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: **476-484 Edgewood Avenue**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-362**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Varies

Property Location: Northeast corner of Boulevard and Edgewood Avenue

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Two-story Commercial

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Lot consolidation

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: NA

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: CA2S-18-444 – Staff review and approval of exterior alterations to three existing buildings

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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

In October, 2018, the Staff reviewed and approved an application for extensive renovations and alterations to the exterior of the buildings. The type of alterations and renovations proposed at that time all fell within the Staff Review parameters as outlined by the District regulations. That work is underway, following the approved plans.

As a part of that renovation process, the new uses of the buildings needed to provide two means of emergency egress from the buildings. Given that the three buildings occupy almost all their respective properties, there was not a way to provide official emergency egress without having to cross onto another property, which is not permitted by the building code. If the properties were consolidated than emergency egress could be provided through and among the buildings themselves without having to cross a property line.

Given that the proposed lot consolidation will not alter the exterior of the existing buildings or result in new development on the site (the site is almost entirely covered by the existing buildings), the Staff finds that the proposed consolidation is "substantially consistent with the historic character of the District" and meets all the lot requirements in the District regulations.

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: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **393 Hopkins St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-363**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1927-1928

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

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics common To colonial revival styles.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window alterations

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: At the December 13, 2019 public hearing, the Commission approved application CA2-19-488 for alterations and site work at this address. One of the conditions placed on the project were that the original windows be retained. In February of 2018, Staff received notice from the neighborhood that all windows had been replaced on the property in violation of the Commission's approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Windows

The original windows on the structure have been removed in violation of the Commission's approval of the project. As the windows were removed in early 2018 and are no longer on site, Staff finds their retention and re-installation would not be feasible. In comparing the windows shown in both the Applicant's proposal and the Inspection files for the Stop Work Order, Staff finds that the windows currently installed on the front and side facades do not match the size of the original windows. Most notably, the new windows are much smaller than the originals. Trim has been applied to the exterior to cover up the gap left by the smaller window in the original opening. Additionally, in looking at the muntins on the replacement windows, Staff finds that the muntins are much wider than those on the original windows and are not integral to the sash as required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the front and side façades be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals. Staff further recommends that the muntins on the new windows match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

Doors

The Applicant notes repairs to the existing front door, but no information regarding what repairs are needed has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door. Staff further recommends the existing front door be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door.

Previous conditions

Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The windows on the front and side façades shall be removed and replaced with unclad wood windows which match the size of the originals, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
2. The muntins on the new windows shall match the width of the original windows and, if simulated divided lite windows are used, the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(c);
3. The Applicant shall provide Staff with a list of repairs required on the front door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
4. The existing front door shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(a);
5. The Applicant shall confirm that the only door being installed is the rear door;
6. All previous conditions of approval for CA2-17-488 shall be retained; and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **675 Elbert Street, SW**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-377**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: **1920**

Property Location: **West of Metropolitan Parkway and East of Mayland Street**

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Fence Construction

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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

FENCE

The Applicant proposes to construct a 6-foot dog eared fence on the rear and sides of the property that will not obscure front of the yard. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **1126 Arlington Avenue SW**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-328**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019 deferred from August 14, 2019 and July 24, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: **Corner lot of Arlington Avenue and Princess Avenue**

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Building permits were issued for interior work only starting from December 2018 to April 2019. First time coming in front of the Urban Design Commission. Work on the exterior already commenced.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

Updated Comments in red for Plans submitted: August 26, 2019

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

PLANS
Being that the Applicant has proposed a fence on the site, the site plans will also need to show FAR calculations to meet the underlying R4-A zoning requirements. Staff recommends the Applicant provide three to-scale plans that show setback and FAR information. The existing and proposed elevations are not accurate. Staff speaks to this throughout the Staff Report.

A site plan was submitted with new elevations. However, the site plan does not indicate the FAR information that is needed. Additionally, the site plan is showing the house with an existing covered porch. However, the Applicant is proposing to remove the cover porch. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a to-scale site plan that show FAR information and doesn't show the covered porch.

ALTERATIONS
The principal structure is on a half-depth lot. This means all sides of the house is visible from the public-away, all the sides of the house will be up for review.

Roof
The Applicant has not proposed any new changes to the roof except for re-shingle with three-tab shingles. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. However, it should be noted that on the front elevation wings on the gable roof appear to be larger than what is depicted in the inventory photos. With this said, these proposed wings are problematic, and Staff cannot support this change. Staff recommends, the Applicant modify the wings and design to reflect what was originally on the principal structure to abide by the District Regulations.

From the new plans submitted, it appears the Applicant has reduced the wing gables. The ridge line is now below the peak of the Gable roof and appears to be reflective of what was there originally. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Windows
The windows displayed on the plans are not accurate to the windows shown in inventory photos and the photos of the windows are not accurate to the plans or inventory photos. On the front elevation lower level, at the front entrance, the inventory photos show two sets of three vertical wood windows that are grouped together with wood trim which appears to be one over one from what Staff can observe. However, the plans the Applicant provided show the larger vertical windows to be two sets of double hung lite divide with minimum trim. Photos provided by

Applicant shows the larger vertical windows but without lite divide. Windows appear to be vinyl windows.

On the second floor, the inventory photos show four smaller vertical windows than what is on the first level that are grouped together. They appear to be one over one with wood trim. On the other hand, the Applicant has provided plans that show these windows to be two larger windows that mimic the lower level windows with lite divide with little trim. Photos provided by the Applicant shows windows not to have lite divides and the windows appear to be vinyl windows.

From the limited amount of inventory photos of the principal property, Staff assessment of the remaining elevations cannot be done thoroughly. The Applicant has provided conflicting plans and photos, so Staff wonders if the plans provided by the Applicant are accurate regarding the side and rear elevations windows. And with the work already been done, Staff has nothing to go by regarding accuracy for the side elevations or rear windows.

Even said, the District Regulations is clear that original windows shall remain, and any replacement windows allowed shall retain the shape and size of the original shape. The style of the windows should be determined by the compatibility standard on the blockface, divided lites with muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to exterior glass of the window.

Staff recommends first, the Applicant return the windows on the lower level to the two sets of three windows grouped; these windows be wood, which would have been the windows material during this time frame. As Staff has noted the inventory photos are not clear enough to show the lite divide or material and it appears the windows are one over one. So, Staff recommends the windows remain one over one. Staff also recommend the windows return to the appropriate sizes that are reflected in the inventory photos to meet the District Regulations.

On the second level, Staff also recommends the windows return to the four grouped windows that are shown in the inventory photo. These windows shall be wood with wood trim, one over one and be the appropriate size as shown in the inventory photo.

If there were any original wood windows on the side and rear elevations that were changed regarding material, shape and size; they should be returned to their originality.

The Applicant has taken the windows back to the original windows and trim on the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch

The original house was a duplex and had two screened porches. The Applicant proposes to remove the screen from the porches and construct a full porch which will include railings, columns and stairs. District Regulations requires front porch to be designed by the compatibility standard regarding actual design and size and consist of roofs, balustrades, columns and steps with closed risers. The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information so that Staff can review the porch proposal thoroughly. Staff recommends the Applicant provide

compatibility information of contributing structures on the blockface for comparison of the design and style of the front porch.

Porch elements

roof

The Applicant has proposed a gable roof over the porch. Since the design of porch is determined by the compatibility standard, Staff reserves to comment on this porch element until the compatibility information is provided by the Applicant.

balustrades/railings

The Applicant proposes rod iron railings with guard rail to abided by the building code. Rod iron would not be a material used during the construction of the principal structure. Staff recommends the railings be wood with a two-part butt-joint head construction, no higher than the front window seal with a plain extension to meet the building code.

floor

It appears from the photos that the Applicant proposes wood floors for the front porch. Staff recommends the floor be perpendicular in orientation.

ceiling

Staff can't see the ceiling proposed on the porch but does recommend the ceiling be board and batten wood ceiling

stairs

It appears from the front photo that the Applicant provided that the steps on the front stairs have a railing. Staff recommends the Applicant construct closed risers to abide by District Regulation.

The Applicant proposes to return the porch back to the original two porches with screens. In doing so, the Applicant will only repair porch elements in-kind if need be. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend the Applicant specify which porch elements will be repaired in-kind.

Foundation Painted Brick

The Applicant proposes to paint the brick foundation. From inventory photos it appears as if the foundation may have been painted. District Regulation permit painted masonry to be repainted. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

Siding and Trim

From the proposed elevation, it appears the Applicant only wants to paint the siding and wood trim. Painting is not apart of the purview of the Commission. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

From the elevations, the Applicant has proposed six panel doors. However, the Applicant has not indicated what material the doors will be. District regulations requires exterior doors to be wood with six-panel or fixed glass panel in a wood frame or subject to the compatibility

standard on the blockface. Since the Applicant has proposed a six-panel door, Staff recommends it be a wood six panel door.

The Applicant new proposal does not include wood panel doors, but screen does that will be on the screened porches. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck
The Applicant shows on one photo a deck on the rear of the principal structure that doesn't extend beyond the side, although doesn't show it on the submitted plan. District Regulation. Staff is not concerned about the deck; however, Staff does recommend the Applicant correct the plans to reflect the deck if one is to be constructed.

On the new site plan shows the existing deck on the rear of the existing structure. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Fence
The Applicant proposes a 6-ft wood privacy fence with a 3 feet gate to be constructed on the property. Because this property is on a half-depth lot, District Regulations fences in a half-depth lot can not be over 4ft. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by District Regulations and construct the fence accordingly.

Walkway
District Regulation requires a walkway to be constructed from the sidewalk to the front stairs. Staff can't determine if the there is a walkway present already. Staff recommends the Applicant either construct a sidewalk or clear what is there to reflect a sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide 3 to-scale site plans that state setbacks and FAR information, per Sec.16-20M.001;

2. Any original wood windows on the side and rear elevations shall be returned to wood and taking them back to their original shape and size, per Sec.16-20M.013(n)(o);

3. The Applicant shall specify if any porch elements will be repaired or replace in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2);

4. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulation regarding fences construction on a half-depth lot, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(l)(1);

5. A paved walkway shall be added from the sideway or be cleared if one is there, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d) and

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

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **827 Elbert Street, SW**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-361**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location: **East of Allene Avenue and West of Murphy Avenue**

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

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

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

PLANS

The Applicant has not provided site plans. However, due to the added space requirement, FAR information must be provided along with setback information. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide plans that include a to-scale site plan that reflect the FAR information and setback information.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes the following alterations to the principal structure: Addition for new interior renovation, new roof in the rear, remove screen off porch, new windows, cementitious siding, replacement of roof material and painting of CMU foundation.

ADDITION

On the left elevation, there is a recess area that Applicant proposes to bump out and add an 8 ft addition to allow for a master bathroom. It appears as if the added space will not go pass the front façade and will be in align with the existing structure and will not exceed the side setback, however a site plan with visual setback information could confirm this supposition. Overall Staff is not concern with this proposal.

ROOF IN REAR

The Applicant proposes to change a flat roof that is at the rear of the existing structure. The proposal is to change the flat room into a small gable roof. The gable roof is proposed with a 12:4 pitch, that will not pier over the existing roofline. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

REMOVE SCREEN

The Applicant proposes to remove the screen off the existing brick porch. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

WINDOWS

Overall the Applicant has proposed to replace all the existing windows and install double hung double panel wood windows of varying sizes. The Applicant has also provided a window schedule and tied that to the plans. There are several regulations from the District that dictates for windows. One of which states the original windows and trim shall be retained. Another state that if replacements are permitted they must match original in style, size, material and shape. The Applicant has not provided photos of each window on the existing structure but has provided a schedule. And from the photos the have been provided, it appears as if the windows are original, in good condition and needs repair not replacement. Staff notes two concerns: 1) the conditions of the windows do not appear to be dire, 2) from the new proposed elevations, it appears many of the existing window sized are being altered, which is a violation of the District Regulations. With these two concerns, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide photographic evidence to merit each window replacement before removal. Staff also recommends that if removal is justified, the replacement must be the same style, size, material and shape of the original to abide by the District Regulations.

SIDING

The Applicant proposes to install horizonal cementitious siding on rear elevation on the left and right -side elevations on the new addition. Staff isn't concerned with the proposal.

ROOF MATERIAL
Architectural shingles are proposed for the roof material on the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

PAINT FOUNDATION
The Applicant proposes to paint the CMU Foundation. Staff has not concern with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1) The Applicant shall provide a to-scale site plan that includes FAR and setback information, per Sec 16-20I.001;
2) The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence of each window to determine each windows feasibility per, Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
3) If the window is permitted to be replaced, the replacement shall be the same style, size, material and shape as the original window, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(3) and
4) Final plans and photos to be reviewed by Staff for final 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: **774 Tift Avenue, SW**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-385**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: **1912**

Property Location: **West of Hugh Street and East of Shelton Avenue**

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order was placed due to work without a permit. Placed on March 15, 2019

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: **Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission Meeting**

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

PLANS

The plans submitted by the Applicant are missing some elements. In the gable roof over the porch, the Applicant has not shown the vent. Although, the vent in the photos is not the original vent. It needs to be shown on the plans that a vent is in the gable. Staff recommends, the Applicant show on the elevation the vent, retain the vent and install what vent was there or a vent that is compatible to what is in the subarea or what was originally there. The railings shown on the plans and those shown on the plans are not matching. The railings on the plans are denser. Staff recommends the Applicant reflect the railings correctly. The brackets in the gable roof are missing on the plans. It is important these be shown and retained. Staff recommends the brackets be added to the plans accurately and retained.

Alterations

Work was proceeded on the principal structure without a permit. The alterations were siding replacement, windows replacement and rearrangement as well as resizing a window, adding shake to the gable roof and adding a deck to the rear of the property.

Siding Replacement

Purposed cementitious siding is planned for the existing structure. The siding photos provided by the Applicant show that the siding is asbestos. District Regulations requires that all replacement siding shall match the original in scale and direction. Staff suggests that from what siding is remaining on the house, to remove the asbestos to see if original wood clapboard siding would have been on the house provide photographic evidence of the removal. If this is the case, it is preferred the Applicant replace with the wood clapboard siding. However, the Applicant is permitted to use horizonal cementitious siding if the original trim, facia and corner boards remain. From photos sent of the house, Staff deems maintaining the original trim, facia and corner boards on the entire principal structure isn't possible. Therefore, Staff recommends the Applicant install horizonal cementitious siding and install wood trim, facia and corner boards to accurately reflect those elements on the principal structure which will match the wood windows.

Gable siding

In the gable the Applicant proposes shake siding. In order for the Applicant to install shake in the gable, the Applicant must provide evidence of shake siding in subarea 1. Staff recommends the Applicant provide evidence on other compatible houses in subarea with shake siding in the gable or install cementitious siding to match what has been recommended for the principal structure.

Windows

Plans show the replacement windows to be one over one windows with trim. The Applicant has not indicated what material the windows or trim will be. As with siding, District Regulations requires original wood and trim remain. However, from photos presented by the Applicant the windows and trim are gone. Being that this is case, the District Regulation requires replacement windows to match the original in style, material, shape and size. Allowing only for a difference of one-inch width in height. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District Regulations and install wood windows that will match the windows in style, material, shape and size. Inventory photos shows original windows were wood and one over one.

On the left side elevation, the Applicant has changed the fenestration pattern of the windows and made one window smaller. Staff cannot discern why the Applicant made this change. The Applicant has not provided floor plans. Staff recommends the Applicant provide an explanation of why the window was moved. However, making the window smaller, would not abide by the District Regulations which states that there should only be a difference of one-inch width in height in replacement windows. Staff recommends the Applicant install the same size window as was there originally.

Porch railings
The railings shown on the porch and one the one photo the Applicant showed, appeared to be original to the principal structure and good condition. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the railings and repair in-kind.

Foundation
The Applicant has proposed brick veneer for the foundation. Inventory photos indicates the foundation was brick. Staff recommends the foundation be brick.

Chimney
Inventory photos and the photo provided by the Applicant show the principal structure had a chimney, in fact two. Staff recommends the chimneys be reinstalled and brick to match what was there originally.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission Meeting

1. The Applicant shall show the vent in the gable, retain the vent and install the vent to accurately reflex what was originally there, per Sec. 16-20I.001;
2. The Applicant shall show accurate porch railings on the plan, per Sec.16-20I.001;
3. The brackets on the gable shall be added to the plans and retained, per Sec.16-20I.001;
4. The Applicant shall install horizontal cementitious siding, with the installation of wood trim, facia and corner boards, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(a)(4);
5. The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence of other compatible houses with shake in the gable in subarea 1 or install cementitious siding in the gable that matches the recommended siding on the existing principle structure, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(a)3) and Sec.16-20I.006(4)(a)(4);
6. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulations and install windows that match windows in style, material shape and size with only a difference of one-inch in width in height. Inventory reflects the windows were one over one wood no mullions or muntins, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(3);
7. The Applicant shall provide an explanation of the window movement on the left elevation, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b);
8. The Applicant shall install the same size window as was there originally on the left elevation, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(3);
9. The porch railings shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(g);
10. The foundation shall be brick not faux brick, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(c)(1);
11. The two chimneys shall be reinstalled and be bricked to match what was there originally, per Sec.16-20I.006 (4)(e)(1) and
12. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

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 28th deferred from August 14th and 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: Defer until the August 28th Meeting

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

UPDATES IN RED in italicized bold.

WINDOW REPLACEMENT

The Applicant has indicated the original windows were rotten and many of the windows were nonoriginal to the principal structure. Staff has no 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. 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 and her notarized statement.

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 had caused extensive damage to where the existing windows could not be repaired but had to 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 Section 16-20B, (1)(f) in the Druid Hills Landmark District code, she took 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 visited the property to ensure that the dimensions were accurate and reflected of the historic windows. She purports they are.

Staff still supports the Applicant 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 has to be the focus. Additionally, the testimony of the architect is strong, she does lay out compelling justification for replacement. Since the architect is the profession and personally went back out to verify her measurements, Staff will lean on her professional opinion.

At the August 14, 2019 Urban Design Meeting, it was noted that the Applicant had also removed the picture window on the front as well as side lights. With this new information, the Commission deferred this case, until the August 28, 2019 meeting. At this meeting the Applicant was told to bring the following:

1) **An actual order for the windows- (shop drawings as you mention)**
2) **Inventory of what windows were delivered on site and still at the shop, what windows were installed and what will be installed (missing)**

3) A shop drawing of the door and side lite.

Along with these items, a site visit needed to happen before the August 28 meeting. Preferably an inspector from the City, Doug Young and myself were to go. On August 23, 2019, I attend the site visit with Mr. Hudson. The City Inspector along with Doug Young couldn't make it. At that visit, I requested Ms. Jan Jones to attend. Ms. Jones is the Druid Hills Landmark Preservation Committee, President However, upon her arrival Mr. Hudson told her she was not welcomed on his property. After a period of conversing with the three of us, I looked around the property. What I observed was the windows that replaced the original were in the openings and appeared to be a good substitute and the openings appear to be original and not tampered with at all . Mr. Hudson said his intentions are to replace the boarded up opening with the picture window that was offsite as well as the replace the side lights.

Mr. Hudson has not turned in the other required information listed above, so my assumption is that his intentions are to turn that in at the August 28 meeting. I have emailed him to ask of the status and reminded him if he plans to turn that information in at the meeting, please remember to provide enough copies.

At this point, Staff reserve the right to defer until the meeting to determine if Mr. Hudson's provides the supplemental information listed above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer until the August 28th 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: **788 Tift Avenue, SW**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-393**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: **1974**

Property Location: **West of Hugh Street and East of Shelton Avenue**

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck construction, Roof Alteration

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: Approval for Application CA2-18-145 for retaining wall and 4ft fence.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

PLANS

The Applicant's property is on a corner lot; therefore, all sides of the principal structure can be viewed by the public right-away. Additionally, the Applicant has proposed a deck, a site plan is needed with setbacks and FAR information. Staff recommends that Applicant provide a to-scale site plan that will include setback and FAR information.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes two changes to the principal structure: a new deck and a new roof construction and dormers.

Deck

The proposed deck will be constructed in the rear of the principal structure and will not extend beyond the side of the principal structure. However, District Regulations states that deck can be constructed only if they are not visible from the public-away. Since this principal structure is on a corner lot the deck can be seen and therefore is prohibited in the District. To alleviate the burden on the Applicant not being able to construct a deck, Staff recommends, some sort of screen be constructed to hide the deck or plant tall trees or foliage to conceal the deck.

Roof Alteration

The Applicant proposes to alter a roof to build the deck by cutting the rear of the gable roof off thus creating a very district drop that can be seen by the public right-away. District Regulations requires the shape of roofs to be determined by the compatibility rule which states that "the compatibility rule is a method of requiring that alterations and new construction are sensitive and sympathetic to existing elements of design, scale and general character of the district with particular attention to the immediate environment constituting a particular block. In accordance with this purpose, the compatibility rule is as follows: "To the maximum extent possible, the element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall substantially match that which predominates on that block. When elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor heights, they shall equal the statistical average of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

The Applicant has not provided any information that supports the roof form proposed. Further research by Staff demonstrates there are no other principal structures on the block that possess a cut off roof form as the Applicant proposes. Staff find this problematic and recommends the Applicant not alter the roof form, rather must retain the current roof form to abide by the District Regulations.

Dormer

The Applicant proposes to add a wide- out -dormer with three windows and a metal roof. The ridge line of the dormer will meet the existing ridge line of the principal structure. Dormer additions in the District are not new. However, the Applicant's proposed dormer with the metal roof is unorthodox. Staff deems the proposed dormer does not reinforce the historic characteristics of the District subarea and is not compatible with other dormers in that subarea. Staff recommends the Applicant construct a dormer that is reflective of dormers in the subarea by reducing the size and the roof material be asphalt shingles to match the existing roof material on the principal structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide a to-scale site plan that reflect the setbacks and FAR information, per Sec. 16-20I.001;
2. If the deck is permit, the Applicant shall construct a screen to hide the deck or conceal it from the public-away, through a screen construction or planting of tall trees or foliage, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(f)(4);
3. The Applicant shall not alter the roof form, rather the Applicant shall retain the roof and leave as is to abide by the District Regulations, per Sec.16-20I.005(1);
4. The Applicant shall construct a dormer that is reflective of dormers on the block by reducing the size and adding asphalt shingles to the roof to match the existing roof material on the principal structure, per Sec.16-20I.005(1) and
5. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

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: **1230 Fairview Rd.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-390**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: North block face of Fairview Rd., east of Briarcliff Rd., west of Springdale Rd.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of the Assymetrical subtype of the Italian Renaissance style.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Roofline alterations

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

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

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 Section Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that the plan set provided by the Applicant shows several alterations to the structure that were completed at some point in the past. The only items the Commission is considering under the current application is the alterations to the rooflines of the structure.

The Applicant is proposing several sets of roofline changes to the existing structure. Firstly, The Applicant proposes changing the front porch roof pitch to a 2:12 sloped hipped roof. The Applicant states that the existing roof contains approximately a 2:12 pitch roof that is "swooped" as opposed to hipped. Staff finds that the proposal would be consistent with other secondary roofs on the structure, namely the side porch area over the main entry. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed change. However, Staff recommends the existing roof eaves and decorative brackets of the front porch be retained in place.

The second alteration involves the roofline over a rear shed addition on the left side of the structure. from the photographs and plans provided, Staff finds that the addition was tied into the side façade using stucco, and the only architectural element signifying the area is a later addition to the structure is the shed roof form. The Applicant's proposal would tie the addition into the side facing hip of the original portion of the structure and add overhangs and brackets to tie the area into the style of the original portions. Staff is concerned that this proposal would disrupt the historical interpretation of the structure. Staff is also concerned that the proposed change would alter the symmetry and spatial relationships of the original side façade. As such, Staff does not support the change as proposed. Staff would be in favor of an approach that introduces a new roof form that would better replicate the original roof form while still clearly conveying this area as an addition to the home. As such, Staff recommends the shed roof form over the rear addition on the left side façade be changed to a hipped roof which does not tie into the hip of the original portions of the side façade.

The third alteration involves the framing of a currently flat area on the rear portion of the house. From the plans and photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that much of this portion of the structure is an addition which was installed at some point in the recent past. As Staff can find no evidence that this addition was reviewed by the Commission, it is likely that the addition was completed shortly before the District was designated. The Applicant's plans do show that the rear addition roofline tied into a pre-existing roofline of the same shape that currently exists today. The proposed change would continue the 12:12 roof pitch to the point of termination, resulting in an overall height change to the structure. The resulting rear ridgeline would be placed higher than the front facing gable or side facing hips of the original portions of the structure. Staff finds that the flattened ridgeline was likely a deliberate design choice that allowed the rear portions of the structure to not overshadow the principal roof forms visible from the front façade. As the proposal would alter the original intent of the design and would alter the spatial relationships of the home, Staff cannot support the proposal. Staff recommends the ridgeline additions to the rear portion of the structure be removed from the plans.

Lastly, the Applicant proposes the reframing of a rear bay window hip that is associated with a rear addition to the property. As the work involves alterations to a non-original portion of the structure

and would not interrupt the spatial relationships of the original portions of the structure Staff has no concerns with this portion of the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The existing roof eaves and decorative brackets of the front porch shall be retained in place, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(b);
2. The shed roof form over the rear addition on the left side façade shall be changed to a hipped roof which does not tie into the hip of the original portions of the side façade, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(b);
3. The ridgeline additions to the rear portion of the structure shall be removed from the plans, , per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(b); 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: **415 Atwood St.**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-357**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: Southwest corner of Atwood St. and Greenwich St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: N. **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. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

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

Compatibility comparisons

In reviewing the project, Staff found that many of the required compatibility comparisons were missing from the application. Those that were provided were taken as averages of the measurements instead of using the method required by the District zoning regulations. Staff will discuss the missing information in the body of the report.

Site Plan

The Applicant has provided compatibility information for the required front yard setback. However, no information detailing the allowable front yard setback has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable Greenwich St. half-depth front yard setback.

The Applicant has provided information on the front yard setback range as taken from the lot line to the front porch and from the lot line to the front façade. Staff would note that two of the properties measured (435 & 445 Atwood) have been measured from the street to the enclosed front porch. Staff will use this information in determining the front yard setback range from the street to the front porch. Staff would further note that the information provided by the Applicant includes the non-contributing structure at 441 Atwood St. Lastly, the compatibility information is presented as an average of the setbacks instead of a minimum/maximum setback range. Staff will use the information provided to determine the setbacks as they are required to be measured by the District regulations.

Per the information provided by the Applicant the setback range on the block face as measured from the lot lines to the front porch is a minimum of 21.3' as set by 431 Atwood St., and a maximum of 25.5' As set by 421 Atwood St. Likewise, the information provided shows the setback range as measured from the lot lines to the front façade is a minimum of 33.6' as set by 425 Atwood St., and a maximum of 35.4' as set by 421 Atwood St. The proposed structure is set back 31.2' as measured from the lot line to the front porch, which does not meet the range established by the compatibility rule. The front façade is set back 34' as measured from the lot line which does fall in the range established by this measurement method. However, the resulting front porch is set back much further than the historic porches on the block. Staff recommends that in addition to meeting the requirements for the front façade setback, the front porch setback meet the range established by the compatibility rule.

Per the site plan, an 11' wide driveway leading from Greenwich St. is proposed. The District regulations only permit driveways with a maximum width of 10'. Staff recommends the proposed driveway meet the District regulations.

Building façades

The height of the first floor of the front façade above grade is subject to the compatibility rule. No compatibility information has been submitted to show the allowable first floor height range. Staff recommends the applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable first floor height range.

In looking at the comparable properties, Staff finds that the historic homes on the block face all contain front facades which do not have an inset. The plans proposed by the applicant have an inset on the front façade which corresponds with the front porch. Staff recommends the front façade inset be removed from the plans.

Building height
The proposed structure is 19' as measured from grade at front façade to the ridge. No information detailing the allowable height established by the compatibility rule has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable building height.

Windows and doors
Staff has no concerns with the proposed 9 over 9 window style or size on the front façade. However, the plans show one over one windows on the side facades. Further two transom style accent windows are proposed for the Greenwich St. façade. Staff recommends the side façade windows be 9 over 9 windows matching the front façade. Staff further recommends the windows on the Greenwich St. elevation be double-hung, vertically oriented, and proportional to other windows on the house. If simulated divided lite windows are used, Staff recommends the muntins be permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass and integral to the sash. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the fenestration on the side and rear façade.

Foundations
From the plans provided, Staff cannot determine the foundation materials or whether siding is proposed for the rear portion of the structure in place of a masonry foundation. Staff recommends the Applicant revise their plans to more clearly convey the design of the foundations on the side façade. Staff further recommends the visible foundation materials continue across all 4 façades.

Roof
The proposed structure is defined by a front facing gable roof with a nested gable over the half-width front porch. The nested gable on the front façade is situated on the right side of the front façade. In looking at the block face in question. Each comparable property has a different roof form, however, the predominate pattern for the porch roofs are front facing gables situated to the right side of the front facade. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed nested gable roof form.

The Applicant proposes an 8 in 12 roof pitch. No compatibility information has been submitted detailing the allowable roof pitch. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

Deck
Per the District regulations decks on corner lots must be screened with fencing or vegetation to reduce visibility from the public street. The Applicant's plans do not mention what fencing/vegetation is planned to screen the deck from view from the public street. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the project will comply with the screening requirements for decks on corner lots.

Porch
The Applicant proposes a front porch which will take up 1/2 to 2/3 of the front façade. Staff finds this proposal meets the compatibility rule. Staff also finds that the proposed materials of the front porch meet the compatibility rule.

With regards to the porch rails, the District regulations require the top rail to be set no higher than 33". The Applicant has proposed a 36" railing which does not meet the District regulations. Staff recommends the front porch railing be set no higher than 33" with any additional height provided using a simple plane extension.

Garage
The District regulations require garages to be located in an accessory structure placed to the rear and behind the principal structure. As such, Staff finds the proposed attached garage does not meet the District regulations. Staff recommends the attached garage be removed from the plans and any garage space be provided using a detached garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information detailing the allowable Greenwich St. half-depth front yard setback, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(a);
2. In addition to meeting the requirements for the front façade setback, the front porch setback shall meet the range established by the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(a);
3. The proposed driveway shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (12)(c);
4. The applicant shall provide compatibility information detailing the allowable first floor height range, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(f);
5. The side façade windows be 9 over 9 windows matching the front façade, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i);
6. The windows on the Greenwich St. elevation shall be double-hung, vertically oriented, and proportional to other windows on the house, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i);
7. If simulated divided lite windows are used, muntins shall be permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass and integral to the sash, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(c);
8. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the fenestration on the side and rear façade, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (3)(i);
9. The Applicant shall revise their plans to more clearly convey the design of the foundations on the side façade;
10. The visible foundation materials shall continue across all 4 façades, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (2)(c);
11. The Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20G.006 (7)(d);
12. The Applicant confirm the project will comply with the screening requirements for decks on corner lots, per Sec. 16-20G.006(8);
13. The proposed materials of the front porch meet the compatibility rule.

14. The front porch railing be set no higher than 33" with any additional height provided using a simple plane extension, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
15. The attached garage shall be removed from the plans and any garage space shall be provided using a detached garage, per Sec. 16-20G.006(10); and,
16. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 calendar days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **650 Gaskill St.**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-381**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Northwest corner of Gaskill St. and Powell St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New single family residence.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

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

Compatibility comparisons
The Compatibility rule in the Cabbagetown Landmark District specifies that compatibility comparisons are to be taken from contributing houses of the same style and use as the proposed structure. For the purposes of reviewing new construction in Subarea 3 shotguns and cottages are defined as the two styles that are to be considered. The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons which include all contributing structures on the block face. As Staff finds the block face only contains two contributing shotgun style homes located at 167 and 169 Powell St., the information for these two properties will be used when reviewing comparisons based on the compatibility rule.

Site plan
The proposed structure contains a front yard setback of 13'4", a rear yard setback of 12', a left side yard setback of 3' 6 ¾" and a right side yard setback of 3' ¾". The two comparable properties both contain a front yard setback of 23', rear yard setbacks of 15', a left side yard setback range of 1' 11" to 2' 6", and a right side yard setback range of 2' 6" and 10'. As such, Staff finds that the front, rear, and left side yard setbacks do not meet the compatibility rule.

Staff Recommends the proposed setbacks meet the compatibility rule.

Height and width
The proposed structure has a height of 23' and a width of 15' 6". Based on the compatibility information, the two comparable properties have a height range of 20' 6" to 21' 5". No information regarding the width of the comparable properties has been received. Staff finds that the proposed height does not meet the range set by the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed height meet the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable building width range.

Porch
Per the regulations a front porch is provided. The porch will contain a hipped roof matching the design of the comparable properties. Staff finds that the design of the front porch features is consistent with those of 167 Powell St. with the exception of a column placed in the middle of the front porch. As such, Staff recommends the middle porch column be removed. Staff further recommends the porch flooring be installed perpendicular to the front façade.

Facades
The first-floor height of the comparable properties has not been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable first floor height range.

The proposed structure has a window on the left side of the front façade and a door on the right side of the front façade. However, the comparable properties both have a door on the left side of the front façade and a window on the right side of the front façade. As such, Staff recommends the fenestration on the front façade match those on the comparable properties.

The Comparable properties contain rectangular louvered attic vents. The proposed structure contains a rectangular casement window. Staff finds that the overall shape of the proposed window is consistent with the gable ornamentation on the comparable properties and has no concerns with the proposal.

The drawings appear to show no door on the side and rear facades. While this is outside the purview of the Commission, Staff suggests the Applicant confirm with Fire Safety Staff from the Office of Buildings that this configuration would be approved per their review.

Information detailing the allowable first floor height above street level has not been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable first floor height above grade.

Roofs

The proposed structure is defined by a front facing gable roof. No information detailing the allowable roof pitch has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a parking pad in the rear of the property for use by neighboring structures, and a concrete strip driveway on the left side of the structure, which will straddle the property line. Staff has no concerns with the layout of these features, but recommends the Applicant confirm that all driveways and parking pads are at least 1/3 pervious as required by the District regulations.

Per the regulations a walkway leading to the front door is provided.

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

1. The proposed setbacks shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.006(9);
2. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable building width range
3. The proposed height shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.009(7);
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable building width range, per Sec. 16-20A.009(7);
5. The middle porch column shall be removed, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(e)(1);
6. The porch flooring shall be installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(e)(1);
7. The fenestration on the front façade shall match those on the comparable properties, per, Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(3);
8. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable first floor height above grade, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(2);
9. The Applicant shall submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(c)(1);
10. The Applicant shall confirm that all driveways and parking pads are at least 1/3 pervious as required by the District regulation, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(f)(1); and,
11. 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: **628 Robinson Avenue**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-374**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location:

Contributing (Y/N)? No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction/Duplex

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION:

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

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes to construct a 4,476 heated square feet new duplex, with Unit A being approximately 2,228 heated square feet and 2,248 for Unit B. The duplex will not exceed the side or rear setback established by District Regulations.

Height

The Applicant has proposed the height of the new construction to be 35.5 feet. However, District Regulations requires the height on all new construction to be no more than 35 feet. To abide by District Regulations, Staff recommends the Applicant reduce the proposed height by .5 and make the new construction 35 feet.

Roof/Pitch

The proposed roof will consist of a front gable roof and corresponding gable roofs on the right, left and rear elevations with a connecting hip roof. District Regulations requires the roof forms be hip or gable. Additionally, the District Regulations requires that the pitch of the houses be no more than a minimum of 6 in 12. Staff is not concerned with these proposals.

Materials

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

Gutters

The Applicants proposes gutters to be installed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Foundation

District Regulations requires the first floor of a new construction to be build on a foundation and have at least a minimum of two entrance steps and which shall be no less than 6 inches in height. The Applicant has abided by the District Regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

6-inches smooth cementitious lap siding is proposed by the Applicant. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Front porch

The Applicant proposes to construct one porch on the front elevation and another on the right elevation. Both porches will consist of a Gable roof with steps and risers with treads and 2x2 wood picket railings. In addition to complying with District Regulations, the proposed porches are consistent with stoop porch in the District. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

Front Door

The Applicant proposes a front wood door with a full glass panel. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Side Doors

The Applicant proposes to same kind of door for the right elevation. Staff s not concerned with this proposal.

Windows
The Applicant proposes to install one over one wood windows with wood trim with no mullions or muntin. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Fenestration
District Regulations states that any façades that face a public street shall consist of fenestration that is either: 1) substantially consistent with fenestration on contributing structures of like use in the district, or 2) shall be no less than 15 percent and no greater than 40 percent of the total surface wall area. The fenestration patterns shown on the elevations illustrates a pattern that is not greater than 40 percent Staff is not concerned with the proposed fenestration pattern.

Deck
The proposed decks are located on the rear and side of the principal structures. The rear deck on Unit A does not concerns Staff. Rear decks are permitted. However, what is labelled by the Applicant as a deck on the side of the principal structure is not permitted. Staff does note what he Applicant classified as a deck is possibly a balcony, which is permitted. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the proposed deck or balcony.

Walkway
The District requires walkways from the paved sidewalk from the sidewalk be installed. The Applicant has shown a walkway to be constructed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall reduce the height of the house to reflect 35 feet not 35.5 feet per Sec. 16-20K.007;
2. The Applicant shall clarify whether the proposed construction is a deck or balcony. If it is a deck it not be on the side elevation. If is a balcony it is permitted, per Sec.16-20K.007(2)(b)(9) and
3. 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: **755 Elbert Street**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-379**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: **1925**

Property Location: **East of Mayland Avenue and West of Allene Avenue**

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

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. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Defer to allow the Applicant time to provide information needed.

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

PLANS
The Applicant has not shown a chimney on the elevations of the principal structures. The chimney is a vital component of the house. Staff recommends the Applicant provide plans that show the chimney. If the chimney has been removed, Staff recommends the Applicant rebuild the chimney with its original material—brick and that brick cannot be painted.

ADDITION
The Applicant proposes to add an additional 664 square feet to the existing structure. This new addition will not exceed the side yard setbacks or rear setback. The allowable lot coverage is 55% the Applicant lot coverage is 41%. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Roof
With the added space, the ridge of the roof on the back of the existing principle with be altered. Instead of the sloping downward at the rear, the proposed ridge will extend out over the proposed deck. Staff is not concerned about this proposal; the roof still will follow the original Hip roof.

Windows
The proposed new windows will match the windows on the existing structure which will be located on the side of the principal structure. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS
The applicant proposes to do the following alterations: install new windows, install new door, replace siding, repair architectural elements and construct a deck.

Windows
The Applicant proposes to install new windows on the entire structure and trim. However, the Applicant has not provided any photos to merit the proposal. District regulations requires the retention of original windows and trim. With the Applicant not providing any photos, Staff cannot deem if this proposal is viable. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic information of the windows, provide a window schedule and tie that window schedule to the elevation. This will allow, Staff to decide on the window and trim feasibility.

Door
A Craftsman door with lights for the front is proposed by the Applicant. Staff isn't concerned with the actual door. However, as with the windows, the Applicant has not provided photos demonstrating the door and the reason for replacement. District regulations requires original doors be retained. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide photos of the existing door so that the Staff can determine the door feasibility.

Siding
New 6in siding wood is being proposed by the Applicant. The Applicant has not provided photos to demonstrate why the siding is being proposed for replacement. Research shows the siding is wood and appears to be in good shape. District regulations requires replacement to match the original material in scale and direction. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photos of the siding to determine its feasibility.

Architectural Elements
The Applicant has proposed to sand and repair in-kind the wood brackets and architectural detail over the gable roof on the porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Deck
The deck will be constructed at the rear of the principal structure and does not exceed the rear or side yard setback and cannot be seen by public-right away. Staff is not concerned about this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to Allow the Applicant time to provide information needed.

1. Applicant shall provide plans that show chimney, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(e);
2. If the chimney has been removed, the Applicant shall rebuild the chimney with its original material—brick and the brick cannot be painted, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(e);
3. The Applicant shall provide photographic information of the windows, provide a window schedule and tie that window schedule to the elevation, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
4. The Applicant shall provide photos of the existing door so that the Staff can determine the door feasibility, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)1;
5. The Applicant shall provide photos of the siding to determine its feasibility, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(a)(4) and
6. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **604 Woodward Ave.**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-365**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 2) **Other Zoning:** SPI-22 (SA4) / Beltline.

Date of Construction: Not listed in the District inventory.

Property Location: North blockface of Woodward Ave., east of Boulevard SE., west of Berean Ave.

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the September 11, 2019 Commission meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Section 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 Woodward Ave. façade.

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.

Front porch and front façade alterations.
As the front porch retains some original materials, Staff finds the second of the two criteria for reviewing alterations to contributing structures is appropriate to use when reviewing the proposed alterations to the front façade.

The Applicant is proposing the removal and replacement of the existing full width front porch with a new front porch roof which is inset from the corners. No information detailing the need to replace the front porch roof has been retained. From the photographs provided by the Applicant, the front porch roof appears to be intact and does not have obvious signs of structural issues. Staff is concerned with the potential loss of historic materials, particularly when viewed in light of the scope of the proposed additions. As such, Staff recommends the existing front porch roof be retained.

The existing decorative metal front porch columns are not original to the structure and are proposed to be replaced with new boxed columns. Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

The Applicant proposes the replacement of the front façade siding. The Applicant's photographs show a cement shingle has been installed over the original wood siding. Based on the trim pattern, Staff finds it likely that this condition exists across much front façade. Staff has not received information detailing the need for the original siding on the front façade to be removed in its entirety. Staff recommends the original wood siding on the front façade be retained. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide photographic documentation of any portion of the original front façade siding that is missing or beyond repair for Staff to review. Lastly, Staff recommends that only those portions of siding on the front façade which Staff has determined to be beyond the point of repair be replaced with new wood siding.

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of the non-original windows with new double hung wood windows matching the size of the original opening. The Applicant also proposes the replacement of the non-original front doors with elements that meet the District regulations. The Applicant has also proposed the Staff has no concerns with these proposals.

Addition

As the proposed additions are largely outside of the purview of Staff and only involve alterations to the existing roofline which likely contains a mix of historic and non-historic elements, Staff finds the first of the two criteria is appropriate for application to this portion of the project.

The Applicant proposes the removal of the existing 10:12 roof structure and the installation of a new 12:12 roof to accommodate the proposed additions. Staff is concerned with the removal of the original roof plane as this will irreparably alter the spatial relationships of the existing single-story structure. As such, Staff recommends the project be redesigned to retain as much of the existing front roof plane, including the 10:12 pitch, as possible.

With regards to the proposed dormer addition, Staff only has concerns with the proposed roof form. Staff finds a shed roof dormer would reinforce both the existing shed porch roof as well as the side gabled principal roof. As such, Staff recommends the proposed dormer hipped roof be replaced with a shed roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The existing front porch roof be retained, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(2);
2. The original wood siding on the front façade shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(2);
3. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation of any portion of the original front façade siding that is missing or beyond repair for Staff to review, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(2);
4. Only those portions of siding on the front façade which Staff has determined to be beyond the point of repair shall be replaced with new wood siding, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1)(2);
5. the project be redesigned to retain as much of the existing front roof plane, including the 10:12 pitch, as possible, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);
6. The proposed hipped roof dormer shall be replaced with a shed roof dormer, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1); and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: **2575 Baker Road, NW**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-369**

MEETING DATE: August 28, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location:

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

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:
SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

PLANS
The Applicant has provided illustrations for the new floor plan but does not provide existing floor plans for discernment. To allow Staff a better view of what is happening on the interior of the house, Staff recommends the Applicant provide plans that are inclusive of the existing floor plan.

ADDITION
The Applicant proposes added space to the existing structure by adding a new bathroom that will push out the left front side of the existing structure. By pushing out the left side of the structure will increase the FAR. The Applicant has provided the FAR calculations on the site plans and the calculations show that this proposal does meet the FAR requirement. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS
On the existing principal structure, the Applicant proposes to do the following alterations: construct a new front porch, add a new deck, add a new front deck and walkway, add a new door, install new windows, replace soffits and wood trim on the entire structure, install new roof material and paint.

Front Porch
The Applicant proposes to transform an existing stoop at the front of the house into a front porch with a Gable roof, columns and front on wood steps. District Regulations requires the retention of original stoops. Staff recommends, the Applicant retain the original stoop and not build the porch.

Decks
Rear
The Applicant proposes a deck at the rear of the existing structure that does not extend beyond the sides. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Front façade and Walkway
A front deck is proposed on the front façade. Decks are not permitted on the front of the structure only in the back. Staff recommends that deck on the front not be built to abide by the District Regulations. A walkway from the front of the stoop to the sidewalk or driveway does not concern the Staff.

Gable Roof on Front Stoop
In proposing to construct the new porch, the Applicant proposes a new Gable roof for cover. The existing roof over the stoop is a flat roof. Changing the flat roof to a Gable roof will require a compatibility study of contributing houses on the block face that show Gable roof over stoops. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a compatibility analysis of contributing houses on the blockface that demonstrate Gable roofs over stoops.

Doors
The Applicant propose adding a French door on the front façade of the existing structure. Without the proposed deck being constructed, the French door would be a door to nowhere. Staff recommends the French door not be installed. Instead a window can be constructed thatat can match in style and size of the existing windows on the front façade.

Windows
The Applicant proposes to install new double hung, double pane windows. The Applicant has provided a window schedule, however does not tie the schedule to the elevations. So, it is difficult for Staff to discern what needs replacing. Additionally, the photos provided by the Applicant, make it different to tell if the windows are original. If so, the District Regulations requires original windows be retained. Staff recommends the Applicant provides photos that demonstrate that the window need replacing. There were many boarded up windows, so Staff also recommends that the Applicant do a complete window schedule that is tied to the elevations to allow for a better assessment of all the windows.

Soffits Replacement and Wood trim
The Applicant proposes to replace the soffits and wood trim on the existing structure. Staff has no concern with this proposal. The wood trim should be done in-kind.

Roof Material
The proposed roof material replacement will be asphalt shingles. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Paint
The Applicant proposes to paint all new wood trim and additions. Staff has no concern for the painted wood trim. However, no masonry shall be painted.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide plans that show existing floor plans to allow for a better assessment of the interior alterations, per Sec.16-20Q.006;
2. The Applicant shall retain the original stoop and not construction the new porch to abide by the District Regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.006;
3. The deck on the front shall not be built to abide by the District Regulations, per Sec.16-20Q.006;
4. The Applicant shall provide compatibility analysis or contributing structures on the blockface that demonstrated a gable over the front stoop, per Sec. 16-20Q.006;
5. The French door shall not be installed. The Applicant can install 0 windows that will match in style, material and shape of the existing windows on the front façade, per Sec. 16-20Q.006;
6. The Applicant shall provide photos that demonstrate that the photos need replacing. There were many boarded up windows, per Sec. 16-20Q.006;
7. The Applicant shall do a complete window schedule that is tied to the elevations to allow for a better assessment of all the windows, per Sec. 16-20Q.006
8. No masonry shall be painted, Sec.16-20Q.006 and
9. All final plans and photos shall be reviewed and approved by Staff.

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: **650 Gaskill St.**

APPLICATION: **CA2-19-380 & CA3-19-383**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Northwest corner of Gaskill St. and Powell St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations pertaining to a residential conversion and a subdivision.

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

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

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 Section Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20A of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Subdivision
The Applicant is proposing the subdivision of the existing lot into three lots. The proposed configuration would permit two new shotgun style homes fronting Powell St. and allow the existing contributing structure fronting Gaskill St. to remain. Based on the information the Applicant has provided, the proposed subdivision would re-establish the historic pattern which consisted of two residential structures, which appear to have been shotgun style homes, fronting Powell St. Staff also finds that the historic platting pattern would support mid-block structures on lots that were subdivided from residential lots facing a different street. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal and supports the Applicant's request.

Alterations and residential conversion
The Applicant is proposing the replacement of non-historic windows, the installation of new skylights, the conversion of a non-historic door on the front façade to a window, and the screening in of the existing side porch area. Staff has no concerns with these proposals but does recommend that all new windows be double hung wood sash windows with true divided lites.

With regards to the windows on the left side façade of the structure, the District regulations require windows to be predominately vertical in orientation. Staff interprets this regulation to mean that Windows are to be taller than they are wide. The regulations also require the size of windows to meet the compatibility rule. Staff finds that while smaller windows exist on comparable properties, they are double hung and proportional to the larger windows on the structure. As such, Staff recommends that the two transom style windows be removed from the plans and replaced with windows that are vertically oriented and proportional to the larger windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION for CA3-19-383: Approval with the following conditions:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION for CA2-19-308: Approval with the following conditions:

2. All new windows shall be double hung wood sash windows with true divided lites, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(3);
3. The two transom style windows shall be removed from the plans and replaced with windows that are vertically oriented and proportional to the larger windows, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(3); 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: **650 Gaskill St.**

APPLICATION: **CA3-19-384**

MEETING DATE: **August 28, 2019**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: Northwest corner of Gaskill St. and Powell St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New single family residence.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

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

Compatibility comparisons

The Compatibility rule in the Cabbagetown Landmark District specifies that compatibility comparisons are to be taken from contributing houses of the same style and use as the proposed structure. For the purposes of reviewing new construction in Subarea 3 shotguns and cottages are defined as the two styles that are to be considered. The Applicant has provided compatibility comparisons which include all contributing structures on the block face. As Staff finds the block face only contains two contributing shotgun style homes located at 167 and 169 Powell St., the information for these two properties will be used when reviewing comparisons based on the compatibility rule.

However, as the property in question is the result of a subdivision that is based on the historic platting pattern of the District, and given the lack of comparable properties on a block face which originally contained several shotgun style homes which would have impacted the comparison analysis if they were still extant, and given that strict adherence to the compatibility rule could result in a hardship for certain provisions of the District regulations, Staff finds it would be appropriate for the Commission to consider a variance from the design regulations which would allow for comparisons to be taken from the contributing structures of like use on the block face as opposed to the contributing structures of like style and use. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant apply for a variance to permit the compatibility comparisons to be based only on contributing structure of like use on the block face.

Site plan

The proposed structure contains a front yard setback of 13'4", a rear yard setback of 12', a half-depth front yard setback of 3' 1", and a right-side yard setback of 4' 6". The two comparable properties both contain a front yard setback of 23', rear yard setbacks of 15', a left side yard setback range of 1' 11" to 2' 6", and a right-side yard setback range of 2' 6" and 10'. As such, Staff finds that the front, rear, and left side yard setbacks do not meet the compatibility rule.

Staff Recommends the proposed setbacks meet the compatibility rule.

Height and width

The proposed structure has a height of 23' and a width of 20'. Based on the compatibility information, the two comparable properties have a height range of 20' 6" to 21' 5". No information regarding the width of the comparable properties has been received. Staff finds that the proposed height does not meet the range set by the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed height meet the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable building width range.

Porch

Per the regulations a front porch is provided. The porch will contain a wraparound shed roof that will tie in to an enclosed area that will simulate an enclosed side porch addition. While Staff finds that the comparable properties contain side entry additions placed in roughly the same place as the proposed enclosure, they are

not associated with a wrap around front porch. As such, Staff recommends the wrap around porch be removed from the plans and changed to a hipped roof porch on the Powell St. façade only.

Staff finds that the design of the front porch features is consistent with those of 169 Powell St. Staff recommends the porch flooring be installed perpendicular to the front façade.

Facades

The first-floor height of the comparable properties has not been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable first floor height range.

The proposed structure has two windows on the main portion of the front façade and a door on the left side façade bump out. However, the comparable properties both have a door on the left side of the front façade and a window on the right side of the main portion of the front façade. The one comparable property with a side addition uses the door on the bump out as a secondary entry. As such, Staff recommends the fenestration on the front façade match those on the comparable properties.

The Comparable properties contain rectangular louvered attic vents. The proposed structure contains a rectangular casement window. Staff finds that the overall shape of the proposed window is consistent with the gable ornamentation on the comparable properties and has no concerns with the proposal.

The drawings appear to show only one door on the property. While this is outside the purview of the Commission, Staff suggests the Applicant confirm with Fire Safety Staff from the Office of Buildings that this configuration would be approved per their review.

Information detailing the allowable first floor height above street level has not been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable first floor height above grade.

Roofs

The proposed structure is defined by a front facing gable roof. No information detailing the allowable roof pitch has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a parking pad in the rear of the property for use by neighboring structures, and a concrete strip driveway on the left side of the structure, which will straddle the property line. Staff has no concerns with the layout of these features, but recommends the Applicant confirm that all driveways and parking pads are at least 1/3 pervious as required by the District regulations.

Per the regulations a walkway leading to the front door is provided.

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

1. The proposed setbacks shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.006(9);
2. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable building width range
3. The proposed height shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20A.009(7);
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable building width range, per Sec. 16-20A.009(7);
5. The wrap around porch shall be removed from the plans and changed to a hipped roof porch on the Powell St. façade only. per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(e)(1);
6. The porch flooring shall be installed perpendicular to the front façade, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(e)(1);
7. The fenestration on the front façade shall match those on the comparable properties, per, Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(3);
8. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable first floor height above grade, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(b)(2);
9. The Applicant shall submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(c)(1);
10. The Applicant shall confirm that all driveways and parking pads are at least 1/3 pervious as required by the District regulation, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(f)(1); and,
11. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File