence. As such, Staff recommends the proposed fence meet the material and style requirements of the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The proposed fence meet the material and style requirements of the District regulations, per Sec. 16-18G.011(3)(j)(2); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 361 Collier Ridge Drive
APPLICATION: CA3-19-282
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1948

Property Location: East of Baker Ridge Drive and West of Dale Creek Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions: rear of the structure, front porch and alterations.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

ADDITIONS

Rear

The Applicant proposes to construct a 932 square feet addition to the principle structure. This will allow for a new interior master suite and bathroom. This proposed addition will not exceed the rear or side setback and will not extend beyond the side of the principle structure. The addition's roof ridgeline will not exceed beyond the principle structure and will be slightly lower than the principle roof ridgeline. Staff is not concerned with the proposed addition.

Porch

Photos show the existing principle structure has a stoop with hand rails over the steps and a small shed roof for coverage. The Applicant proposes to transform this stoop into to a porch with a Gable roof for coverage, brick piers and columns and hand railings over the steps. District regulation regards that original stoops be retain. Therefore, Staff recommends the Applicant retain the stoop. Instead, Staff recommends the Applicant construct a small Gable roof over the stoop entry. This will negate the proposed egress window on the proposed Gable roof. Research show that other principles structures on the blockface have the small Gable roof over stoops.

Deck

A rear deck is proposed by the Applicant that will not exceed the rear setback nor exceed beyond the side of the principle structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding Material

The Applicant shows on plans that the addition will continue with brick siding that is current on the principle structure. Staff notes that the brick is painted and from research seems to indicate that brick was always painted. District Regulations prohibits brick to be painted. So, the brick for the addition could not be painted to match the existing brick on the principle structure. Staff recommends the addition use a different siding material such as horizontal smooth-face cementitious siding with a distinguishable corner. This will allow for a clear distinction from the old and new and allow the Applicant to abide by the District Regulations on compatibility.

Windows/Fenestration

With the new proposed addition, the fenestration on one side of the principle structure ratio of windows to solid is off from the other side of the principle structure. While one side has four windows the other side only has one. Staff recommends the Applicant add one window on the side where there is only one to be compatible with the other side of the house. Staff also recommends that any new windows match the existing windows in size, style, scale, placement and proportion to abide by the compatibility rule.

Roof material

The Applicant proposes architectural shingles on the proposed addition to match the existing shingle on the principle structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The stoop shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(10)(a);
2. A small gable roof shall be built over the stoop, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(10)(d);
3. The addition siding material shall be smooth face cementitious siding with a distinguishable corner to indicate the old from the new, per Sec.16-20Q.001 (h);
4. The Applicant shall add one more window on the side of the house that only has one window to be compatible with the side of the house that has four windows, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(f);
5. New windows shall match the existing windows in size, style, scale, placement and proportion to abide by the compatibility rule, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(e) and
6. 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: 732 Brookline Street, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-732
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Allene and West of Mayland

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations on Porch

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.

PORCH

The Applicant purposes to repair in-kind four columns on the contributing structure. In doing so, the Applicant proposes three of the columns' bases be removed and rebuild due to them leaning, repair in-kind the granite stones using a beaded limestone mortar that match what is there and retain the caps on the columns. The fourth column's base will remain since as the Applicant purports that column is plum and does not need removing. The Applicant further proposes to replace all the wood columns which connect the base to the porch. Purposing to wrap the columns with tapered fiberglass wraps with Tuscan caps and bases.

Staff is not concerned with these 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: 1077 Saint Augustine Place
APPLICATION: CA3-19-302
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Atkins Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of North Highland on the Corner lot.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Dormer Addition and re-shingle Roof

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-200

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.

DORMER ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to install two dormers on the existing structure. One dormer will contain two closets for the master suite and the other dormer will be contain one closet for the guest room. The dormers will be an addition that will have to meet the District Regulation on reinforcing the historical architectural character of the entire structure. From the plans provided by the Applicant the proposed dormers will match the details of the existing structures with the half timbering detail and extended joists under the roof line and exposed rafters on the dormers. Additionally, the dormers will not exceed the roof line of the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ROOF RESHINGLING

The Applicant also proposes to re-shingle the entire roof with asphalt shingles that are in-kind with shingles on the existing structure. 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: 1050 Sparks St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-291
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: Southeast corner of Sparks St. and Peoples St.

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-120 & Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-120 & Sec. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Site Plan

The proposed site plan notes both the existing and proposed lot coverage and floor area. Based on the information provided, Staff finds the proposed addition and improvements meet the R-4A zoning requirements. Staff would note however, that these regulations are under the purview of the Office of Zoning and Development and will be subject to a review and approval by their Staff.

From the plans provided, it appears the Applicant is proposing the removal of the existing driveway and a partial replacement of the driveway in-kind. The location of the driveway to be retained is in the Peeples St. half depth front yard. The District regulations prohibit parking in the front yard and the half-depth front yard. As such, Staff finds the proposed driveway could not be approved as currently designed. Staff recommends the proposed driveway be removed from the plans or redesigned so as to allow for parking in a compliant location.

The Applicant is proposing a permeable paver walk way from the proposed driveway to the proposed interior side patio. Given Staff's previous recommendation regarding the driveway location, it is likely that the design of this site feature will change. However, Staff has no concerns with the proposed walkway and recommends that Staff be permitted to review any changes to the proposed permeable paver walkway.

A new grade level patio is proposed for the interior side of the property where the addition is inset from the corner of the existing house. Staff has no concerns with this portion of the overall design.

The District regulations require alterations and additions to contributing structures to comply with the criteria for new principal structures. As such, Staff finds it appropriate that the project comply with the requirement for sidewalks along both street frontages. Staff recommends that a concrete sidewalk inlaid with a hexagonal paver pattern be added to the Sparks St. and Peeples St. facades.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing a series of alterations to the existing principal structure. On the front porch, the Applicant proposes the removal of the screening, metal columns, and metal railing. The Applicant proposes replacing the columns and railing with new wood boxed columns and metal railing. Staff has no concerns with the proposed columns but finds that metal railings would not be consistent with the architectural style of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the proposed porch rails be comprised of wood constructed using a two part-butt joint technique. Staff further recommends the top rail of the new railing be installed no higher than the bottom sill of the front windows with additional height needed to meet code provided using a simple plane extension.

It is unclear from the plans whether the Applicant proposes replacing the porch flooring. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether the replacement of the porch flooring is proposed, and what the material of the existing porch flooring is. If the existing porch flooring is wood, staff recommends the porch flooring be replaced with a 1x4 – 1x5 wood tounge and groove material installed perpendicular to the front façade.

The proposed elevations show the retention of the original concrete porch steps, but the floor plans appear to show the installation of a new cheek wall. As Staff cannot find evidence of step cheek walls as original features of historic homes on the block the District regulations would not permit such a change. As such, Staff recommends the proposed floorplans be revised to match the design of the front porch steps shown on the proposed elevations.

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of non-original six over six windows on the side façades with two over two windows matching the style of 4 extant original windows on the property. Staff has no concerns with this change. However, if simulated divided lites are used on the proposed replacement windows, Staff recommends the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

The Applicant is proposing the removal of the asbestos shingle siding and the installation of new smooth faced cementitious siding. Given the profile of the window trim in relation to the asbestos siding, Staff finds it likely that the original wood lap siding is still extant beneath the asbestos shingle. Replacement of this original siding without a proper review would result in the unnecessary loss of historic materials. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant remove a small portion of the asbestos siding to determine whether the original wood lap siding is still in place and provide photographic documentation to Staff. If the original wood lap siding is still extant, Staff recommends it be retained and repaired in-kind. If the original wood lap siding is missing or beyond the point of repair as determined by Staff, smooth faced cementitious siding shall be allowed as a replacement product.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition to the existing principal structure. The addition will be inset from the interior lot line creating an addition which is easily distinguishable from the original structure. From the site plan provided by the Applicant, it appears that the addition is using the underlying zoning's setback regulations which are not applicable in the Historic District. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that this addition could use the setbacks of the existing structure, which would allow for an addition which is inset on both sides which would further add to the differentiation of the old and the new portions of the structure. Staff does recommend the original cornerboards be retained on the Peoples St. façade of the structure.

The addition will contain a ridgeline which is shorter than the main ridgeline of the principal structure and which will terminate in a rear facing gable. The existing structure is defined by both a front facing gable and a rear hip. As the rear hip will be retained in the proposed addition, Staff has no concerns with the proposed addition's roof form.

The Applicant proposes smooth faced cementitious siding for the addition, which is permitted by the District regulations. New windows will be installed which match the design of the extant original windows on the structure. Given Staff's previous recommendation regarding the muntins if simulated divided lite windows are used, Staff has no concerns with the proposed windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The proposed driveway shall be removed from the plans or redesigned so as to allow for parking in a compliant location, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4)(a);
2. Staff shall be permitted to review any changes to the proposed permeable paver walkway;
3. A concrete sidewalk inlaid with a hexagonal paver pattern shall be added to the Sparks St. and Peeples St. frontages, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(c);
4. The proposed porch rails shall be comprised of wood constructed using a two part-butt joint technique, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(e);
5. The top rail of the new railing shall be installed no higher than the bottom sill of the front windows with additional height needed to meet code provided using a simple plane extension, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(e);
6. The Applicant shall clarify whether the replacement of the porch flooring is proposed, and what the material of the existing porch flooring is.
7. If the existing porch flooring is wood, the porch flooring shall be replaced with a 1x4 – 1x5 wood tounge and groove material installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(e);
8. The proposed floorplans shall be revised to match the design of the front porch steps shown on the proposed elevations, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(e);
9. If simulated divided lites are used on the proposed new and replacement windows, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n)(2);
10. The Applicant remove a small portion of the asbestos siding to determine whether the original wood lap siding is still in place and provide photographic documentation to Staff, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(2);
11. If the original wood lap siding is still extant, it shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(2);
12. If the original wood lap siding is missing or beyond the point of repair as determined by Staff, smooth faced cementitious siding shall be allowed as a replacement product, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(2);
13. The original cornerboards shall be retained on the Peeples St. façade of the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(2); and,
14. 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: 505 Waldo Street
APPLICATION: RC-19-279
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Hansell Street and West of Glenwood Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory Structure

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-19-279 for 505 Waldo Street
July 10, 2019

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

The Applicant proposes to build an accessory structure at the rear of the property that will be used for a workshop. The proposed accessory structure will have limited or any visibility from other surrounding structures. The total amount of proposed lot coverage on the entire property after the accessory structure is built will be 33.1 percent. The underlying R-5 allows for 50 percent of coverage. District Regulations requires that accessory structure be either at the rear or side of the principal structure which this proposed accessory structure meets.

The Applicant is requesting a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA) to increase the maximum size allowed of an accessory structure from 30% to 86.7%. The Applicant has stated that most of the accessory structure is studio space and unfinished. Therefore, the unfinished space should not be considered in the heated and cool square footage calculation.

While the Applicant meets the District Regulations governing accessory structure as well as does not exceed the allowable 50% of lot coverage for R-5, it does not meet the standards set forth regarding maximum sized allowed for an accessory of 30%. Even though this is the case, BZA seems this proposal reasonable. Staff is not concerned with the accessory structure proposal.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 740 Clifton Rd.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-298 & CA3-19-299
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1913-1924

Property Location: Northwest corner of Ponce De Leon Ave. and Clifton Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics of the Dutch Colonial Revival style.

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. 16-120 & Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-298: Approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-299: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-120 & Sec. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow a reduction in the Clifton Rd. front yard setback from 129' (required) to 50' (proposed), to permit an accessory structure and swimming pool between the principal structure and Clifton Rd., and to permit a fence between the principal structure and Clifton Rd.

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 property's corner lot condition which creates double frontages along both Clifton Rd. and Ponce de Leon Ave. This leads to issues with required setbacks, placement of the active recreation feature (pool) and the accessory structure (pool house), and the location of the fence between the principal structure and a public ROW.

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

The Applicant states that the lot configuration would prevent the expansion of the pool area and the construction of a new accessory structure, which are both currently legally non-conforming with regards to their placement in relation to the principal structure. It would likewise prohibit a 6' high fence which is needed for safety requirements in the location proposed by the Applicant.

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

The Applicant again cites the corner lot/double frontage configuration of the property as the primary conditions which are peculiar to the property.

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

The Applicant cites the non-impact of the existing features in their non-conforming locations as primary evidence that relief would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. Staff would add that the existing vegetation along the Clifton Rd. frontage limits any potential visual impact on the public ROW.

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

Site work

The Applicant is proposing the removal of a non-contributing pool house, the installation of new pool facilities, and new fencing. Given Staff's previous findings with regards to the variances associated with the pool and fence, Staff has no concerns with the design of either of these two features.

With regards to the proposed accessory structure (pool house), Staff finds that the use of a hipped roof will differentiate the structure from the principal structure enough for accurate historic interpretation to take place. Further, the design of the structure is clearly secondary to the principal structure as would be expected for an accessory structure in the District. While Staff has no concerns with the design of the proposed structure as it relates to the District regulations, Staff would suggest that the Applicant consider altering the design to be more consistent with the Dutch Colonial Revival style of the principal structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-298: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-299: Approval with the following conditions:

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-120 & Sec. 16-201 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing a series of minor alterations to the structure. Staff generally does not have concerns with the proposed scope with a few exceptions.

The Applicant's narrative states the existing siding will be painted, while the elevations provided by the Applicant appear to show faux board and batten siding being installed. The existing siding appears to be vinyl, so Staff would have no concerns with the removal of this feature, but Staff finds that the original wood siding could still exist beneath the vinyl siding. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether siding replacement is proposed as part of this project. If siding replacement is proposed, Staff recommends the Applicant remove a small portion of the vinyl siding to determine whether the original wood lap siding is still in place and provide photographic documentation to Staff. If the original wood siding is still in place beneath the vinyl siding, Staff recommends it be retained and repaired in kind. If the original wood siding is missing, Staff recommends it be replaced with wood horizontal lap siding.

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of broken window glass. From the images in the District photographic inventory, Staff finds that none of the original windows were in place at the time of the District's designation. The windows shown in these photographs are vinyl. From the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds these vinyl windows are still in place. However it is unclear from the proposed scope which windows will be repaired and what the method of repair will be. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant detail the specific windows in need of repair and what the method of repair will be. Staff further recommends the window repair method meet the District regulations.

The Applicant proposes the replacement of the non original front door. No information on the proposed replacement door has been provided. As such, Staff recommends the replacement door be unclad wood with a rectangular lite division matching the size and style of original doors on the block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-299: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall clarify whether siding replacement is proposed as part of this project;
2. If siding replacement is proposed, the Applicant shall remove a small portion of the vinyl siding to determine whether the original wood lap siding is still in place and shall provide photographic documentation to Staff, per Sec. 16-201.006(4)(a)(4);
3. If the original wood siding is still in place beneath the vinyl siding, it shall be retained and repaired in kind, per Sec. 16-201.006(4)(a)(4);
4. If the original wood siding is missing, it shall be replaced with wood horizontal lap siding with a 4" to 6" reveal, per Sec. 16-201.006(4)(a)(4);
5. The Applicant shall detail the specific windows in need of repair and what the method of repair will be, per Sec. 16-201.006(4)(b);
6. The window repair method shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-201.006(4)(b);

CA2-19-293 for 937 Metropolitan Pkwy.

July 10, 2019

Page 3 of 3

7. The replacement door shall be unclad wood with a rectangular lite division matching the size and style of original doors on the block, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(3);
8. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File





CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 929 Charles Allen Dr.
APPLICATION: RC-19-288
MEETING DATE: July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: The school facilities comprise the entire block created by Charles Allen Dr., 8th St., Monroe Dr., and 10th St.

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.

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

The Applicant proposes a new modular classroom building to be placed between the front façade of the historic school building and Charles Allen Dr. No information has been received as to the reason for this classroom to be installed. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant discuss the need for the modular classroom structure. With temporary modular classrooms such as this, The Commission has typically asked the Applicant to give a specific date that the structure will be removed. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant discuss the timeframe that the structure will be in use and provide the date that it will be removed.

The proposed modular classroom building will be highly visible from both Eighth St. and Charles Allen Dr. and, due to its placement, will become the primary visual feature of the site. Staff finds that the proposed placement of the modular classroom structure in front of the historic school building is inappropriate as it drastically alters the public viewshed of the site. Staff finds that this proposal would also disturb the relationship of the historic structure to the street, specifically the spatial relationship created by the open lawn in front of the historic building. While other modular classroom structures exist on the property, they are located to the north of the historic school building adjacent to a parking lot. The location of these trailers allows for a non-impact on the public viewshed of the historic school building. Staff finds that this location is a more appropriate site for a building of this type. Staff suggests the Applicant discuss why the proposed structure could not be placed in a more appropriate location next to the existing modular classrooms.

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

cc: Applicant
File