



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: 2937 Collier Drive, NW
APPLICATION: CA3-19-335
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: West of Valley Heart Drive and East of Linkwood Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance for Painted to Remain on the brick

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: June 13, 2018, the Applicant come before the Urban Design Commission regarding alteration on the stated address where a Stop Work Order was placed and given to a prior owner. One violation was the unpainted brick was painted. The current owner was diligently working with Staff to remove the painted to no avail.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

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

VARIANCE

The Applicant seeks a variance on the above address. The Applicant is requesting the paint remain on the unpainted brick and has laid out his reasonings in the following standard set below:

EXTRA ORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL CONDITONS

The Applicant proposes that because the brick is textured decorative on this particular house which is not a traditionally flat brick, removing the paint is impossible because the textured brick absorbs paint.

ZONING ORDINANCE CREATE AN UNNESSARY HARDSHIP

The Applicant states, "The failure to give this home a variance would create a severe financial hardship on the owners of the home. The only company willing to remove the paint uses sodium blasting, costing thousand of dollars and additional costs to replace mortar and brick because the job would harm the home. This would also cause long adverse effects on the house, costing an unknown sum of money."

PECULIAR TO THE PROPERTY

The Applicant purports to have contacted several paint removal companies and most refused to touch removing this because of the textured brick which this house has.

RELIEF WOULDN'T BE DETRIMENTAL TO PUBLIC GOOD OR IMPAIR THE ZONING ORDIANCE

The Applicant argues that are eight homes in the community that have been painted and the name from these residences. His argument is the Urban Design Commission doesn't care about the color but the longevity of the brick and that the paint is set into the porous of the brick thus protecting the home

While the Applicant makes a compelling argument in criterias one and three that the porous brick makes it extremely difficult to remove paint from it; the Applicant arguments for required criterias two and four are not so convincing. Staff discuss two and four below,

- 2) Staff understands that financially this is a hardship for the Applicant, however the financial cost of complying with the zoning regulations is not a criteria for the granting of a variance. In fact, the paint removal is needed to allow the brick to sustain and survive. Staff agrees, that blasting is not an option. However, Staff maintains that there are other methods that could remove the paint in a gentler way. These ways may get most of the paint off but leave some in the porous crack, creating a distress that the Commission have approved prior.
- 4) The Applicant's argument regarding how if relief is granted would not create a substantial detriment to public good or impair the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is not relevant. If others have painted brick then actions to have these residents remove the paint is also in motion. So, the Applicant relying on others having their brick painted cannot be used. The Applicant is correct "color" is not a purview of the Commission, however, unpainted brick is. Not certain to how the paint is protecting the brick that the Applicant states.

In conclusion, Staff finds the Applicant arguments for one and three do meet the Variance requirement but two and four are not as convincing. As such, Staff cannot support the variance request as proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

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: 832 Springdale Road
APPLICATION: CA2-19-314
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019 deferred from July 24, 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: Window replacement

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: Windows were removed before coming to the UDC

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

Updated remarks in italicized bold.

WINDOW REPLACEMENT

The Applicant has indicated the original windows were rotten and many of the windows were non-original to the principal structure. Staff has not viable photos to support claim. To an already approved plans, the Applicant proposes to replace the existing windows with historically accurate windows that will match in-kind to the original windows. ~~Staff is not concerned with this proposal.~~ While, Staff does not agree with changing windows on a significant structure without following the proper procedures set by the District Regulations, Staff focus must be on the resolution of replacement windows. Since the Applicant has replaced the windows in-kind, Staff agrees with the proposed work.

At the July 24, 2019 Commission Meeting, it was decided that the Applicant should provided information that would support the in-kind replacement of the windows and provide official measurements of the windows. The Applicant provided this information along with the architect who measured the original windows.

The architect purports that in her profession opinion upon review of the existing windows, the previous work done on the windows by a prior owner has caused extensive damage to where the existing could not be repaired but must be replaced. Additionally, the architect assessed that many of the existing historic windows were not reflective of the character of windows on the house during that period.

The architect states in abiding by the Section 16-20B, (1)(f) in the Druid Hills Landmark District code, she based her measurements of the windows to ensure the windows were properly measured to include sizes, casings and mullion were preserved before ordering. She personally attests that the measurements were correct. On July 30, 2019, she personally visited the property to ensure that the dimensions were accurate and were reflected of the historic windows. She purports they are.

Staff still support the Applicant's replacement of the windows. As stated above Staff does not condone wholesale replacement of windows without following the proper procedure. However, being that this has taken place, the resolution is the focus. Additionally, the testimony of the architect is strong, she does lay out a compelling justification for replacement instead of repair. Since the architect is the profession and personally went back out to verify her measurement, Staff will lean on her professional opinion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

CA2-19-265 for 851 Springdale Road

June 26, 2019

Page 3 of 3

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Various Addresses
APPLICATION: RC-19-387
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Period of Significance: 1935-1960

Property Location: Approximately 154 Acres of park space bounded by Campbellton Rd. on the south, Delowe Dr., Boulevard Lorraine, and Venetian Dr. on the east, and Wilson Dr. on the north.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- Expansion of the National Register of Historic Places Boundary

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support of the National Register Nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff.

CONCLUSIONS: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of the architectural and historical significance of a building, structure, object, site, or district.

The nomination was sponsored by the Adams Park Foundation, Inc., and the nomination materials were prepared by members of the organization.

Analysis: The current proposal before the Commission for comment is the expansion of the boundaries of the 2012 National Register of Historic Places listing for Charles A. Adams Park. The new boundaries would include the Alfred "Tup" Holmes Golf Course (a.k.a. the Adams Park Golf Course). The listing was originally submitted under National Register of Historic Places Criteria A and C for Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, and Landscape Architecture. The updated boundaries are submitted under the same criteria as the original listing.

The Applicant states that the golf course, which was historically part of the park itself, was not included in the original listing due to a lack of information regarding the historical integrity of the course. However, the Applicant's research has shown that while the vegetation of the course has changed over time, the layout of the course is intact with regards to the period of significance of the park as a whole. Further, the Applicant has determined that the course retains the original rustic-style clubhouse and site features which are consistent with the designed portions of the park.

Staff agrees with the Applicant's assessment of the historical significance of the golf course and supports the proposed expansion of the listing boundaries.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff.

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: 688 Hill St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-346
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5.

Date of Construction: 1905

Property Location: The northeast corner of Hill St. and Pavilion St.

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to facades not facing a public street.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Application of regulations

The District regulations only give the Commission purview over those façades of the structure which directly face a public street. As the subject property is a corner lot Staff will limit their commentary to only the Hill St. and Pavilion St. façades.

The District regulations give two options for reviewing alterations to contributing structures such as the subject property. The alterations and additions may be consistent with and reinforce the historic character of the existing structure while complying with the applicable regulations for new construction, or, the alterations and additions may not destroy historic materials while also complying with the applicable regulations for new construction. As the project involves alterations to several different elements of the existing structure, Staff will discuss which criterion is appropriate for each project component in the body of their analysis.

Site plan

As the project involves an addition which will change the FAR of the property, a site plan will be required for permitting. Staff has not received a site plan for the review of this project. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide copies of a to-scale site plan showing the existing and proposed FAR and any site work proposed under the current project.

Porch alterations

At some point in the past, the front porch flooring, columns, and column bases were replaced. The existing columns are fluted craftsman style elements. The Applicant proposes replacing these features with new squared columns that are consistent with the style of the structure. As no historic materials will be removed or damaged by the replacement of the existing columns, and as the work meets the applicable regulations for new construction, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

The Applicant proposes the installation of new porch rails and balusters. From the drawings, the railing will be constructed using what appears to be traditional two-part butt-joint methods. As no historic materials will be removed or damaged by the installation of the new rails and balusters, and as the work meets the applicable regulations for new construction, Staff finds the proposal meets the District regulations. Staff would suggest, however, that the Applicant consider placing the top rail no higher than the bottom sill of the front porch windows and use simple plane extensions to achieve proper code compliant height to allow the new rails to interact with the front façade in a historically appropriate manner.

Shed dormer addition

A new shed dormer is proposed for the Pavilion St. façade of the structure. In general, Staff has no concerns with the design of the proposed addition and finds the addition is consistent with and reinforces the architectural character of the existing structure and meets the applicable regulations for new construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide copies of a to-scale site plan showing the existing and proposed FAR and any site work proposed under the current project;
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: 97 Howell Street and 99 Howell
APPLICATION: CA3-19-340
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King's Landmark District (subarea 2) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction 1920 (97 Howell Street) and New Construction for (99 Howell)

Property Location: East of Irwin Street and West of Old Wheat Street

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Folk Victorian (97 Howell) and New Construction (99 Howell)

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Subdivision (340) a New Construction (341)

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

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.

SUBDIVISION STANDARD

The Subdivision standard that governs the proposed work set forth by the applicant states that “That the proposed subdivision, consolidation or replat is substantially consistent with the historic character of the district and meets all lot requirements set forth in Chapter 20C; and That the proposed subdivision, consolidation or replat will facilitate development that furthers the historic qualities and regulations of the district. In addition, within Subareas 1 and 2, all subdivisions, consolidations or replats of parcels or lots shall conform to the historic platting pattern in these subareas with regard to lot size, dimensions, and configurations.”

The Applicant has submitted seven properties in the district that conform to the lot size, dimensions and configurations which match the subdivision proposal of the Applicant. The seven properties width have a range from 20 to 25. The proposed subdivision’s width of 24.45 fits into the greatest of 25 width. In addition, the configuration the Applicant proposes matches the seven properties. Staff has no issues with the subdivision of the proposed property.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The compatibility standard that governs over this proposed new construction is the blockface comparison. If there are not contributing properties, the Applicant can use the opposing block for comparisons purpose. If the opposing block can’t yield comparisons the district will suffice. The seven properties provided for the subdivision will be use for the compatibility standard.

LOT COVERAGE

The proposing lot coverage for the new construction is 3,251. Staff has no concern with this proposal. The permissible lot coverage is 5,300 sf.

HEIGHT

The Applicant has proposed 30 feet as the maximum height for the new construction. Staff has no concern for this proposal. The maximum height allowed between Irwin on the eastern side is 32 height. Additionally, the proposed 30 feet falls in the range of 21 to 34 feet for houses on the blockface. Height is determined by the compatibility. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

SETBACKS

Setbacks are determined by the compatibility standard. The Applicant has proposed a front yard setback of 17.5 feet. District regulations permit the nothing less than the minimum of 12. For the side yard the District regulations requires nothing less minimum of 3.0 feet. The Applicant proposes 5.4 for the south yard setback and 3.0 for the north side setback. The Applicant proposes a rear yard setback a 36.3 ‘the District Regulation requires no less the 6.0 feet. All the proposed setbacks the Applicant has listed meet the compatibility. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ROOF

The Applicant proposes to construct a gable roof with an 8-12 pitch on the front elevation and a flat gable roof over the front porch with a pitch of 3-12. The Applicant has not provided quantitative information on the comparison properties. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information as the roof types and pitch of the comparison properties. Photo provided does show a variety of roof forms for the primary roof and the porch roof.

Roof material

The Applicant proposes asphalt shingles for the roof material. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

SIDING

The Applicant proposes to install smooth face cementitious siding with a 5" reveal. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Cementitious siding is prevalent on the blockface and through out the District.

Trim and Corner Boards

The Applicant proposes to install 1x6 trim, 1x2 vertical trim at the corners and windows and doors and 1x8 Fascia boards. From photos provided for comparison, Staff can see trim surrounds the corners, windows and door as well as Fascia boards are prevalent on the contributing properties. However, Staff cannot determine the measurements of all the trim through a photo but can see if these elements are there. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

PORCH

The Applicant proposes a full porch with a 2x6 top rail, 2x4 sub and bottom and 2x2 pickets spaced on 4" O.C. max, with concrete or brick steps, risers and decorative columns. Staff is not concerned with the porch proposal. It is in line with other porches.

WINDOWS

The proposed windows are wood windows with simulated light divide. District regulations permits, simulated lite windows. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

FRONT DOOR

The Applicant has shown a front door on the proposed house. Staff recommends the front door be solid wood panel or single panel fixed light and should be composed of no more of no more than of 50% of glass.

FOUNDATION

The Applicant proposes concrete, cementitious with parge coat or brick foundation. District Regulations requires the foundation be brick, smooth face stucco or smooth face concrete. Staff recommends the Applicant construct the foundation either in brick, smooth face stucco or smooth face concrete to abide by the District regulations.

DECKS

The Applicant proposes to install a double deck on the rear of the house. The decks are at the rear of the house and no wider than the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

WALKWAY

The Applicant proposes a walkway between the street and the front porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CHIMNEY

On the plans, the Applicant has shown that a chimney is proposed for this built. Staff recommends that the chimney should be built from the grade and be brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide roof type and roof pitch information for the comparable properties for Staff review, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);
2. The foundation shall be either brick, smooth face stucco or smooth face concrete, per Sec.16-20C.002(c)(iii);
3. The chimney shall be built from the grade and be brick, per Sec.16-20C.008(2)(c)(iv) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1065 Peeples St.
APPLICATION: CA2-19-348
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1943

Property Location: West block face of Peeples St., south of Cordova St., north of Arlington St.

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to the rear façade.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: On May 31, 2019, the subject property received a Stop Work Order from the Office of Buildings for exterior and interior work without proper permits.

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 Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Plan Issues

The plans provided to Staff for review contain several errors and internal inconsistencies. Staff recommends the Applicant provide updated plans that are internally consistent and which accurately reflect both the existing and proposed conditions of the structure.

Photographs

The only photographs for this project are those that were provided by the City's inspection Staff. While these photographs show much of the existing structure, particularly areas where work has occurred, they do not show the entire structure. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic documentation of each façade of the structure so that Staff can properly review the existing and proposed work.

Site plan

The Applicant is proposing the removal of an existing deck and the installation of a new deck in the same location. The photographs taken by the inspector show the deck has already been removed. Staff has not received a site plan for this project, which will be required for permitting. Staff recommends the Applicant provide an accurate to-scale site plan showing the existing conditions and any proposed work.

Windows

Per the Applicant's proposal, all windows on the property are to be replaced. Staff has not received information detailing the condition of any window on the site, other than the photographs taken by the City's inspection Staff. This photograph shows an intact 6 over 6 true divided lite wood window on a rear façade. The remaining windows are boarded over and obscured. Staff recommends the Applicant provide unobscured photographic documentation of each window proposed for replacement and key the photographs to a floorplan for Staff to review.

Staff has not received information on the proposed replacement windows. Given the information on the existing window's that Staff has found in their research, Staff finds that the original windows were 6 over 6 double-hung windows made of wood. As such, the replacement product for any window on this property would be a 6 over 6 unclad wood window. If simulated divided lites are used, they are required to be dimensional, integral to the sash, and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass. Staff recommends the Applicant provide manufacturer specs for a replacement window product that meets the District regulations.

The Applicant's drawings show windows on the existing right side façade of the gable wing extension. Staff's research has shown these elements do not currently exist. Staff recommends the windows on the gable wing extension be removed from the existing elevations.

The Applicant's drawings show a transom accent window on the existing and proposed right side façade. Staff's research has shown this element is currently a double-hung window with one 6 over 6 true divided lite sash in place. Staff recommends the drawings be revised to accurately reflect the

existing conditions of the windows on the right side façades. As this feature is original to the structure, the District regulations will require the opening to be retained. Further, based on the photograph available to Staff, the frame and sash of this window appear intact and in repairable condition. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant revise their drawing to show the double-hung window on the right side façade as retained and repaired with only the missing bottom sash being replaced with an unclad wood window

Siding

The Plans show all siding on the property to be retained. Staff notes the district inventory and inspection photographs show a mixture of wood and cement lap siding on the property. Staff recommends the Applicant confirm their plans to retain all existing siding on the front and side façades of the property.

The Applicant's drawings show the corner board between the main massing of the structure and the gable wing extension as being removed on both the existing and proposed drawings. Staff recommends the corner board between the main massing of the structure and the gable wing extension be retained and shown on the plans.

Roofline alterations

The existing gable wing extension has a side facing gable set approximately 2.5' lower than the ridge of the principal roof. The plans provided by the Applicant show the feature containing a roofline matching the height of the principal roof on the front elevation. The right-side elevation shows the correct placement of the side gable wing but shows the structure with a shingled hipped roof. Staff recommends the plans be revised to show the correct roofline and roof form over the gable wing extension.

The Applicant's drawings show the rear roofline changing from a shed roof to a rear-facing gable roof. However, the photograph's provided by the Inspection staff show the rear shed roof has been reframed. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their intention for the rear roof alterations.

The Applicant's drawings do not show the gable returns on the gable over the front stoop. Staff recommends the plans be revised to show the gable returns on the front stoop.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide updated plans that are internally consistent, and which accurately reflect both the existing and proposed conditions of the structure;
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation of each façade of the structure so that Staff can properly review the existing and proposed work;
3. The Applicant shall provide an accurate to-scale site plan showing the existing conditions and any proposed work;
4. The Applicant shall provide unobscured photographic documentation of each window proposed for replacement and key the photographs to a floorplan for Staff to review;
5. The Applicant shall provide manufacturer specs for a replacement window product that meets the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n);
6. The windows on the gable wing extension shall be removed from the existing elevations;

7. The Applicant shall revise their drawing to show the double-hung window on the right side façade as retained and repaired with only the missing bottom sash being replaced with an unclad wood window, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
8. The Applicant shall confirm their plans to retain all existing siding on the front and side façades of the property, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
9. The corner board between the main massing of the structure and the gable wing extension shall be retained and shown on the plans, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
10. The plans shall be revised to show the correct roofline and roof form over the gable wing extension, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
11. The Applicant shall clarify their intention for the rear roof alterations, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
12. The plans shall be revised to show the gable returns on the front stoop, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
13. 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: 479 Old Wheat St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-338 & CA3-19-339
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 1) / Beltline **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: South blockface of Old Wheat St., east of Hogue St., West of Boulevard NE.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction and Variances.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-389: Approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-389: Approval with conditions.

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

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow a reduction in the side and rear yard setbacks from 7' to 3' and an increase in the maximum lot coverage from 60 to 72%.

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 small size of the lot as the primary condition of the site which is extraordinary and exceptional.

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 size would only permit a structure measuring 19' by 19.7'. The Applicant further states that a structure of this size would be unfeasible for the project.

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

The Applicant cites the existence of a historic structure with similar side and rear setbacks and a similar lot coverage on the subject property which was removed at some point in the past.

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 compatibility of the proposed structure with the historic architectural character of the neighboring properties.

According to the Sanborn fire insurance maps, the subject property was once a part of a larger, but narrow, lot comprised of 479 & 483 Old Wheat St. The property originally contained 3 duplexes which, based on their size, were likely single room homes. Due to the limits of the records, available Staff cannot confirm the exact setbacks of the historic duplex at the subject property. However, Staff finds that the proposed 3' side and rear yard setbacks, as well as the proposed lot coverage, are similar in width to those of the historic duplexes that once defined this block face. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed setback reduction. Further, Staff finds that the Applicant's responses meet the criteria for granting a variance.

New Construction

Site plan

Per the District regulations, the front yard setback of new construction is based on the Compatibility rule. The block face contains only one contributing structure, located at 53 Boulevard NE. This property is setback 6.3' from Old Wheat St. The new structure on the subject property has been

designed to conform with this setback. Given Staff's findings regarding the variance request for the side and rear setbacks, Staff finds the setback regulations have been met.

Given Staff's findings regarding the variance request for the lot coverage, Staff finds the lot coverage requirements have been met.

Height

As the only contributing structure on the block face faces Boulevard NE., the Applicant has elected to use the opposing block face for architectural compatibility. In the past, the Commission and Staff have supported this practice where comparable properties are not present on the block face in question. The comparable properties for this project will be 482, 483, and 496 Old Wheat St.

Per the compatibility information submitted by the Applicant, the height range set by the comparable properties is a minimum of 18' and 35'. The proposed structure has a height of 35' as measured from average grade to the ridge. As such, Staff finds the proposed structure meets the height requirements.

Fenestration

Staff finds the proposed fenestration patterns meet the compatibility rule. The District regulations require new windows to be compatible with the style and material of the historic windows on comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed windows be unclad wood. If simulated divided lites are used, Staff recommends the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Per the District regulations, the front door is vertically oriented and facing the street. Staff recommends the front door be wood and composed of no more than 50 percent glass.

Porch

Per the District regulation, a porch is provided and is comprised of elements which are compatible with the comparable properties and which meet the District regulations.

Per the District regulations, a walkway leading from the front porch to the sidewalk is provided.

Siding and foundation

The Applicant proposes smooth faced cementitious siding with a reveal of 6" as is permitted by the District regulations. A parge coated concrete block or brick foundation is proposed. Staff finds either material would meet the District regulations.

Roof

The proposed structure contains a hipped roof which is compatible with the comparable properties. However, no compatibility information has been submitted regarding the proposed 7 in 12 roof pitch. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-339: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-338: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The proposed windows shall be unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(i);
2. If simulated divided lites are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(b)(iii);
3. The proposed door shall be wood and composed of no more than 50 percent glass, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(b)(iii);
4. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii); and,
5. 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: 2852 Cascade Rd. (Cascade Springs Nature Preserve)
APPLICATION: RC-19-389
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-3.

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: South block face of Cascade Rd. SW, east of Harbin Rd. SW, west of Woodland Ter.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Park/greenspace.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work relating to trail improvements.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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

The project before the Commission for comments is the installation of new trail infrastructure at the Cascade Springs Nature Preserve. From the information provided, the proposed trail consists of a raise board walk comprised of pressure treated lumber set on precast concrete curbing. The project documents are not clear as to whether this trail is a new feature, the formalization of an existing feature, or a replacement of existing trail facilities. Staff suggests the Applicant discuss the existing conditions of the site.

Regarding the material choice, Staff finds the use of lumber an appropriate material for this application but will require periodic maintenance to ensure the boardwalk remains in usable condition. Staff suggests the Applicant detail the planned maintenance cycle for the boardwalk.

Lastly, as this project involves improvements to a public amenity Staff suggests the Applicant discuss the public outreach efforts that went into the design process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Various Addresses
APPLICATION: RC-19-387
MEETING DATE: August 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Period of Significance: 1914-1948

Property Location: Multi-block area bounded by Glenwood Ave. to the south and Sanders Ave. to the north. Includes only those properties associated with the original 1914 Stonewall Park Subdivision.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

- National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Nomination

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 6-4043

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support of the National Register Nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff.

CONCLUSIONS: In its capacity as a Certified Local Government, the City of Atlanta is given the opportunity to comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places provides recognition by the federal government of the architectural and historical significance of a building, structure, object, site, or district.

The nomination was sponsored by property owners Maureen Kelly and Paul Larkin, and the nomination materials were prepared by Morrison Design, LLC

Analysis: The proposed Stonewall Park Historic District is a small collection of north-south oriented residential blocks within the larger Ormewood Park neighborhood. The Applicant's research shows the area has been settled since the late 1800's when an unincorporated settlement labeled the "Faith Community" appeared on maps in 1872. Initial platting of the area appears to have been performed in the 1880's. The area was incorporated into the City of Atlanta in 1909. Stonewall R. Jacobs purchased the land in 1914 and platted the Stonewall Park Subdivision the same year with replating occurring in 1917.

The residential structures express characteristics of early to mid-20th-century architecture and exhibit a mixture of common building materials of this era. The extant historic structures retain both their architectural integrity and their original platting pattern, with the exception of several small additions noted by the Applicant.

Staff agrees with the Applicant's assessment of the historical significance of the proposed District and supports the nomination proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support of the National Register nomination to the Historic Preservation Division Staff.

cc: Applicant
File