



## 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:** 676 Shelton Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-528  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1906

**Property Location:** East of Tift Avenue and West of Metropolitan Parkway

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

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."

### **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to add an additional 500 sf for a second story addition that will allow for living space. This will increase the height of the principle structure from 18 feet 6 inches to 20 feet and 9 and half inches, still an acceptable height allowed in the District. Staff is not concern about the added space.

### **Roof form**

The plans illustrate the Applicant plans to continue the hip formation, which is fine, although the massing of the house on plans appear to be huge and really transform the house. The added roof will also tuck under the existing roof which is not a concern to Staff. However, the Applicant's proposal to add a gable roof on the front of the house is a concern to Staff. Inventory photos, as well as, photos provided by the Applicant show the original front roof over the porch to be a shed construction. Staff recommends, the Applicant not add the gable front porch roof and retain the shed roof that is currently over the front.

### **Chimney**

On inventory photos, a chimney is shown. However, the Applicant has not shown the chimney on the plans. Staff recommends the chimney either remain and be shown on the new set of plans or just shown on the new set of plans if the Applicant does not plan to remove it.

### **Windows**

The proposed windows for the second-story addition are double hung four over four lite divide windows will trim. The Applicant doesn't specify what material the window will be. Staff recommends, the Applicant abide by the District regulation and install windows that are compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.

### **ALTERATIONS**

#### **Porch**

As mention, the Applicant proposes to add a Gable roof over the porch. Staff recommends the shed roof remains. The Applicant proposes also to restore the porch back to its' original orientation. From the plans, the Applicant has shifted the off centered front door to the center of the principle structure. While this is visually appealing, Staff has no evidence from the Applicant or department inventory photos to support the shift. With this being the case, Staff recommends the Applicant keep the door in its current position and provide photographic evidence or information supporting

the claim the door was originally in the center. Staff also recommends, any remaining original trim on the porch shall be retained and replace or repair in-kind.

### **Windows**

The Applicant has added two additional double hung 6 over 6 windows with lite divides to the front façade. Department inventory photos illustrate there are only two front windows, respectfully on each side. Staff recommends that Applicant retain the original fenestration patterns and not add the two additional windows.

Additionally, the Applicant proposes to add two 36 x36 windows on the side of the house to allow for the interior remodel for a kitchen and a bathroom. Each of these windows appear to retain the patterns of windows that are on the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

### **Foundation**

Right now, older inventory photos illustrate the front porch foundation is not as pronounced as recent photos and brick, not stucco. If the Applicant plans to return the porch foundation as well as the entire foundation to brick and remove the stucco, Staff is not concern for that proposal.

### **Railings**

The Applicant also proposes to remove the non-original porch railings and install new railings. Staff recommends the Applicant install porch railings that are wood with a two-part, top to bottom construction that is no higher than the front windowsill with a simple plain extension to satisfy building code regulations regarding the guard-rail.

### **Siding**

Currently, the siding on the principal structure is stucco. The Applicant has proposed to remove the stucco to expose the wood clapboard siding and repair in-kind. Any new siding will be replaced to make the pre-existing clapboard siding. As well any new siding for the addition will be matched in-kind. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

### **Door**

The current door on the principal structure is non-original. The Applicant proposes to install six panel wood door that is conducive to door of that time period. Staff is not concerned with this proposal but does recommend this door match other doors that predominates on the block to abide by District Regulations.

### **Deck**

The Applicant has stated on the front of the cover a proposal for deck, however, has failed to show the deck on the site plan. Staff recommends, the Applicant place the desk on the site plan so that Staff can determine if the deck is meeting District regulation concerning decks.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall not add the gable front porch roof and retain the shed roof that is currently over the front porch, Sec.16-201.006(4)(g)(1);
2. The chimney shall either remain and be shown on the new set of plans, if the Applicant plans to remove it or just shown on the new set of plans if the Applicant does not plan to remove it per, Sec. 16-201.006(4)(e);
3. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulation and install windows that are compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors, per Sec.16-201.006(4)(b)(5);
4. The Applicant shall keep the door in its current position and provide photographic evidence or information supporting the claim the door was originally in the center per Sec.16-201.006(4)(b);
5. The Applicant shall retain all the original trim on the house and replace and repair in-kind, per Sec.16-201.006(4)(g)(2);
6. The Applicant shall retain the original fenestration patterns and not add the two additional windows per, Sec.16-201.006(4)(b)
7. The Applicant shall install porch railings that are wood with a two-part, top to bottom construction that is no higher than the front windowsill with a simple plain extension to satisfy building code regulations regarding the guard-rail per, Sec.16-201.006();
8. The door shall match other doors that predominates on the block to abide by District Regulations per, Sec. 16-201.006(4)(g);
9. The Applicant shall place the desk on the site plan so that Staff can determine if the deck is meeting District regulation concerning decks per, Sec. 16-201.006 and
10. The final plans shall be reviewed and approved by Staff

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:** 683 Lawton Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-518  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1900's

**Property Location** West blockface, North of Lawton Place and South of Ralph David Abernathy Boulevard

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Roof Conversion

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20G.006

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Applicant was approved in January 2018 for renovations. CA3-18-428.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** APPROVAL

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

**ROOF END CONVERSION**

The Applicant has been before the Commission for renovation on 683 Lawton in 2018 and was approved with conditions. The Applicant is now before the Commission to request the existing front gable end to be converted to a hip construction. The Applicant is seeking tax credits for the renovations from the State Office. From a photo find by the State Office (part of the application packet) illustrates the current front gable end with the unusual vent is not the actual configuration of that part of the roof. In fact, it was hipped. With this being the case, the State Office has indicated that currently the house is non-contributing which is required for the credit. The State Office has requested the Applicant to (remove the front gable end with the vent) to the original hip roof to bring the house into compliance. If this is done the Applicant can apply for the tax-credit. Staff deems that removing the front gable end with the vent and hipping as shown in the photo is not a detriment to the District, but rather an asset. The house can be seen and read in its original intent. Staff just warns that the architect be meticulous in the conversion and use as many photographic resources in the endeavor. Additionally, Staff would like to encourage more Applicants to seek financial assistance from agencies as the State Office who are stewards in of positive and accurate preservation work. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: 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:** 891 White Street, SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-532  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1909-1910

**Property Location:** West of Lee Street and East of Joseph E. Lowry. Boulevard

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Porch Alteration

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20G.006

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

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

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

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

## **ALTERATION**

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing porch and restore the front porch to its original footprint. The Applicant has provided photos of two houses on the blockface—885 and 895 White Street which were constructed around the same time period. These houses show the original porch orientation. Staff agrees with the Applicant that the two addresses above are reflective of what the orientation of the proposed porch. Staff has no concerns with the proposal

### **Front Porch**

#### *Front door Entry and Stairs*

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing door and reorient the front door to the center of the house, removing the side stair entry, creating a front stair entry and full porch. The proposed plans also demonstrated stairs that will have close risers and ends as well as concrete. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

#### *Roof*

With the movement of the front door, the roof over the front is proposed to be changed from a gable roof to a shed roof. The shed roof is reflected on the comparable houses submitted. Staff deems the shed roof would have been accurate on the Applicant's proposed porch. The Applicant has proposed the flashing, cladding and fascia will match the existing on the house. Staff has no concerns with these proposals.

#### *Foundation*

The Applicant proposes modular brick veneer on the foundation of the porch. From the photos provided, it appears the existing foundation on the house is painted brick. To be consistent with the existing foundation, Staff recommends the porch foundation be brick.

#### *Railings*

The Applicant proposes wood railings with a two-part construction (top and bottom banisters), 4-inches between the bannisters, 36-inch railing in height with a guard rail and a 4-inch sphere. District regulations requires the height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District Regulations regarding the railing's construction and use a simple plain extension if needed to comply to the City building code.

#### *Floor*

The Applicant proposes a contiguous 4-inch wide tongue and groove flooring that will run perpendicular in direction for the porch floor construction. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

#### *Columns*

The Applicant proposes 8x 8 fluted wood post with post cap and base. District regulations state that columns and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. Staff was provided information that 841 White does have fluted columns after confirming, Staff is no concerns with this proposal.

### **Siding**

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace in-kind any existing and rotted clapboard siding. Staff is no concerns with this proposal.

CA2-19-532 891 White Street  
November 13, 2019  
Page 3 of 3

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The porch foundation shall be brick, per Sec. 16-20G.006(5);
2. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations regarding the railing's construction and use a simple plain extension if needed to comply to the City building code, per Sec.16-20G.006(9)(d) 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 284 Milledge Avenue SE  
**APPLICATION:** RC-19-526  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 2018

**Property Location:** East of Boyles Street and West of Hill Street

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Commenting on the variance to the BZA

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Variance to the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA) to increase an accessory structure from 30% to 41 %

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the BZA.

RC-19-526 for 284 Milledge Avenue  
November 13, 2019

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

**ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

The Applicant is requesting a variance for the accessory structure to be built on an existing two-story garage to increase from 30% to 41% of the size of the main dwelling. Staff has reviewed the request and found the setbacks and height of the proposed addition to consistent with Grant Park Historic regulations. In fact, this will allow for increased density with minimal impact to the lot coverage. Staff supports this request and find it to be consistent with the intent of the District Regulations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Send a letter with comments to the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA).

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:** 918 Oakland Dr.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-530  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1945

**Property Location:** West block face of Oakland Dr., south of Richland Rd., north of Montreat Ave.

**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:** Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-19-530: Approval with Conditions.**

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

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing a number of alterations to the exterior of the structure. The proposed alterations are replacing of the siding of the structure, repairing the side porch, and replacing the windows and doors.

**-Siding**

Based on pictures provided by the Applicant, the siding on the structure shows signs of deterioration, warping, and rotting in various places. Along the front façade of the structure, the siding is primarily warped and separating from the structure. The right side of the structure has a number of areas where the siding is missing or has deteriorated to the point of disrepair. The left side of the structure has siding that is warped and severely damaged. The Applicant has provided evidence of rotting underneath the siding along the rear façade. As such, Staff recommends that the damaged siding be replaced in kind, with the same dimensions and patterning.

**-Side porch**

The side porch of the structure is in a state of disrepair. The stairs are missing the risers, the porch floor is severely deteriorated, and the railings are missing numerous posts. Staff finds that the conditions mentioned warrant replacement, with the exception of the railings. As such, Staff recommends that the porch floor is replaced in kind, new steps are added to the existing stair stringer, and that the missing posts on the railings are replaced to match the existing. Staff also recommends that the existing railings and stair stringer are maintained.

**-Windows**

Based on the pictures provided by the Applicant, the windows do not appear to be original. Therefore, Staff has no issues with the replacing of the windows. However, Staff recommends that the new windows match the same patterning as the old.

**-Doors**

The doors on the structure appear to be in good condition. Minimal repairs should be able to suffice. As such, Staff recommends that the front door, rear door, and side door be maintained.

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

1. The siding along the front façade, rear facade, left side, and right side of the building shall be replaced in kind, matching the existing pattern and dimensions.
2. The porch floor shall be replaced in kind.
3. New posts along the side porch railings shall match existing.
4. The existing railings and stair stringer shall be maintained.
5. The new windows shall match the patterning and fenestration of the old windows.
6. The front, rear, and side doors shall be maintained.
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood

CA2-19-530 for 918 Oakland Dr.  
November 13, 2019.  
Page 3 of 3

File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1131 Merrill Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-366  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019 deferred from 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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** A demolition was requested CAPH-19-499 requesting to demo the existing house which has already been demolished by the Applicant. The house was a contributing house. The Minimal Tradition has to be rebuilt.

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

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

Updated Plans in **Italics**

#### **PLAN ISSUES**

**The Applicant is taking the house from a 2/1 to a 3/2 building a 2,156-sf house. This is permitted. The Applicant has provided a side plan that only show the existing footprint but not the proposed rebuild. Staff recommends the Applicant provides a site plan that show the proposed footprint of the house with the addition.**

#### **REBUILD/ ADDITION**

##### **Roof**

The Applicant proposes a Hip roof, that matches the roof that was on the existing principal structure. Essentially the Applicant is reconstructing the roof that was previously there. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Additionally, the Applicant has stated the pitch on the house will be 6:12 but has not indicated what the original pitch or height of the new construction. Staff recommends, the Applicant construct the pitch to be in-kind as the original. Regarding the height the Applicant has provided compatibility information of five contributing houses on the blockface for comparison. The lowest height on one of the comparisons is 18 feet, the highest is 21feet. Staff recommends the height of house be between these comparisons.

**Taking the house from a 2/1 to a 3/2, the Applicant proposes the roof line to be changed from the original Gable roofline. Essentially, the Applicant has constructed a roofline that continues too far back and essentially creating a hip roof. Staff recommends the Applicant create a distinctive gable roof coming from the front as it was on the original house. The new added roof must tuck under the gable roof. This demarcation will clearly show the original Minimal Traditional Cottage construction from the addition.**

##### **Stoop**

A stoop with a gable roof is proposed by the Applicant for the new construction. From inventory photos and the compatibility comparisons, houses with a stoop is prevalent on the blockface. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Inventory photos indicate the steps on the stoop were cement. Staff recommends the steps be cement. In the original photos, the stoop did not have rails but columns. Staff is not concerned with the columns since they do not appear non- original as well as gable roof over the stoop. Staff does recommend the columns match the be designed to match what is prevalent on the block face for contributing houses. Regarding the rails, Staff would not be concerned with the railing addition, there are three houses that have railings. However, Staff does recommend the rails be a two-part butt-head construction.

**The Applicant has changed the design of the stoop construction. The Applicant now proposes to construct a stoop that will not reflect railings, taking it back to the original design. Regarding the gable roof over the stop, additional photos show the gable roof(s) not**

**to be original, therefore the double gable is not necessary. Staff recommendations a small gable roof over the stoop that is reflective of a Minimal Traditional Cottage.**

#### **Windows/Fenestration**

From the plans, the Applicant proposes to repeat the same fenestration pattern that was on the prior house with the exception on the right side where the two front windows spaced apart. The Applicant proposes to have the two on the right side together. Staff recommends the Applicant construct the windows on the front right side apart as they were prior to the house being demolished. From inventory photos the windows on the existing house were wood one over one with lite divides. Staff recommends the Applicant replace all windows in-kind with wood and mimic the original divides on the window.

**The Applicant has changed the plans and placed all the windows in the correct orientation. Staff is no longer concern with this proposal. Staff does still recommend the Applicant replace all windows in-kind with wood and mimic the original divides on the window if there are any.**

**Staff recommendations, the Applicant balance the fenestration on the left-side elevation. The first window should move up closer to the front of the house as the right-side elevation demonstrates. On the rear, Staff recommendations, the Applicant add a window to make the wall to space more in line to wall to space on the right-side elevation.**

#### **Siding**

Inventory photos reflects the prior house's siding was asbestos. The Applicant proposes cementitious siding. Staff is not concerned with the cementitious siding. Staff does recommend the cementitious siding be smooth faced with either a 4 to 6-inch reveal.

#### **Door**

The Applicant proposal a Craftsman Style door with upper lites. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### **Walkway**

The District Regulation states the "a paved walkway from the front sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure shall be provided." The Applicant has not demonstrated this on the site plan. Staff recommends a paved walkway to be installed from the front of the sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall provide a site plan that demonstrates the proposed footprint of the new construction including the deck, per Sec 16-20M.012;
2. The height of the house shall be between 18 and 21 feet and construct a pitch in-kind to abide by the District Regulation, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
3. The Applicant shall create a gable roof from the front that is distinctive from the added roof, per Sec.16-20M.005:

CA3-19-366 for 1131 Merrill Avenue

November 13, 2019 deferred from the October 23, 2019 UDC

pg. 4

4. All windows shall be wood and have the patterns of window divides, per Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(o) (1);
5. The first window on the left-side elevation shall move up closer to the front of the house as the right-side elevation demonstrates, per Sec. 16-20M.13(2)(o)(2);
6. On the rear left-side elevation, the Applicant should add a window to make the wall to space ratio more in line to the wall to space ratio on the right-side elevation, per Sec.16-20M.13(2)(o)(2);
7. The siding shall be smoothed-face cementitious side with a 4 to 6 reveal, per Sec.16-20M.013 (2)(q);
8. A paved walkway shall to be installed from the front of the sidewalk to the front entry of the principal structure, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d) and
9. 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:** 211-235 Mitchell St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-534  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Hotel Row Landmark District **Other Zoning:** Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** developed from 1892 through 1908

**Property Location:** North block face of Mitchell St., east of Ted Turner Dr., west of Forsyth St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Subject properties exhibit elements of early 20<sup>th</sup> century commercial buildings.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations and signage

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

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

**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 20H of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The project in question involves five of the 8 structures which make up the Landmark District. The properties for which alterations are proposed are the Sylvan Hotel, the factory building located at 227-231 Mitchell St., the Scoville Hotel, the commercial building located at 217-221 Mitchell St., and the Gordon Hotel.

As each of the projects involves alterations that are unique to that building, Staff will provide analysis of the project on a building by building basis.

#### New signage

With regard to the new signage, Staff has no general concerns with the proposed work. However, Staff would suggest that the Applicant submit a palate of tenant signs for the Commission to approve which would then allow for an administrative sign off for each tenant sign as opposed to requiring each sign to be approved by the Commission separately.

#### Gordon Hotel and adjacent commercial building

The subject property consists of ground-floor retail and residential uses on the second and third floors. The alterations proposed for this structure concern the ground floor storefront area only. In general, the proposed work centers on repairs to the historic façade and storefront units. Staff is generally supportive of the methods of repair proposed and with the replacement of non-original features with historically accurate replacements but has concerns with the notations that indicate wholesale removal of wood trim at the base of the storefronts. While some of this material clearly requires replacement, Staff finds that much of the wood appears to be in repairable condition. Staff recommends the Applicant submit information showing the specific location of original trim to be replaced on the Gordon Hotel and adjacent commercial building property. Staff recommends only those portions of the trim on the Gordon Hotel and adjacent commercial building which Staff has determined to be beyond repair be replaced in-kind with regards to material and design.

#### Scoville Hotel

The proposed work for this building would consist of “mothballing” the structure after work is done to stabilize the historic features and provide aesthetic improvements to the Mitchell St. façade. In General Staff has no concerns with the proposed work other than the potential replacement of historic façade elements. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit information showing the specific location of original façade materials to be replaced on the Scoville Hotel. Staff recommends only those portions of the original façade materials on the Scoville Hotel which Staff has determined to be beyond repair be replaced in-kind with regards to material and design

#### Sylvan Hotel and adjacent factory building

The subject properties consist of ground-floor retail and proposed office uses on the two additional floors on the factory building and three additional floors on the Sylvan Hotel building. The proposed work for these buildings would again center on the front façade, but would also include more substantial work on the side and rear facades as well. The work on the sides and rear consists of the replacement of non-historic elements with new elements that meet the regulations. Staff has no concerns with this portion of the proposal.

On the front façade, alterations to both the storefront area and the windows on the top floors are proposed. In general, Staff has minimal concerns with the proposed work as it centers on the repair of historic materials. In a few places on the front façade, replacement of original materials is proposed. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit information showing the specific location of original façade materials to be replaced on the Sylvan Hotel and the adjacent factory building. Staff recommends only those portions of

the original façade materials on the Sylvan Hotel and the adjacent factory building which Staff has determined to be beyond repair be replaced in-kind with regards to material and design

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

1. The Applicant shall submit information showing the specific location of original trim to be replaced on the Gordon Hotel and adjacent commercial building property, per Sec. 16-20.009(5);
2. Only those portions of the trim on the Gordon Hotel and adjacent commercial building which Staff has determined to be beyond repair shall be replaced in-kind with regards to material and design, per Sec. 16-20.009(5);
3. The Applicant shall submit information showing the specific location of the original façade materials to be replaced on the Scoville Hotel, per Sec. 16-20.009(5);
4. Only those portions of the original façade materials on the Scoville Hotel which Staff has determined to be beyond repair shall be replaced in-kind with regards to material and design, per Sec. 16-20.009(5);
5. The Applicant shall submit information showing the specific location of original façade materials to be replaced on the Sylvan Hotel and the adjacent factory building, per Sec. 16-20.009(5);
6. Only those portions of the original façade materials on the Sylvan Hotel and the adjacent factory building which Staff has determined to be beyond repair shall be replaced in-kind with regards to material and design, per Sec. 16-20.009(5); and,
7. 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:** 1091 Tucker Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-527  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District    **Other Zoning:** RG-3-C / Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** North block face of Tucker Ave, west of Lee St., east of Peoples St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Infill.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Variance.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Commission reviewed applications CA3-19-439 and CA3-19-440 at this location.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval.

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

**Variance Requests**

The requested variance is to allow an increase in the allowable height from 22' 6" to 35'.

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography;

The Applicant states that the subject property, which contains a frontage of 358' along the north block face of Tucker Ave., is the largest contiguous and undeveloped properties in the District. The Applicant also cites the existence of only one comparable property on the block face as an extraordinary and exceptional condition of the subject property.

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

The Applicant states that the reduction in height to conform to the one comparable property on the block face would reduce the density of the project thus eliminating its viability as an affordable housing project.

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

In response to this criterion, Applicant cites the lack of comparable residential structures.

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

The Applicant states that the street in question is unusual as it appears to originally have been an alley which would not originally have contained many structures along its frontage. The Applicant also states that the lack of single-family housing on this street would limit the impact on the historic District as a whole. The Applicant further states that the introduction of new affordable density on a block face that is otherwise devoid of any residential uses outweighs the need for strict adherence to the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

In general Staff finds that the lot size and location are the primary factors creating unnecessary hardship for the project. As such, Staff supports the requested variances.

**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:** 195 Pearl St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-525  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** Pre 1911

**Property Location:** East block face of Berean Ave., south of Tenelle St., north of Gaskill St.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Addition and site work.

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Commission previously reviewed and approved CA3-19-120 for additions and site work at this location. The current application would change the design of the proposed additions.

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

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

Addition

The Applicant is proposing revisions to the previously approved one-story addition to the rear of the existing structure. The proposed change will include an additional nested rear-facing gable on the rear façade of the previously approved rear gable. Staff has no concerns with the design of these structures as they conform to the architecture of the existing structure while differentiating the additions from the existing structure. As such, Staff has no concerns with the design of the revised rear addition.

The second change to the proposal is the removal of the previously approved dormer from the plans. Staff has no concerns with this portion of the proposal.

The third change is the inclusion of two new windows on the right side façade. The new windows, while smaller than the original windows on the structure, are proportional to the originals and appear to be double hung. Staff has no concerns with this change.

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

1. 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:** 1112 Colquitt Avenue, NE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-524  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1928

**Property Location:** East of Euclid Avenue and West of Sinclair Avenue

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Second Story Addition/rear dormer, Accessory Dwelling Addition, renovations

**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.

## **NEW ADDITIONS**

### **Garage/ADU**

The Applicant proposes to remove an accessory structure, that is not original to the main structure and non-contributing. In removing this structure, the Applicant proposes to construct a two-car garage that will also act as an accessory dwelling that sits in the buildable area of the property and does not exceed the side or rear setbacks. The new garage will be 632 sf., per the District Regulation, the square footage of the accessory dwelling unit shall not be included when calculating the total area of the accessory building. Material proposed for the ADU such as cementitious siding is permitted. Staff is not concerned with his proposal.

### **Second Story Addition/Dormer**

The Applicant proposes to add more space to the existing structure by adding a second floor by proposing a rear facing dormer. The proposed dormer will not exceed the existing roof line and will tuck under it with a slope of 2:12 matching the existing slopes on sections of the Hip roof. The added trim and siding are consistent with material proposed on the entire main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **RENOVATIONS**

In addition to the proposed garage/ADU and dormer, the Applicant proposes alterations to the existing main structure which consists of porch renovations, siding removal and repair, gutter replacements, restore molding and drip cap.

### **Porch**

#### *Railings*

The existing railings are non-historic to the main structure, the Applicant proposes to remove the existing railings and install two-part construction wood railings with guardrail. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Columns*

As with the existing railings the porch columns are non-historic, and the Applicant proposes to remove these and install 8x4 wood box columns that are reflective of the style and time period of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Sliding**

The Applicant proposes to remove the vinyl siding and repair and replace in-kind the wood siding underneath the vinyl siding and repair and replace the trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **General Repairs**

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing gutter and install Ogee gutter. As well, the Applicant proposes to restore the molding and drip cap on the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with these proposals.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood

CA3-19-524 for 1112 Colquitt Avenue  
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:** 479 Edgewood Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-496

**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** Southwest corner of Boulevard SE and Edgewood Ave.

**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. 16-20C

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** Yes. Deferred October 23, 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 20C of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing a new 4 story building in the existing vacant lot.

#### Height

The District regulations allow a height equal to 1.5 times the height of the tallest structure on the block not to exceed 55' if the property is located east of I-75/85. The Applicant has provided information detailing that the tallest structure on the block face has a height of 34' 6" which would allow for a structure with a total height of 51' 9". The proposed structure contains a height of 51' 5" which meets the District regulations.

#### Facades

The District regulations require the principal structures general façade organization, proportion, scale, roof form, pitch and materials, door and window placement, and other architectural details to meet the compatibility rule. As these are non-quantitative measurements, these elements should be consistent with those that predominate on contributing structures of like use on the block.

Staff has several concerns with the north and west façades of the proposed structure. Firstly, the proposed structure contains voids associated with a colonnade, balconies, and stairwells on the north and west elevations. Staff finds that the contributing structures on the block face are defined by solid walls with fenestration as the only penetrations into their façades. Staff finds that the compatibility issue could be addressed by either creating true façades with compatible fenestration or by adding metal grids which mimic the fenestration on the north façade into the voids on the north and west façades.

Staff also has concerns with the proposed green wall on the west façade. Firstly, no information relating to the construction of the green wall has been provided. Secondly Staff can find no precedent for greenwalls on contributing structures on the block.

Staff is not concerned with the cantilevered projection which constitutes portions of the west and south façades. In general, Staff finds that the overall massing and design is consistent with the contributing structures on the block face and the projection provides architectural interest on a façade which would otherwise be devoid of such.

Staff recommends the north and west façades conform to the compatibility rule.

*The revised plans show the colonnade area still in place. Staff finds that a colonnade could be compatible if the exterior wall appeared to be cut into the façade. Staff also finds that the easiest way of achieving this aesthetic is to introduce a column to the negative space in the corner of the structure between the second and fourth floors. As such, Staff recommends a column be installed to hold the corner of the building from the second to the fourth floor.*

*The Applicant has provided additional information provided detailing the construction and compatibility of the proposed green wall. In reviewing these documents, Staff finds there is no precedence on the block for the inclusion of a green wall. The examples provided are not from the immediate area and show walls that are overgrown with vegetation as opposed to an intentionally designed green wall. As such, Staff finds that the proposed green-walls do not meet the compatibility rule and recommends they be removed from the plans.*

#### Fenestration

Staff finds that the fenestration provided on the north façade is consistent with the fenestration found on the contributing buildings on the block. However, Staff has concerns with the fenestration provided on the west façade.

Of particular concern to Staff is the style and pattern of fenestration on the west façade. While the north façade is comprised of fenestration that is more commercial or industrial in nature, the west façade contains only one window unit that Staff would classify this way. The remaining fenestration consists of a vertically oriented glass band associated with the lobbies present on all 4 floors which is inset from the primary façade. Given Staff's earlier commentary regarding the façade organization and the recommendations made there, Staff will limit their comments in this section to the style and pattern of the windows only.

Staff has concerns that a departure from both the style of windows present on contributing structures as well as the pattern of window placement would create a façade that is altogether inconsistent with the historic pattern of structures on the block.

Further, Staff finds that the west side façade does not meet the requirements that development along the sidewalk without fenestration not exceed a maximum of 10 feet of the façade. It is also unclear whether 60% of the west side façade contains fenestration as required by the regulations.

Staff recommends the fenestration on the west façade meet the District regulations.

*The Applicant has revised their drawings to include windows that are more industrial in style on the west side façade. The windows on this façade contain two different widths of lite divisions. Staff recommends the lite division pattern for the windows on the boulevard façade match the lite pattern on the Edgewood Ave. facade, with the exception of the windows associated with the rear bump-out section.*

#### Use

The proposed structure will contain a mix of multi-family residential and retail uses. Staff finds that both of these uses meet the District regulations. However, The regulations also require active use along the entire length of the building façade, with the exception of building ingress and egress points. Staff finds that the west side façade does not comply with this regulation. As such, Staff recommends the west side façade conform to the active use requirements of the District regulations.

*The Applicant has revised the first floor layout to include active uses along the entire Boulevard frontage. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.*

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

- 1. A column shall be installed to hold the corner of the building from the second to the fourth floor, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);*
- 2. A column shall be installed to hold the corner of the building at the corner of Edgewood Ave and Boulevard, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(a)(ii);*
- 3. The lite division pattern for the windows on the west façade shall match the lite pattern on the Edgewood Ave. facade, with the exception of the windows associated with the rear bump-out section, per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(b) and Sec. 16-20C.008(3)(d); and,*
- 4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documents.*

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File

CA3-19-496 for 479 Edgewood Ave.  
November 13, 2019  
Page 4 of 4



## 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:** 887 Metropolitan Pkwy  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-522  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

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

**Historic Zoning:** Adair Park Historic District    **Other Zoning:** C-1

**Date of Construction:** 1914

**Property Location:** East block face of Metropolitan Pkwy, south of Lillian Ave., north of Pearce St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Infill.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Additions.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-19-522: Approval with Conditions.**

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

**Additions**

The Applicant is proposing the addition of a front yard fence with a wood gate that maintains openness. The proposed fence will be located along Metropolitan Pkwy and does extend past the existing block wall that is located along the drive of the property.

Per Sec. 16-20I.006.(4)(i), fences must be constructed of stone, brick, iron, or wood pickets, must follow the property line, and must not obscure the front of the building. Staff recommends that the fence maintain 50% openness, in order to have the least impact on views from the public right-of-way, as Staff was not able to determine the height of the fence. Staff has no issues with the fences placement or materials.

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

1. The front yard fence shall be at least 50% open.
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:** 2695 Oldknow Dr.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-535

**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** North block face of Oldknow Dr., west of Albert St., east of E Handy Dr.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:**

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New additions and alterations.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-535: Approval with Conditions.**

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

Additions

The Applicant is proposing additions to the left side of the structure. This proposed addition would cause the existing screened-in porch and two existing windows to be removed. The new addition would add three new windows. As this lot is a corner lot, the new addition would be clearly visible from the public right-of-way. The Applicant is also proposing the addition of a new deck to replace the old.

After review, Staff finds that the existing screened in porch is in good condition and of historic nature. Therefore, Staff recommends that the screen-in porch be maintained and preserved. Additionally, Staff recommends that any new windows along the new addition match the patterning and fenestration of the existing windows.

The new deck is larger than the existing deck. It is unclear if the railing construction will match the existing. As such, Staff recommends that the railing on the new deck is constructed using a two-part butt joint and that the flooring on the deck run perpendicular to the rear façade of the structure.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing alterations to the exterior façade of the house and to the overall roof shape. Currently, the existing roof structure is unique for the neighborhood, with varying slopes and hips. The proposed new roof would create a uniform look with a single height plane.

After review, Staff finds that the proposed roof would compromise the historic character embodied by the primary structure. Additionally, no other roof on the block face matches the proposed new roof. Therefore, Staff recommends that the existing roof shape and pitch are maintained. Staff also recommends that the roof over the addition be based on the compatibility rule.

The Applicant is proposing changing many of the window openings along the façade of the structure. As no window plan was provided, Staff recommends that the Applicant document the state of the existing windows to determine where replacement is necessary. Additionally, Staff recommends that any window that needs to be replaced is done in kind, matching the fenestration and shape of the existing windows.

Lastly, the Applicant is proposing replacing the existing siding with hardi-plank siding. Staff was unable to determine the status of the existing siding and recommends that any replacement of the siding is done in kind.

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

1. The existing screened-in porch shall be maintained and preserved.
2. The new windows on the addition shall match the existing patterning and fenestration.
3. The new railing on the deck shall be constructed using a two-part butt joint.
4. The flooring of the new deck shall be perpendicular to the rear façade of the house.
5. The existing roof shape and pitch shall be maintained.
6. The roof over the new addition shall be based on the compatibility rule.

CA3-19-535 for 2695 Oldknow Dr.  
November 13, 2019.  
Page 3 of 3

7. Applicant shall provide documentation detailing the state of the existing windows.
8. Any windows that are deemed to be replaced shall be replaced in kind.
9. The siding shall be replaced in kind.
10. 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:** 2930 Eleanor Terrace  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-533  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1963

**Property Location:** East of Kings Grant Drive and West of Eleanor Court

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Applicant was approved with conditions February 2019 for alterations. Received a Stop Work Order for unpainted brick. Requesting to keep paint on bricks.

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

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

## **ALTERATIONS**

### **Painted Brick**

The Applicant was approved for alterations to the structure in February 2019. Between that time and now, the Applicant painted the siding, which is fine as well as painted the unpainted brick. Unpainted brick is not permitted in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the paint. Sandblasting is not permitted.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**

1. The Applicant shall remove the paint from the brick, per Sec. 16-20Q.006 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:** 203 Peters St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-513  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Castleberry Hill Landmark District **Other Zoning:** None.

**Date of Construction:** 2000

**Property Location:** West block face of Peters St., south of Haynes St., north of Fair St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?** No

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Infill

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** site work related to a new swimming pool.

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

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

**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 20N of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes the installation of a swimming pool in the rear yard of the existing residential property. Per the District regulations, swimming pools in the District require the Commission to issue a special exception upon finding the following:

- a. The location shall not be objectionable to occupants of neighboring property, or the neighborhood in general, By reason of noise, lights, or concentrations of persons or vehicular traffic; and
- b. The area for such activity could not reasonably be located elsewhere on the lot.

The regulations also give the Commission authority to require any screening, lighting restrictions, or hours of operation they find appropriate to ameliorate any negative impacts on neighboring properties.

The owners of the subject property also own the neighboring property at 201 Peters St. The Applicant has also provided a letter from the owners of 211 and 180 Peters St. stating they are supportive of the swimming pool with no objections. Staff finds that this requirement has been met.

Staff finds that the location of the swimming pool is the only area on the property that could reasonably accommodate the accessory use. As such, Staff has no concerns with this portion of the proposal.

With regards to screening of the swimming pool, the proposed site plan shows the location of the swimming pool is a courtyard area with 7' high walls along the side lot lines. Additionally, a garage along Bradberry St., would screen the pool from view along the rear yard. Likewise, the principal structure would completely obscure the pool from view along Peters St. As such, Staff has no concerns regarding the visibility of the pool that would require screening or additional fencing.

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

1. 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:** 1052 Donnelly Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-536  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1940

**Property Location:** Southwest block face of Donnelly Ave., south of Richland Rd., north of Peebles St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Bungalow/Craftsman

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New additions and alterations.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-536: Approval with Conditions.**

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

Additions

The Applicant is proposing a new addition to the structure along the rear façade. The new additions roof will not be higher than the existing roof height, the siding will be uniform between the new addition and the existing, and the window patterning is similar to the existing. After review, Staff feels that the new addition is compatible with the existing structure. Staff recommends that the existing corner board on the existing structure be maintained in order to differentiate the new addition from the existing structure.

Alterations

The alterations proposed by the Applicant deal with the front façade of the structure, the siding, and the roof. The Applicant is proposing to alter the existing front porch by changing the front railing to a brick veneer. As this faces the public right-of-way, Staff recommends that the type of brick and pattern of brickwork be based on the compatibility rule.

The Applicant is proposing replacing the existing siding. Staff was unable to confirm the condition of the siding and finds it likely that the original siding is underneath the existing. Staff recommends that the Applicant remove a small portion of the existing siding and send photographic documentation to Staff. If the original siding is still extant, Staff recommends that it be retained and repaired in kind.

The Applicant is proposing to add new asphalt single roofing. As this matches the existing roof pattern and material, Staff has no issues with this.

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

1. The existing corner board where the proposed addition meets the structure shall be maintained.
2. The type of brick and pattern of brickwork in the front porch shall be based on the compatibility rule.
3. The Applicant shall remove a small portion of the existing siding to determine if the original wood siding is still in place and provide photographic evidence to Staff.
4. If the original siding is in place, it shall be retained and repaired in kind.
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 194 Berean Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-538  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** Pre 1911

**Property Location:** East block face of Berean Ave., south of Tenelle St., north of Gaskill St.

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

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

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

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

**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 20A of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Site plan

Per the District regulations, the rear yard setback is based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant has provided information showing that the neighboring contributing property at 196 Berean Ave. has a rear yard setback of approximately 52'. The proposed addition would have a rear yard setback of 52' conforming to the range established by the subject property and the neighboring property.

The proposed addition would conform to the side yard setbacks of the existing structure, satisfying the requirements for side yard setbacks.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing a one-story addition to the rear of the existing structure. The proposed addition will contain a rear-facing gable consistent with the pitch of existing rear additions to the structure. As such, Staff has no concerns with the design of the structure.

The floor area ratio in this subarea is limited to 50% of the lot area. The proposed structure would contain a heated square footage of 869 sf which is approximately 26% of the 3,341 sf lot. As such, Staff finds this regulation has been met.

The Applicant has provided existing and proposed lot coverage calculations. The proposed addition would bring the proposed lot coverage to 42% which does not exceed the lot coverage maximum for this subarea.

With regards to the fenestration, the District regulations require the fenestration pattern, size, scale, design, and materials to be based on the compatibility rule. In looking at the proposed fenestration on the right side and rear façade, Staff finds that the windows proposed are consistent with the design of the existing structure. As such, Staff has no concerns with the windows on these two façades.

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

1. 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:** CA3-19-529  
**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 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:** Approval with conditions.

**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.

The District regulations have both quantitative and qualitative requirements for new construction. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related regulations were met.

Site plan

The Applicant proposes the construction of 3 new multi-family buildings. Staff has concerns with the amount of parking proposed for inclusion at the front of the property. Staff is also concerned with the amount of negative space on the south side of the property. As such, Staff recommends Building A be widened as far south as possible while still allowing for both the required 20' buffer and fire access. Staff further recommends the parking to the south of Building A be removed from the plans. Likewise, Staff recommends the amount of parking between building A and Building B be significantly reduced in favor of locating the parking towards the rear of the property.

Staff recommends the Applicant provide information showing the project's impact on the total lot coverage of the site.

Building massing and height

The District regulations have specific requirements for both height and placement of new construction. Based on the information provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the height and placement of the structure meet the District regulations. Staff likewise has no concerns with the proposed massing of the structures.

Facades

The District regulations require the façade organization, proportion, scale, and other architectural details to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant has provided a compatibility study showing the materials and style of the contributing structures on the property. Based on this information, Staff has no concerns with the design of the structures or the proposed fenestration patterns.

Staff does have concerns with the proposed materials, namely the inclusion of cement horizontal lap siding and cement board and batten siding. Staff finds the use of horizontal lap siding on these structures does not meet the compatibility rule. However, The Applicant has provided information showing the proposed vertical board and batten siding will be indistinguishable from metal siding at a distance. Staff is comfortable with the use of this product on some of the secondary surfaces of the structures. However, Staff recommends metal siding be used on both the main portions of the west and east facades of Building A, and the main portions of the west facades of Buildings B and C. Staff has no concerns with the use of the vertical board and batten siding on the eastern or western facades of the rooftop massing on Building A, or on the western facades of the rooftop massing of Buildings B and C.

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

1. Building A shall be widened as far south as possible while still allowing for both the required 20' buffer and fire access, per Sec. 16-20T.004(1);
2. The parking to the south of Building A shall be removed from the plans, per Sec. 16-20T.004(1);
3. The amount of parking between building A and Building B shall be significantly reduced in favor of locating the parking towards the rear of the property, per Sec. 16-20T.004(1);
4. The Applicant provide information showing the project's impact on the total lot coverage of the site, per Sec. 16-20T.006(6);

CA3-19-529 for 225 Rogers St.  
November 13, 2019  
Page 3 of 3

5. Metal siding shall be used on both the main portions of the west and east facades of Building A, and the main portions of the west facades of Buildings B and C, per Sec. 16-20T.007(1)(c)(i); and,
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documents.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File