



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1112 Richland Rd.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-445  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1950 (Existing structure.)

**Property Location:** South block face of Richland Rd., west of Lawton St., east of Hall St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Minimal Traditional.

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

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Demolition of non-contributing structure

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20M.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** Yes, Deferred October 9, 2019. *Updated text in italics.*

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

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

---

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

Compatibility Comparisons

Staff has not received the required compatibility comparisons for this property. The District regulations heavily rely on these measurements to determine the appropriateness of new construction. Building elements including, but not limited to, the front yard setbacks, the height of the structure, the massing of the structure, the style of the structure, the fenestration pattern, the front porch design, the roof form/pitch, and the siding material are based on the compatibility rule. As this information has not been received, Staff cannot fully or properly review the proposed new construction at this time. Staff would note that it appears the project is basing the design of the structure on standard R-4 measurements, which are not the governing metrics in the District. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the contributing structures on the south block face of Richland Rd. between Lawton St. and Hall St.

*Staff was able to locate compatibility comparisons from a review completed in 2007 along this block face. As such, Staff finds this condition is no longer required.*

The following analysis will be based on the limited information Staff has on the property at this time.

Development Controls

As noted before, the front yard setbacks of new construction in the District are based on the compatibility rule. Compatibility information for the proposed setbacks have not been received by Staff. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed front yard setback. Staff has no concerns with the proposed side and rear yard setbacks.

*The Applicant has not provided compatibility comparisons for the block face. However, Staff was able to locate a review from 2007 where the comparisons for the block face were given. In this analysis, the front yard setbacks were shown to be a minimum of 22' and a maximum of 30.6'. As such, Staff recommends the front yard setback meet the range established by the Compatibility Rule.*

The District regulations prohibit off-street parking in the front yard. The site plan appears to show a driveway which terminates at the front porch. Staff finds this arrangement does not meet the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the proposed driveway be set to the side of the principal structure and extend at least 20' past the front façade of the structure.

*The Applicant has provided an updated site plan showing the driveway being relocated to the left side of the structure extending 20' past the front façade of the home. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

The Floor Area Ratio is determined by the District regulations and is set at 50% of the net lot area. The property in question contains approximately 8,710 sf of lot area meaning the allowable floor area for any proposed structures is limited to 4,355 sf. Staff recommends the Applicant note the proposed FAR on the site plans.

*The Applicant has provided information showing the proposed FAR meets the requirements. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

No information on the proposed lot coverage has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant note the proposed lot coverage on the site plans.

*The Applicant has provided information showing the proposed Lot Coverage meets the requirements. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

#### Architectural Standards

The District regulations require a sidewalk containing a planting strip to be installed where none is present. The dimensions and material of the sidewalk is based on the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the site plan show a hex stamped sidewalk no less than 6' wide.

*Staff retains this recommendation.*

The District regulations require a walkway leading from the front door to the sidewalk. The proposed site plan has a walkway leading from the front door to the proposed driveway. Staff finds this does not meet the regulations. As such, Staff recommends the site plan be revised to show a walkway leading directly from the front door to the sidewalk.

*Staff retains this recommendation.*

As no compatibility information has been provided, Staff cannot determine whether the proposed 5:12 roof pitch meets the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed roof pitch. principal roof form is also based on the compatibility rule. in looking at the block face in question, there is one example of a contributing structure with a front facing gable exhibited by the property at 1132 Richland Rd. This structure contains a hipped principal roof with a gable roof over the front porch. As such, Staff recommends the plans be revised to show a hipped principal roof with a gable over the front porch.

*Based on the compatibility comparisons, the structures on the block all contain roofs with 6 in 12 pitches. As such, Staff recommends the proposed roof contain a pitch of 6 in 12.*

No compatibility information for the height of the proposed structure has been received. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the height of the proposed structure.

*Based on the compatibility comparisons, the height of structures on the block face are between 16.2' and 17.5'. As such, Staff finds the proposed height meets the compatibility rule.*

No compatibility information for the height of the first floor above grade has been received. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the height of the first floor above grade.

*Based on the compatibility comparisons, the first floor height range is between 7" and 18". Staff finds the proposed 21" first floor height does not meet this range. As such, Staff recommends the first floor height meet the compatibility rule.*

The District regulations require fenestration patterns for the front and side façade to meet the compatibility rule. In looking at the block face in question, Staff can find several examples of a front façade fenestration pattern consistent with the Applicant's proposal. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed front façade fenestration pattern. With regards to the right side façade fenestration pattern, Staff has no general concerns with the Applicant's proposal. However, Staff is concerned with the transom style accent window on the left side façade. Staff can find no evidence of transom style accent windows such as the ones proposed as original features of contributing structures on the block face. Staff recommends the proposed accent window on the left side facade be removed from the plans and replaced with a double hung window. Staff

would note that these new double hung window can be smaller, as they will be associated with a bathroom, but should be proportional to the other windows on the structure.

*The revised plans show the horizontally oriented windows have been removed in favor of vertically oriented windows which, while smaller than the majority of windows on the home, are proportional and appear double hung. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

The Applicant is proposing a horizontal lap siding, which is a permitted material in the District. It is unclear whether the siding will be wood or cementitious siding. If cementitious siding is used, Staff recommends it be smooth faced. The Applicant is proposing a horizontal lap siding, which is a permitted material in the District. The regulations require the exposed face of siding to meet the compatibility rule. Generally, historic siding width would be between 4" to 6". As such, Staff recommends the proposed lap siding contain a reveal of 4" to 6". It is unclear whether the siding will be wood or cementitious siding. If cementitious siding is used, Staff recommends it be smooth faced.

*The Applicant has submitted information showing the siding will have a reveal of 6". Staff finds the related recommendation has been met. However, Staff retains all other recommendations relating to the siding.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. *The front yard setback shall meet the range established by the Compatibility Rule, per Sec. 16-20M.012(1);*
2. *The site plan shall show a hex stamped sidewalk no less than 6' wide, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(c);*
3. *The site plan shall be revised to show a walkway leading directly from the front door to the sidewalk, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(d);*
4. *The proposed roof shall contain a pitch of 6 in 12, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(f);*
5. *The first floor height shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(h);*
6. *If cementitious siding is used, Staff recommends it be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q); and,*
7. *All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.*

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 240-248 North Highland Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-497  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** New Micro-Units

**Property Location:** West of Elizabeth Street and East of Alaska Avenue

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Micro-units

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 124 Elizabeth Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-480  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East of Euclid and West of Edgewood

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

## **COMPATIBILITY**

The District Regulations for Subarea 1, new construction and alterations to existing contributing structures in Subarea 2 and Subarea 3 are compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district as it existed in 1945, of the contributing structures in each subarea, and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face; and further, to ensure that lot platting in Subarea 1 is compatible with the historic platting pattern of Subarea 1 and of a particular block face as it existed in 1945.

## **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to demo a section of the existing structure and construct an 1140 square foot addition to the 2,854 square foot to the existing structure. This new addition will meet the FAR requirements as well as the lot coverage pertaining to the District Regulations. This proposed addition will also meet the front and sides sets under the District Regulations. The Applicant has requested a variance for the rear setback. Applicant provided compatibility information for the rear yard setback for comparison. The proposed addition will be in the buildable area and will not extend beyond existing structure. Staff is not concerned with the addition proposal.

### *Roof Form*

The proposed roof form will continue the hip roof form that is currently on the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### *Chimney*

Staff has noticed the existing chimney has been removed from the north side elevation, but the chimney is presented on the front, south and rear elevations. Considering this an oversight, Staff recommends the Applicant in the submission of the final plans, draw the chimney back onto the south elevation plans since the chimney is a defining architectural trait.

### *Siding*

The Applicant proposes to install either cementitious shingle or cedar shingles to the addition. Either material would be appropriate abiding by the District regulations. Staff suggest the Applicant install wood shingles especially since the trim divide clearly distinguish the old house from the new.

### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes to install three over one windows and trim that will match in-kind the existing windows. Staff is not concerned this proposal.

### *Side Porch and Deck*

A side porch and deck are proposed at the rear of the existing structure, both will be in the buildable area and will not exceed beyond the side of the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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

1. When the Applicant submit the final plans, the chimney shall be drawn back on the south elevations, per Sec. 16-201.001 and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood

CA3-19-480 for 124 Elizabeth Street  
pg. 3

File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 731 Woodson St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-458  
**MEETING DATE:** October 9, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1992

**Property Location:** Northwest corner of Cordova St. and White Oak Ave.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Second story addition and alterations

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20K.

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

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

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

---

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

Addition and front porch alterations

The project before the Commission involves a full second story addition to the existing non-contributing single-story structure. The District regulations require additions and alterations to non-contributing structures be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing contributing structure or comply with the regulations for new construction. This contrasts with the regulations for similar projects on contributing structures where the project would be required to be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the structure and comply with the regulations for new construction. As Staff finds that the addition and alterations would be inconsistent with and would not reinforce the architecture of the existing structure, Staff will review the project using the related regulations for new construction.

Of the District regulations which relate to the proposed work, Staff finds that there is not enough information to confirm whether the project meets the fenestration requirements of the Grant Park Historic District. The regulations require fenestration to either be substantially similar to contributing residential structures in the District or require the Applicant to confirm the front façade consists of no less than 15% and no more than 40% fenestration. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the project meets the fenestration requirements of the District regulations.

Work on non-street facing facades

While the Commission and Staff do not have purview over the side and rear portions of the structure and addition, Staff finds that the proposed rooftop deck and shed roof on the rear of the structure have little relation to the architecture of other parts of the structure. Staff suggests the Applicant look at ways that the design for these portions of the structure could be changed to better conform to the style of the structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:**

1. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the project meets the fenestration requirements of the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(B); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 660 McWilliams Road—KIPP VISION  
**APPLICATION:** RC-19-486  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** N/A

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Site Work/Open Air Pavilion

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** N/A

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

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

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

---

---

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

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

The Applicant proposes to construct an open-air pavilion that will sit on a concrete slab. The framing of the structure will be cedar wood with a metal roof. It is proposed to have a gutter and down spout with a plastic barrel. Staff is not concerned about the proposal. Staff does wonder if the pavilion will have electrical outlets or wireless capabilities for internet access and lighting for safety. Otherwise, Staff fully supports this project.

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

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 615 Delmar Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-502  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1935

**Property Location:** Corner of Delmar and Rosedale

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Non-Contributing

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

---

### **VARIANCE**

The Applicant variance request is for a reduction of the secondary street frontage setback to be reduced from 15 feet to 7.5 feet on the Rosedale Avenue to construct a new 2-unit duplex. Unit 1 will be 2 stories with a basement and a 2-car garage and wrap porch. Unit 2 will have 2 stories but framed on a crawl space 1 car garage with wrap around porch. District Regulations does not permit front facing garage to be construct. Thus, the Applicant is requesting a variance. The Applicant explanations for requesting the variance took in the following criteria: extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the piece of property; Zoning Ordinance creating an unnecessary hardship; conditions peculiar to this particular piece of property; detriment to the public good or impair the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

### **EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTION**

The Applicant states that because the property is on a corner lot, this presents a challenge for creating a reasonable house width with a rear driveway and garage. Additionally, the Applicant purports that the westside of the property has multiple "setback trees" whose allowable impact area further encroaches in the buildable area.

### **UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP**

The Applicant purports that the setbacks for the R-5 Zoning for the corner lot is an hinderance because it doesn't allow for a buildable area. Because the regulations require no street facing garage, this doesn't permit the Applicant to construct a house that could utilize the alleyway for entrance into the garage. This can only happen if the variance is granted.

### **PECULIAR CONDITIONS**

The Applicant states the corner lot and the setback trees on the property creates peculiar conditions to construct the duplex.

### **DETRIMENT**

The Applicant proposes by allowing for the variance does not create a detriment to the public good because if the variance is granted, less grading will occur, minimum trees will be impacted. The variance will also allow for the garage and the driveway to be placed at the rear of the property. Will not hinder the regulations because the FAR will still comply.

### **Staff Perspective**

Staff deems the Applicant's statement that because the property is on a corner lot that constructing a duplex with garages that are not front facing is extremely difficult. It is a compelling argument. To allow the Applicant to put the garage in the rear of the house with a driveway that is wide enough to allow for entering and leaving requires space, is an efficiency argument that Staff agrees with. The Applicant argument that the R-5 setback for corner lots is compelling. Because this is a corner, and placing the garage limits the Applicant options for where the garage will be placed; the spacing to allow for entering and existing as well as utilizing the alley is extremely limited. Staff sees this as a hardship. By permitting a variance to reduces the amount of house that must push back to the rear of the duplexes where the garage must be placed makes for a better development on the lot. Staff also believe granting the variance will not be a detriment to the general public or the regulations.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File

CA3-19-502 for 615 Delmar Avenue (Variance)  
October 23, 2019



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1131 Merrill Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA4PH-19-499  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location** East of Hall Street and West of Lawton Street

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Applicant demolish the house, without coming through the Urban Design Commission

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial**

---

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

### **Type IV Demolition**

To apply for an application for the demolition of a historic property due to threats to public health and safety the Applicant must prove the existence of the following criterions below:

**(1) Demonstrate through independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public safety exists.**

The Applicant purports that the house was embedded with termites, rodents and 50 percent of the back side of the house was destroyed. Over 60 percent of the walls inside the house was missing and the house suffered from a mold infestation because of flooding. With all these problems and a decision to demo the house was made. Staff realize the house was in terrible shape, however, the Applicant has not shown how the termites, rodents, mold and missing were a health and safety issue and not repairable or replaceable. Staff deems at worst the Applicant could have replaced some wood boards and walls, hired an exterminator to resolve the termite, rodent and mold issues, as well as board up the house. But surely, it did not rise to the house been destroyed.

Additionally, the Applicant provided an engineer report that lists there were cracks in the ceiling and a hump in floor at the doorway to the bedroom. All of this was assessed through the observation by the engineer. The engineer also relays that through visual inspection, nothing was to code, therefore it everything had to be brought up to code. While all of this is true, none of the improvements listed would merit demolition due to public health and safety.

The Applicant argues the engineer said the house was not structurally sound, however, the Applicant doesn't say that. The Applicant does state that nothing was to code.

Additionally, photos provided by the Applicant doesn't illustrate the house damages rise to the level of a demo through public health and safety concern. Securing the house was needed but not tearing it down.

**(2) Present all reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat and analysis of all such alternatives.**

As state the Applicant did not consider any other alternatives to getting rid of the termites nor any other repairing or replacing any concerns. It was full on decision to the demolition of the house.

**(3) Demonstrate that the costs associated with rectifying the threat would create a condition whereby the investments in the project are incapable of earning a reasonable economic return.**

*This finding shall be made by considering, and the applicant shall submit*

*to the commission evidence establishing, each of the following factors:*

*a) The applicant's knowledge of the landmark designation at the time of acquisition, or whether the property was designated subsequent to acquisition.*

*b) The current level of economic return on the property as considered in relation to the following:*

*(1) The amount paid for the property, the date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased.*

*(2) The annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.*

*(3) Remaining balance on any mortgage or other financing secured by the property and annual debt service, if any, during the prior three (3) years.*

*(4) Real estate taxes for the previous four (4) years and assessed value of the property according to the two (2) most recent assessed valuations.*

*(5) All appraisals obtained within the previous two (2) years by the owner or applicant in connection with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property.*

*(6) The fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation and the fair market value of the property (in its protected status as a designated building or site) at the time the application is filed.*

*(7) Form of ownership or operation of the property, whether sole proprietorship, for-profit or not-for-profit corporation, limited partnership, joint venture, or both.*

*(8) Any state or federal tax returns on or relating to the property for the past two (2) years.*

*(9) That the property if not marketable or able to be sold, considered in relation to any listing of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any, within the previous two (2) years. Including testimony and relevant documents regarding:*

*a) Any real estate broker or firm engaged to sell or lease the property. b) Reasonableness of the price or rent sought by the applicant.*

*c) Any advertisement placed for the sale or rent of the property.*

*(10) The infeasibility of alternative uses that can earn a reasonable economic return for the property as considered in relation to the following:*

*a) A report for a licensed engineer or architect with experience in rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures on the property and their suitability for rehabilitation.*

*b) Estimate of the cost of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal, and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendation and decision of the commission concerning the appropriateness of the proposed alterations.*

*c) Estimated market value of the property in the current condition; after completion of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal; and, in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing property for continued use.*

*d) In the case of a proposed demolition, the testimony of an architect, developer, real estate consultant, appraiser, or other real estate professional experienced in rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure on the property.*

*e) The infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer or development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances.*

*(11) Economic incentives and/or funding available to the applicant through federal, state, city, or private programs*

*(12) Provide photographs of the existing conditions of the building, both exterior and interior.*

Of the requirements listed above to demonstrate that there was a threat to a reasonable economic return, the Applicant provided few evidences to support this criterion. At the time of the demolition, the Applicant has stated that she was not aware of the historic designation. Which is problematic. Nor has the Applicant provided a cost analysis for renovation of the house. She has only provided the value of the house. Without, the cost to the repairs, it is difficult to determine the economic return.

### **Staff Analysis**

Staff deems the Applicant has not proven beyond a shallow of a doubt the house needed to be demolished. What the Applicant has proven is that the house needed repair due to its age and neglect. Because of this, Staff denies the Applicant reasoning for demolition.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 615 Delmar Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-501  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1935 (original house) New Constitution

**Property Location:** Corner of Delmar and Rosedale

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

### **COMPATIBILITY**

The District Regulations states for new construction the identified design elements of size, scale, massing and materials of new construction shall be substantially consistent with said identified design elements found in contributing structures of like use in the district as listed in subsection [16-20K.007\(15\)\(c.\)](#).

### **NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The Applicant proposes to construct two duplexes on essentially the same footprint of the previous non-contributing structure that is scheduled for demolition. The proposed duplexes will have a lot coverage of 53% with is acceptable for R-5 zoning which permit an allowable lot coverage of 55%. The allowable FAR for duplexes for R-5 is .60, the FAR for the proposed duplexes will be .52. The duplexes meet all setbacks except for the rear. The Applicant is seeking a variance requesting a smaller rear setback. Staff is not concerned with the proposal of the duplexes.

#### *Height*

The average grade for the height measured at all four sides is 33-10/12. This meets the District Regulations for no more than 35 feet. Staff is not concerned for the height proposal.

#### *Roof form and Pitch*

The proposed roof form for the duplexes is a Hip roof on the massing of the house with Gable roofs on the front of unit 2 and flat roofs over the porches on both units. The proposed pitch for both units is higher than the required 6:12.

#### *Porch*

Both Units meet the requirement for front porches in the District. Both units will have ¾ porches and face the frontage of the property. The porch elements; railings, columns, steps seems to comply with other comparable houses that were submitted for review by the Applicant. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Siding*

The proposed siding material for the duplexes are cementitious smooth-face lap siding with a 6-inch reveal and vertical board-n-batten siding at the garage and bay windows. Staff is not concerned with the lap siding. However, the vertical board-n-batten does give Staff pause. The Applicant has provided comparable houses in the District with vertical board-n-batten siding, the house noted have small amounts of vertical board-n-batten. The Applicant's proposal for board-n-batten is significant and is quite pronounced on the structure. Being on a corner lot, the board-n-batten will be quite visible. Staff would suggest the Applicant look at the other siding material that has been called out by the District Regulations and install siding that would meet those requirements instead of the vertical board-n-batten siding.

#### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes to install one-over-one windows with classic lite divides. The proposed windows are aligned with other windows in the District. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Garage*

The Applicant proposes side garages for the duplexes and seeks a variance to allow for the construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

---

CA3-19-501 for 615 Delmar Avenue  
October 23, 2019

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1131 Austin Avenue, NE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-498  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1898

**Property Location:** East of Euclid Avenue and West of Moreland Ramp

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Room Addition and Side Porch

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 20l of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

**NEW ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to enclose a rear screened porch allowing for a family room. Since the Applicant will be using the same footprint of the screened porch and the FAR requirement of 4,643 SF is below the allowed FAR in this District, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**PORCH**

The Applicant proposes a side porch to be added off the proposed family room. Since this new porch will be constructed in the side rear of the structure and is consistent with the architectural elements of the existing structure and does not exceed the side or rear yard setbacks, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1131 Austin Avenue, NE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-498  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1898

**Property Location:** East of Euclid Avenue and West of Moreland Ramp

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Room Addition and Side Porch

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 483 Edgewood Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-506  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** 1908

**Property Location:** East block face of Boulevard SE., south of Ormewood Ave., north of Delmar Ave.

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Commercial

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Storefront replacement

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20C

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

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

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

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

The Applicant proposes the replacement of the entire storefront system which includes both original windows, original trim, non-original trim, and non-original plywood bead-board. The Applicant proposes replacing these items with period correct wood products. In looking at the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the storefront windows exhibit various stages of disrepair with some areas being easily repairable and others possibly requiring replacement. The areas of most notable concern are located in the transom area, where it appears the window casing and putty has failed and the glass lites are falling out of their proper placement. However, it is not clear what physical evaluation has taken place to

While Staff has no concerns with the replacement of non-original trim and the plywood beadboard with period correct wood replacement products, Staff finds that there is not sufficient information at this time to approve a wholesale replacement of the entire storefront at this time. The preference in any project involving historic windows is to retain as much of the original materials as possible. To this end, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a photographic inventory which is keyed to the existing elevation. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide documentation of the physical evaluation for each window and detail the feasibility of various repair methods. Lastly, Staff recommends only those windows which Staff has determined to be beyond the point of repair to be replaced with unclad wood true divided lite products matching the style and size of the original windows.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. The Applicant shall provide a photographic inventory which is keyed to the existing elevation, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(f);
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation of the physical evaluation for each window and detail the feasibility of various repair methods, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(f);
3. Only those windows which Staff has determined to be beyond the point of repair shall be replaced with unclad wood true divided lite products matching the style and size of the original windows, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(f); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documents.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 225 Rogers St. (Pratt-Pullman Landmark District).  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-496  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Pratt Pullman Landmark District **Other Zoning:** Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** West block face of Rogers St., north of Hosea L Williams Dr.

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

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20T

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral.

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

Building placement, massing, and height

The Applicant proposes the construction of 5 new buildings of undefined use. The District regulations have specific requirements for both height and placement of new construction. However, based on preliminary conversations, Staff understands that the placement and height of the proposed structures could be based on previously existing buildings constructed between 1904 and 1927. However, this information has not been provided for Staff to review. Staff would note that if the structures are not based on the height of buildings constructed between 1904 and 1927, then building 14, 16A, and 16B would exceed the 28' height limit for structures placed between a contributing building and Rogers St. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the proposed buildings are reconstructing previously existing structures built between 1904 and 1927 to their original footprint, height, and massing, or the new structures shall meet the requirements for new construction between a contributing structure and Rogers St.

From the elevations and site plan provided, Staff cannot determine how the structures will relate to the sidewalk along Roger's St. and the retaining walls close to where the structures will be installed. If paving or paths are proposed, Staff cannot find evidence of them in the submitted materials. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing how the proposed structures will engage both the site, the sidewalk, and the existing structures and whether any new paving is proposed as part of the project.

Facades

The District regulations require the façade organization, proportion, scale, materials, and other architectural details to meet the compatibility rule. No compatibility comparison information has been received. Further, the materials of the structures is not detailed other than to note the buildings will be metal and the windows will be glass/poly. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility comparisons supporting the design of the proposed structures. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide information detailing all exterior materials used for the proposed structures.

Staff notes several of the structures contain decking which the plans indicate are included to accommodate grade change. However, no stairs are provided on the decks. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information, such as a section drawing, showing how the decking will engage the change in grade.

Fenestration

The windows proposed by the Applicant are a mixture of vertically oriented windows and horizontal, or transom, style windows. On building 16 C and 16 D, both the east and west elevations will consist entirely of windows and doors. On several of the structures, windows set high on the façade appear to continue on to the roof plane, but this is difficult to confirm with the information Staff has at this time. While no compatibility information has been provided, Staff has concerns that the fenestration proposed by the Applicant would not be compatible with the fenestration pattern, materials, and style of the windows on contributing structures in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information detailing the pattern, materials, and style of windows on contributing buildings in the District. Staff further recommends the fenestration on the proposed structure conform to the District regulations.

Use

No information detailing the proposed use of the structures has been received. Likewise, no floorplans showing the interior layout of the structures has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide floorplans showing the interior layout of the proposed structures along with information detailing the proposed uses for the new structures.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide information showing the proposed buildings are reconstructing previously existing structures built between 1904 and 1927 to their original footprint, height, and massing, or the new structures shall meet the requirements for new construction between a contributing structure and Rogers St., per Sec. 16-20T.006(7);
2. The Applicant shall provide information showing how the proposed structures will engage both the site, the sidewalk, and the existing structures and whether any new paving is proposed as part of the project, per Sec. 16-20T.006;
3. The Applicant shall provide compatibility comparisons supporting the design of the proposed structures, per Sec. 16-20T.007(1)(a)(ii);
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing all exterior materials used for the proposed structures, per Sec. 16-20T.007(1)(c)(i);
5. The Applicant shall provide information, such as a section drawing, showing how the decking will engage the change in grade;
6. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information detailing the pattern, materials, and style of windows on contributing buildings in the District, per Sec. 16-20T.007(1)(b)(i);
7. The fenestration on the proposed structure shall conform to the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20T.007(1)(b)(i);
8. The Applicant shall provide floorplans showing the interior layout of the proposed structures along with information detailing the proposed uses for the new structures, per Sec. 16-20T.005; and,
9. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documents.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 615 Delmar Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-501  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1935 (original house) New Constitution

**Property Location:** Corner of Delmar and Rosedale

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

---

CA3-19-501 for 615 Delmar Avenue  
October 23, 2019

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 615 Delmar Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-502  
**MEETING DATE:** October 23, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1935

**Property Location:** Corner of Delmar and Rosedale

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Non-Contributing

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

CA3-19-502 for 615 Delmar Avenue (Variance)  
October 23, 2019