



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 809 Cherokee Ave

APPLICATION: CA2-19-557

MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1904

Property Location: West block face of Cherokee Ave, south of Grant Park Pl, north of Ormond St

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Victorian.

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. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-19-557: Approval with conditions.

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

Alterations

Front Porch

The Applicant is proposing removing the existing walls along the front façade to expose the porch that had been previously enclosed, demolishing the existing flooring that is currently enclosed while maintain the original porch framing and adding Tuscan columns, a new door, and 3 new windows. This would require the existing front door and 5 existing windows to be removed. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing the removal of the existing stairs, to be replaced in kind in the same location with the same dimensions.

Given that the front porch was original to the design of the house, Staff has no issue with reopening of the porch. As such, this would mean the existing windows and doors along the enclosure are not original historic material. It is important to note that Staff was not able to determine the when the porch was enclosed.

After review, Staff finds the opening of the porch to be consistent with the original intent of the structure and the relatable to the overall design of the neighborhood. Staff also finds the patterning and size of the proposed windows to be acceptable given their conformity to existing windows on the second story of the primary structure. However, Staff finds the proposed porch flooring to be inconsistent with the time period. As such, Staff recommends that the front porch flooring be installed to run perpendicular to the front façade of the house. Staff also recommends that the proposed porch railing be constructed using a two-part butt joint method, as was common with houses of this time period.

Side

The Applicant is proposing a number of alterations to the side of the primary structure: removal of existing vinyl siding, removal of an existing stair case, removed of an existing door, and the addition of 2 new windows.

After review, Staff has no issue with the removing of vinyl siding in order to expose the original wood lap siding underneath. In order to be sure of the preservation of historic materials, Staff recommends that prior to repair or replace of any wood lap siding, that the Applicant take a photograph and send to Staff for review. Staff also has no issues with the removal of the existing stair case and door located along the right side of the primary structure, as they are not historic materials. While the proposed windows do not match in size to the existing along the right side of the house, Staff finds the new fenestration to be consistent with the existing fenestration. Additionally, Staff finds the proposed window pattern of one-over-one to be consistent with the existing windows. Staff does recommend that any existing siding damaged during removal of the stairs and/or door be replaced in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The front porch flooring shall be perpendicular to the front façade of the primary structure.

2. The front porch railing shall be constructed using a two-part butt joint method with the top rail placed no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows where allowed by the IEBC.
3. The Applicant shall provide detailed photographic documentation of the condition of the original siding, once the vinyl siding has been removed, for Staff to review.
4. Only those portions of siding which Staff has determined to be beyond repair shall be replaced in-kind.
5. Vinyl siding damaged during removal of stairs and/or door shall be replaced in kind.
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 740 Clifton Rd.

APPLICATION: CA2-19-563

MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1913-1924

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

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

.

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

Site work

The Applicant is proposing improvements to 11 acres of the existing driving range/practice area of the golf course located on the property. The subject property has a split zoning jurisdiction as only the southern portion of the property is located in the City of Atlanta and the Druid Hills Landmark District. From the site plan provided, it appears that all or most of the 11 acres proposed in the work are within the portion of the property located in the City of Atlanta. Included in the work are general site improvements, drainage improvements, and netting along the perimeter of the northeast area of the course where the subject property abuts private residences fronting Oakdale Rd.

The Commission has purview over site work on properties in the District which are visible from the public right of way. Work taking place in such area that are visible from the public right of way are required to preserve the overall character and quality of the landscaping. However, in reviewing the current proposal, Staff finds that the area of work will be screened from view via a tall mature evergreen hedge situated along the Clifton Rd. frontage of the property. This hedge, along with the topography and the overall size of the site, will prevent the work from impacting the public viewshed. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1164 Wilmington Avenue, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-19-593
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West of Oakland Drive and East of Selwin Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations: siding, windows, door, roof repair.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work issued in June 2019, for working without permits, looks like interior work was the cause of the Stop Work order.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

Several alterations are being proposed for the existing structure: replacement of siding, repair porch windows replacement, door and roof repair.

Siding

The Applicant has proposed cementitious siding on the principle structure stating the original siding material is vinyl. However, inventory photos show the siding to be wood. The Applicant has produced one photo to show that vinyl siding is on the house now. While cementitious siding is a permissible material in the district, it is not a suitable material for original wood siding replacement. This must be done in-kind. Staff recommends, the Applicant use wood siding with a 4 to 6- inch reveal as the material for replacement.

Windows

The Applicant has stated all existing windows are missing in the principle structure and propose to replace with one-over-one vinyl windows. Photos presented by the Applicant reflect boarded up window openings that are three-over-one wood windows. As well, the inventory photos reflect three-over-one wood windows were originally on the house. Staff recommends the Applicant install three-over-one wood window for windows that can not be repaired and repair those that can in-kind.

Doors

The Applicant proposes a new door. District regulation requires exterior doors to be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame. Staff recommends the door be either wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame.

Roof Repair

The Applicant proposes to replace the shingle with asphalt shingles. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall use wood siding with a 4 to 6-inch reveal for the siding replacement, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. The Applicant shall install three-over one wood windows that cannot be repaired and repair those that can be repaired in-kind, per Sec16-.20M.013(2)(o);
3. The exterior door shall be either wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame, per Sec.16-20M.01(2)(r)(5) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA2-19-593 for 1164 Wilmington Avenue

December 25, 2019

pg. 3



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1109 Cordova Street
APPLICATION: CA3-19-512
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019 deferred from November 13, 2019 Meeting

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of White Oak Avenue and at the intersection of Tucker Place

Contributing (Y/N): No
Construction

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior of the new construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

PLANS

The Applicant has not provided a required site plan for new construction. Staff recommends the Applicant provide two sets of to-scale site plans that will include setback and FAR information. This will allow for Staff to see if the proposed house is in the buildable area permitted and will comply with the District and Zoning regulations.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided four houses for comparisons: 1105 Cordova, 1115/1117 Cordova, 1125 Cordova and 1123 Cordova.

Height and Pitch

1105 Cordova is the lowest at 13 feet and 5 inches in height. While 1123 Cordova is the highest at 19 feet and 2 inches in height. The Applicant has proposed a height of 21 feet 7 ½ inches. The proposed height is too high for the District. District regulations requires new construction’s height to be no less than or higher than the comparable houses on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant adjust the height of the house to meet the requirements set by the District.

As with the height, the pitch must comply as stated: no higher than the highest and no lower than the lowest. The Applicant negates to provide the pitch information for the comparable houses. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by District regulations and have the pitch to fit into the requirement of no lower than the lowest and no higher than the highest.

Roof form

A gable roof front with a hip roof projecting over the house is the roof form present on the four comparisons the Applicant provided. Two of the comparisons have pronounced side gables. The Applicant proposes a gable front roof, hip extension and two pronounced side gable roofs. Staff is not concerned with this proposal since two out of the four comparable houses do have pronounced side-gable roofs.

Shutters

The Applicant has proposed board-batten shutters (barn-yard) that are not appropriate for the District. Staff recommends the Applicant not install board-batten shutters, install shutters that are appropriate to the District or not install shutters.

Siding

The Applicant proposes cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is permissible material in the District. Staff recommends it be smooth faced with a 4 inch to 6-inch reveal.

Windows

The proposed windows are one over one with light divides. Two of the comparable houses show vinyl one-over-one windows with no light divides; one house's windows are boarded with one vinyl window and the last house appears to have wood windows. Windows and window material are based on the compatibility standard, Staff is not concerned with the proposes one-over-one windows that the Applicant proposes.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a three- quarter porch with a Gable roof, side facing steps with what appears to be closed risers on the plan, solid columns and side-railings, which appear from the plans to be metal. District regulations state that "the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends." The comparisons the Applicant provided reflect one house with a similar layout—1123 Cordova. However, the railings on 1123 Cordova are wood two-part construction that are no higher than the front window. Staff recommends the Applicant construct the porch railings on the proposed construction to be a two-part construction, vertical not horizontal, wood not metal. The height should be no higher than the front seal of the front window and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension.

The Applicant has proposed cedar shake inside the Gable roof over the porch. Cedar Shake is not a permissible material in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant, replace the Cedar Shake with the cementitious lap siding that will be installed on the house.

Foundation

The Applicant has proposed brick foundation for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. A brick foundation is prevalent amongst the comparisons the Applicant provided.

Deck

The Applicant has proposed a deck in the rear of the house that will pier beyond the side of the house on the west elevation. "Decks are permitted only when located to the rear of the principal structure and such decks shall be no wider than the width of the principal structure." Staff recommends that Applicant only construct the deck to the rear of the house to abide by District regulations.

Fence

The Applicant has not provided a site plan so that Staff can determine where the fence is proposed and the material of the fence. District regulations require fences to be no higher than 6 ft in the rear and sides of the house, fences not exceeding four feet in height may be erected in the front yard. Walls, excluding retaining walls, are not permitted in the front yard, and fences located in the front yard shall be constructed of brick, stone, ornamental iron, or wood. Chain link fencing is not permitted in front yards. If the Applicant intends to construct a fence, the Applicant should abide by the listed regulations.

Walkway

District regulations require a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District regulations and establish a walkway in the construction of the proposed house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide two sets of to-scale plans with setback and FAR information, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
2. The Applicant shall adjust the height of the house and abide by the District regulations regarding height, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
3. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations regarding the pitch of the house, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
4. The Applicant shall not install Board-n-batten shutters, install appropriate shutters or not install shutters, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
5. The cementitious siding shall be smooth-face with a 4-6-inch reveal, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
6. The Applicant shall construct the porch railings on the proposed construction to be a two-part construction, vertical not horizontal, wood not metal. The height should be no higher than the front sill of the front window and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);
7. The Applicant shall replace the Cedar Shake on the Gable over the roof with cementitious lap siding, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1);
8. The Applicant shall only construct the deck to the rear of the house to abide by District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(j);
9. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulation regarding fence construction, per Sec. 16-20M.013 (2)(i)(1)(2)(3);
10. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations and establish a walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(d) and
11. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 962 Mathews St.

APPLICATION: CA3-19-520

MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1923-1924

Property Location: Southwest corner of Mathews St. and Azalea St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Deck replacement.

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

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 with Chapter 20 and Chapter 20G of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow an alternate block to be used for the purposes of compatibility comparisons for the proposed new construction.

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

In looking at the subject property, Staff finds that the deck the Applicant seeks to replace is an existing feature that was existing on the property before the 2010 photographic update to the District Photographic Inventory. Staff additionally finds that the deck is in a state of disrepair such that it has the potential to be hazardous and must be repaired if it is to continue to be used by the property owner.

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

Staff finds that the application of the Zoning Ordinance would prevent the continued use of this area by the property owner.

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

Staff finds that the placement of this deck is unique or rare in relation to the immediate area and the District as a whole.

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.

Staff finds that the issuance of a variance to permit the replacement deck to occupy the location and dimensions of the existing deck would not increase the level of non-conformity on the property. Staff further finds that the granting of this variance would not establish an automatic precedent to permit decks between the principal structure and the street throughout the District.

Staff supports the requested variance and recommends approval.

Deck

While not under the purview of the Commission, Staff finds that the design of the deck is consistent with the Historic District regulations for decks. Given Staff's support of the variance, Staff has no concerns with the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 136 Estoria St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-531
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West blockface of Short St., north of the Kirkwood Ave. intersection, south of the Wylie St. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition.

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 CA3-19-558: Deferral.

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.

The Landmark District regulations contain qualitative and quantitative requirements related to additions to contributing structures. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related requirements met the District regulations.

Site plan

The Applicant has provided information showing the setbacks of only two neighboring properties located at 132 and 140 Estoria St. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that all setbacks in the Landmark District are based on the compatibility rule which establishes a minimum and maximum setback range. In researching the contributing status of these properties, Staff has determined that neither property is contributing as they were constructed in 2016 and 2013 respectively and as such are not contributing properties and are ineligible to be used for comparisons. However, Staff was able to locate the original design review for 132 Estoria which documented the allowable rear yard setback range as a minimum of 70' 10" and a maximum of 81' 10". As such, Staff finds that the proposed rear yard setback of 65.4' does not meet the District regulations. Staff recommends the plans be re-designed to conform to the required rear yard setback range.

Building façades

Absent Staff's concerns with the rear yard setback, Staff has a few concerns regarding the design of the second story portion of the proposed additions. The addition to the second story has been designed as a rear cross gable that ties into the first floor area of the façade. Staff finds that this approach does not give the impression that the feature is a non-historic addition to the property. Staff finds a better approach is for shed dormers to be placed on the roof plane as permitted by both the general regulations and subarea 3 specific regulations of the Landmark District. As such, Staff recommends that the second-floor portion of the addition be designed as shed dormers which do not engage the ridgeline of the main structure, do not occupy no less than 15% and no more than 35% of the total surface of the roof plane on which they are constructed, and which do not interrupt the primary fascia or soffit line.

In order to preserve the historic interpretation of the original dimensions of the home, Staff recommends the existing rear corner boards be retained in place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-531: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The plans shall be re-designed to conform to the required rear yard setback range Any new windows and doors shall be unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20A.006(9);
2. The second-floor portion of the addition shall be designed as shed dormers which do not engage the ridgeline of the main structure, do not occupy no less than 15% and no more than 35% of the total surface of the roof plane on which they are constructed, and which do not interrupt the primary fascia or soffit line, per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(d);
3. The existing rear corner boards shall be retained in place, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(c)&(e); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 991 Sparks Street
APPLICATION: CA3-19-546
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lee Street and East of Peeples Street

Contributing (Y/N): No
Construction

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior of the new construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided 11 houses for comparisons: 975 Sparks, 979 Sparks, 1005 Sparks, 1009 Sparks, 1013 Sparks, 1017 Sparks, 1021 Sparks, 1027 Sparks, 1031 Sparks and 1037 sparks. Several of these existing houses are non-contributing and will not be used in the analysis. 975 and 979, 1021 and 1013 Sparks will be excluded.

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed a height of 16 feet and 4 inches for the new construction. 979 Sparks is the lowest at 13 feet and 6 inches in height and 205 Sparks is the highest at 19 feet and 4 inches in height. The proposed height for the new construction meets the District Regulation, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

As with the height, the pitch must comply: no higher than the highest and no lower than the lowest. The Applicant negated to provide the pitch information for the comparable houses. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by District regulations and have the pitch to fit into the requirement of no lower than the lowest and no higher than the highest.

Roof form

The comparable houses have a shed roof over the full porches, with a gable roof projecting from a hip roof that extends over the rest of the house. The Applicant’s roof proposal also reflects the same roof forms as the comparable houses. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is permissible material in the District. Staff recommends it be smooth faced with a 4 inch to 6-inch reveal.

Windows

The proposed windows are one-over-one. There are varying windows on the comparable houses with many boarded. One-over-one windows are permissible windows in the District. Staff is not concerned with the windows proposal.

Shutters

The Applicant proposes wood shutters to be added to the front windows. Plans indicate, the shutters are standard shutters that would be appropriate for the District. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a full porch, front facing steps with closed risers and ends, stucco-base columns with cap ends on the actual columns and wood railings. The District regulation states that “the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.” Four of the comparable houses have full porches, two have front facing steps, two have closed risers and ends and most have varying columns construction. The Applicant’s smooth stucco base columns does not concern Staff. The end cap columns do not concern Staff. Staff does recommend the railings be a two-part construction. The height should be no higher than the front windowsill and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension

The Applicant has proposed cedar shake inside the Gable roof. Cedar Shake is not a permissible material in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant, replace the Cedar Shake with the cementitious lap siding that will be installed on the house.

Doors

On the front, the Applicant proposes a solid wood panel door. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

Foundation

The Applicant has proposed smooth stucco for the foundation. From the comparable houses, Staff cannot clearly determine what is the prevailing foundation material on the blockface. With this being the case, District regulation states, “above-grade foundation materials. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, foundations shall constitute a distinct building design element and shall contrast with the primary façade's exterior material and exposed concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls are prohibited as a finished surface.” Since the smooth stucco is a distinct material from the façade exterior material and is not concrete, the foundation proposal does not concern Staff.

Stoop

The Applicant proposes a stoop on the left side elevation for egress. Being a compatibility analysis, Staff finds that 1009 Sparks, also a new construction, demonstrates the same type stoop the Applicant proposes. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Retaining Wall

The Applicant proposes a 3ft high, 8ft wide stucco retaining wall in the front of the principal structure with steps leading up to the walkway. None of the comparable houses the Applicant provided, show a retaining wall. However, Staff doesn’t find it problematic the construction of the retaining. The Applicant’s proposal abides by the District regulation on retaining walls.

Sidewalk

The Applicant proposes a new 6 feet wide sidewalk. District regulation states that “the sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.” Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the specific laid out in the District requirement regarding sidewalks.

Walkway

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant has shown on the site plan a proposed walkway. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations regarding the pitch of the house, per Sec. 16-20M.005
2. The cementitious siding shall be smooth-face with a 4-6-inch reveal, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(q);
3. The Applicant shall construct the porch railings on the proposed construction to be a two-part construction, vertical not horizontal, wood not metal. The height should be no higher than the front sill of the front window and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
4. The Applicant shall replace the Cedar Shake on the Gable over the roof with cementitious lap siding, per Sec.16-20M.013(1);
5. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations regarding the specific’s construction for a sidewalk, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(m) and
6. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 746 Bonnie Bra, SW
APPLICATION: CA2-18-548
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Allene Avenue and East of Tift Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

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

PLANS

The Applicant has provided a site plan that does not appear to be to-scale. Nor has the Applicant provided setback or FAR information which is required for an addition to allow Staff to determine if the addition meets the zoning requirements. Staff recommends the Applicant provide two to-scale site plans with setback and FAR information.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to added space to the existing structure to allow for a master suite in the interior of the house. The Applicant proposes to remove the existing back porch replacing with an interior master bath room and walk-in closet; remove an existing window and create a new door opening; and add stairs and railing to the same side of the house, thus creating a side deck.

Staff deems the overall construction of the addition is not problematic being that the Applicant is using the existing footprint of what was there previously. However, Staff does find that removing the existing window on the side of the house to make room for a door and adding stairs and railing to the same side, problematic. District regulaions state that original framing of windows should be retained. The Applicant has not provided any information to demonstrate that the window needs replacing. Additionally, District regulation states that any replacement of windows shall be no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size. To place a window with a door would be significantly higher than the District regulation permits. Therefore, an added deck without a door to enter upon is a moot point. Staff recommends the Applicant not remove the existing window and not construct the new stairs and railings on the side of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide two sets of t-scale plan with setback and FAR information, per Sec. 16-20I.005;
2. The Applicant shall not remove the existing window on the side of the house and not construct the new stairs and railings , per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1) and (3)and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 389 Grant Park Place SE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-549
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: West of Grant Street and East of Cherokee Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alteration/Restoration of porch roof and columns

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 20K.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Applicant's client (owner) was advised by the contractor on the project to remove the porch roof with securing permits.

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.

ALTERATIONS/RESTORATION

The Applicant is proposing to restore the porch roof and columns back to their original look and style before the removal. The owner has provided a letter that states her intention was not to remove the porch roof and columns but was instructed to do so by the contractor. The Applicant has also produced a letter from the contractor who states that the owner had hired him to repair the roof leak and replace any water damaged framing and trim associated with the front porch, stating that water damage was coming from how the front porch was originally constructed. In doing this work, the contractor tested for any hazardous materials such as asbestos and lead base paint. No asbestos was found but lead was found in the house siding, beams, columns, trim and tongue and groove ceiling. Upon removing the lead from these affected areas, it was discovered that the roof was compromised and presented a safety hazard. Attempting to shore up the roof, the contractor realized it would not last any length of time. So, the roof was demolished. The contractor and Applicant report the foundation is “as is” and good shape to allow for the restoration to occur.

Staff has reviewed the Applicant’s proposal for the actual restoration and deems the Applicant porch roof plans and columns matched what was previously on the house. Additionally, the proposed metal roof is an acceptable roof material in the District. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide photos of the existing front door. If replacement is warrant, the Applicant shall select a door that will reinforce the architectural style of the period (1920’s) in keeping with the style of the principal structure, per Sec.16-20K;
2. The Applicant repair in-kind the columns and railings, per Sec.16-20K and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 712 Glenwood Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-550
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: South block face of Glenwood Ave, west of Muse St, east of Cameron St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style:

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-550: Defer.

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

Variance

The Applicant is seeking a variance to reduce the west side yard from 7 feet to 3 feet 6 inches.

Extraordinary and exceptional conditions;

- The Applicant identifies that while the lot has 50' of frontage, the perpendicular distance from side to side is only 44'.

How the zoning creates unnecessary hardship;

- The Applicant states that parking is not allowed in the front yard, per district regulations. Therefore, shifting the duplex to the west allows for a garage and sufficient turning space. Staff finds that more information is required to show unnecessary hardship.

Conditions peculiar to the property;

- The Applicant identifies the narrow width of the property.

How relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment;

- The Applicant states that the property is zoned appropriately and its use shall remain residential, allowing for new construction.

Staff finds that the variance petition needs more evidence to prove hardship. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide details regarding how the turning radius is impacted due to the required setback and documentation showing how the alley located to the rear of the lot cannot be used for egress.

New Construction

The Applicant is proposing the new construction of a duplex on 712 Glenwood Ave. The proposed duplex will have an architectural style of contemporary craftsman, with a 30' front yard, front porch that spans the width of the house, gable style roof, and a shared driveway with 716 Glenwood Ave.

After review, Staff finds the design of the proposed new construction to be consistent with district regulations. However, Staff was unable to determine the existence of a paved walkway from the sidewalk to the front entrance of the proposed structure. As such, Staff recommends that a new walkway be installed.

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

1. Compatibility for the variance request.
2. Updating site plan to include a paved walkway from the front entrance to the sidewalk.
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 716 Glenwood Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-552
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: South block face of Glenwood Ave, west of Muse St, east of Cameron St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-551: Defer.

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

Variance

The Applicant is seeking a variance to reduce the east side yard from 7 feet to 3 feet 6 inches.

Extraordinary and exceptional conditions;

- The Applicant identifies that the lot only has 47.77' of frontage, the perpendicular distance from side to side is only 41'.

How the zoning creates unnecessary hardship;

- The Applicant states that parking is not allowed in the front yard, per district regulations. Therefore, shifting the duplex to the west allows for a garage and sufficient turning space. Staff finds that more information is required to show unnecessary hardship.

Conditions peculiar to the property;

- The Applicant identifies the very narrow width of the property.

How relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment;

- The Applicant states that the property is zoned appropriately and its use shall remain residential, allowing for new construction.

Staff finds that the variance petition needs more evidence to prove hardship. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide details regarding how the turning radius is impacted due to the required setback and documentation showing how the alley located to the rear of the lot cannot be used for egress.

New Construction

The Applicant is proposing the new construction of a duplex on 716 Glenwood Ave. The proposed duplex will have an architectural style of contemporary craftsman, with a 30' front yard, front porch that spans the width of the house, hipped style roof, and a shared driveway with 712 Glenwood Ave.

After review, Staff finds the design of the proposed new construction to be consistent with district regulations. However, Staff was unable to determine the existence of a paved walkway from the sidewalk to the front entrance of the proposed structure. As such, Staff recommends that a new walkway be installed.

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

1. Compatibility for the variance request.
2. Updating site plan to include a paved walkway from the front entrance to the sidewalk.
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 26 Hilliard St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-554 & CA3-19-555
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: West block face of Hilliard St., south of the Auburn Ave. intersection and north of the Edgewood Ave. Intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: variance and 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)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-554: Deferral.
SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-555: Denial.

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.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow an alternate block to be used for the purposes of compatibility comparisons for the proposed new construction.

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

The Applicant cites the small size of the lot as the primary condition of the site which is extraordinary and exceptional. The Applicant states that the application of the compatibility rule for this site would create hardships relating to building typology, setbacks, height, and other lot metrics. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that there are no lot coverage requirements in Subarea 4 of the Landmark District. Staff would further note that only the front and rear yard setback would need to comply with the compatibility rule and Staff would generally be in support of a setback variance to reduce the front and rear yard setbacks. However, Staff finds that the Applicant has not demonstrated how the size of the lot would prevent the structure from conforming to the architectural style of comparable buildings on the block face.

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

In addition to the items raised in the previous response, the Applicant states that the variance would allow the development for a development that promotes good urban design principles. The Applicant cites the existence of commercial structures on other block faces of Hilliard St. as support for this claim. In researching the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps for this block, Staff finds that the subject property contained a residential structure, the footprint of which appears to have been similar to the contributing residential style structures on the block. Staff finds that the Applicant has not demonstrated how the application of the Landmark Regulations would prevent a compliant structure from being built.

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

The Applicant again cites the small size of the lot and states that the allowance of a mercantile architectural style could catalyze the vacant properties to the north of the structure to be developed. However, Staff cannot find either in the Applicant's responses or the site itself, any peculiarities that would prevent a structure that appears residential in style from being built.

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

The Applicant cites the projects adherence to the Sweet Auburn Works design guidelines and their compliance with several required comparisons as evidence that the project would not cause detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance. However, Staff finds that the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, in particular the Landmark District regulations for the subject property, are to preserve the sense of place and pattern of development in the District and ensure that architecturally

compatible infill is built. As such, Staff finds that the requested variance would impair the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the subject property.

The Applicant's responses purport a hardship on the property as it relates to the architectural style of the structure. However, Staff finds that the hardship relates more to the Applicant's preference in architectural style and typology than an actual hardship based on the Landmark District regulations. As such, Staff does not support the requested variance. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that there are no lot coverage requirements for Subarea 4 of the Landmark District, and that it appears that a compliant structure could be built on the site that mimics the residential style of the contributing structures on the block while allowing for the mixed residential and commercial uses sought by the proposal. Staff would further note that a variance to reduce the depth of the required front and rear yard setbacks would generally be supported for a structure which otherwise meets the Landmark District regulations.

New Construction

Compatibility comparisons

Given Staff's response to the requested variance, a comparison analysis which is based off the contributing properties on the same block as the subject property will be required. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide an updated comparison analysis which includes only the structures on the same block as the subject property.

Permitted Principal Uses and Structures

The Applicant proposes a mix of retail and residential uses for the subject property. Staff finds that both uses are permitted as principal uses by the Subarea 4 regulations of the Landmark District.

Lot Controls and Building Height

As mentioned in Staff's responses to the variance request, Subarea 4 has no lot coverage requirements.

Height in subarea 4 of the Landmark District is limited to 1.5 times the tallest structure on the same block as the subject property, with a maximum cap of 55' for properties east of I-75. The tallest of the two comparable properties on the block provided by the Applicant is approximately 40' which would allow for a maximum height of 55' with the maximum height cap required by the Landmark District regulations. As such, Staff finds that the proposed 46' 6" height would meet these requirements.

Sidewalks, Yards, and Open Space

Staff recommends the Applicant provide a site plan documenting that the project meets the sidewalk requirements.

In subarea 4 of the Landmark District, the front and rear yard setbacks are based on the compatibility rule. Zero lot line setbacks are permitted for the side yard setbacks. With regards to the front and rear yard setbacks, the Applicant has provided only 2 comparable properties which have front yard setbacks of 8' and 10' and rear yard setbacks of 19.94' and 22' 6". Staff finds that

compliance with these setbacks on a property of this size would impose a hardship on the project and recommends the Applicant submit a variance to reduce the required front and rear yard setbacks.

Design Standards

The design of the proposed structure is based on commercial structures on different block faces and not on the residential style of the structures on the same block of the subject property. Given Staff's recommendations regarding the proposed variance request, Staff recommends the structure be redesigned to conform to the style of structures on the same block as the subject property, per the District regulations.

Parking Requirements

Based on the proposed floor plans, Staff finds that a minimum of 4 fixed bicycle parking spaces is required per the Landmark District regulations. Staff recommends the Site Plan be amended to note compliance with this requirement and show the location of the bicycle parking which is to be provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-555: Denial.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-338: Deferral to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide an updated comparison analysis which includes only the structures on the same block as the subject property, per Sec. 16-20C.004(2);
2. The Applicant shall provide a site plan documenting that the project meets the sidewalk requirements, per Sec. 16-20C.007;
3. The Applicant shall submit a variance to reduce the required front and rear yard setbacks;
4. The structure shall be redesigned to conform to the style of structures on the same block as the subject property, per the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20C.008;
5. The Site Plan shall be amended to note compliance with this requirement and show the location of the bicycle parking which is to be provided, per Sec. 16-20C.009(1)(a);
6. All updated plans and documentation 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 674 Lexington Avenue, SW
APPLICATION: CA3-18-556
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1936

Property Location: West of Catherine Street and East of Metropolitan Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory Structure

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Applicant has filed a variance for a reduction from 7 to 3.5 on the eastside yard setback with The Boarding of Zoning Adjustment (BZA).

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.

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The Applicant proposes an accessory structure to be constructed on the rear eastside of the yard that will not exceed the height of the principle structure. The accessory structure will exceed the setback and the Applicant has applied for a variance with The Boarding Zoning Adjustment (BZA). Staff has reviewed the the proposed accessory structure and deems the structure complies with the District regulation. The District regulation permits accessory structure to be constructed to the side or rear of the principle structure that does not project beyond the front of the façade of the principal structure. In regards to the builable area, the Applicant is seeking an adjustment from the BZA to address this. Otherwise, Staff has no concern with this proposal. Staff does recommend, the Applicant provides a screen if the accessory structure is visible from the public right-away.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide a screen if the accessory structure is visible from the public right, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(h) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 111 Short St.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-558 & CA3-19-559
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Pre-1911

Property Location: West blockface of Short St., north of the Kirkwood Ave. intersection, south of the Wylie St. intersection.

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

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

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 CA3-19-558: Approval with conditions.
SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-559: Approval.

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.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow a reduction in the minimum allowable rear yard setback from 45' to 30'.

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

The Applicant cites the shape of the lot and the size of the lot relative to the comparable properties.

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 size and shape of the lot would severely restrict the size of any addition on the property.

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

The Applicant states that the predominate pattern in the District is for true rectangular lots. The subject property is pentagonal in shape which is a condition which is unique to the subject property in relation to properties in the District as a whole.

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

The Applicant cites the existence of properties with shorter rear yard setbacks on the block face, though of different architectural styles, as well as the resulting 29% FAR and 36% Lot Coverage that the addition would establish as indications that the request would not damage the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff finds that the variance request meets the criteria and supports the Applicant's request.

Addition

The Landmark District regulations contain qualitative and quantitative requirements related to additions to contributing structures. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related requirements met the District regulations.

Chimney

The District regulations require alterations and additions to not harm historic materials that characterize the property. The current plans call for the removal of what appears to be an original chimney to accommodate interior changes. Staff finds that the original chimney is a character-defining feature of the structure and should be preserved. As such, Staff recommends that the existing chimney be retained.

Since there have been several instances of chimneys being demolished and rebuilt when the Commission has required them to be retained, Staff would clarify that the intent of the

recommendation that the chimney be retained is that at no point should the exterior portions of the chimney be removed from the structure or otherwise demolished.

Windows and doors

The District regulations require replacement and new windows and doors to replicate the original materials. The photographs of the property in the District inventory show the structure with non-original windows and doors which were replaced were replaced at some point between the District's designation and the update to the inventory in 2010. However, the replacement materials retain the original openings which were extant in the previous alterations. Staff finds in general that the proposed fenestration pattern and sizes match the size and pattern of the original window and door openings.

As the regulations require the new materials to replicate the original building materials, Staff recommends any new windows and doors be unclad wood.

Architectural differentiation

In order to preserve the ability to accurately interpret the structure, Staff recommends the existing rear corner boards be retained in their existing locations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-559: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-558: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The existing chimney shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(c);
2. Any new windows and doors shall be unclad wood, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(b);
3. The existing rear corner boards shall be retained in their existing locations, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(c); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 124 Krog Street, NE
APPLICATION: CA3-19-561
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lake Avenue and East of West Ashland Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20L.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

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

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Applicant proposes a new 34,000sf mixed used building—office and retail space that incorporates a traditional and modern appearance. The new structure will replace an existing gravel and dirt surface parking lot. On the site are historic walls that will remain. Staff is not concerned with the overall proposal.

Building Façade

West Elevation

The Applicant proposal for the “porch” design for west elevation (facing the Beltline) is derived from the necessity to accommodate for stairs and ramps needed due to a grade change in topography. Additionally, there is a need to accommodate for the Beltline potentially securing 20 feet of the current site. Staff’s initial concern for the west elevation design was it appeared to be a mass cut from the building instead of a solid front that had been removed for an adaptive use. However, because of the land restriction and possible ownership conflict of a section of the site, Staff realized the design is appropriate for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with the west elevation.

East Elevation

The Applicant has proposed to retain the historic walls and implement their existence into the design of the façade. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

North Elevation and South Elevation

The Applicant has proposed a brick retaining wall on the north elevation. Staff is not concerned with the retaining wall but suggest the Applicant design the wall to mimic the historic walls. This way the new development appears to sit in once was a historic building.

Staff proposes to retain the existing metal bridge. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. To allow for this to remain encourages a modern yet industrial flow to the project.

Siding Material and Material

The proposed siding material the Applicant proposes is a prefabricated thin brick wall system that will fit well into subarea 3 and pairs well with the other developments in the immediate Krog area. Staff is not concerned with the siding material.

The Applicant proposal for metal louvres, TPO roofing, additionally is not problematic for Staff. Staff has no concern for this proposal.

Windows

The industrial glass storefront window system the Applicant proposes is reflective of an industrial design and Staff has no concern with this window system.

Skylights

The Applicant proposes skylights on the roof of the building. From the plans it appears as if the skylights are not intrusive and barely visible from the public-right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Parking/Parking Deck

The proposed development will be sharing surface parking with the Krog Street Market and sharing parking with the 99 Krog Street future development parking deck. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Security

On the plans, provided by the Applicant, Staff could not locate lighting details. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by District Regulations and provide adequate lighting for the pedestrian walkways as defined by the regulations.

Height

The Applicant proposes an average total height of 40ft for the new construction. District Regulations allows mixed use developments height to range from 28 feet to 40 to be determined by the Commission. This allowance is governed on the heights of the surround buildings. The Applicant has not provided that information. Staff recommends the Applicant provides the height of other buildings in the immediate area so that the Commission can make that determination.

Open Space

Since the Applicant has less than 40,000sf of development for non-residential, open space requirement is not required.

Sidewalk

Illustrations provided by the Applicant shows side walks along the public street. District Regulations requires sidewalks along all public streets and must be a minimum width of 12 feet. Staff recommends the side walks along the public streets meet District Regulation and have a minimum width of 12 feet.

Landscaping

Trees and Street furniture

The Applicant has proposed lined trees along the pedestrian sidewalk and street furniture the abides by the District regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Pedestrian Plaza

The Applicant has proposed a pedestrian plaza. Staff is supportive of this plaza. It permits pedestrian easier access to the Beltline and all other Krog developments. Additionally, it encourages safe pedestrian flow.

Signage

The Signage proposed by the Applicant does not concern Staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide adequate lighting for the pedestrian walkways as defined by the District regulation, per Sec.16-20L.008(6)(i);
2. The sidewalks along the public street shall be a minimum of 12feet, per Sec.16-20L.008(6)(a) and
3. Staff shall review final plans if appropriate the final photography documentation

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 852 Skipper Dr.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-19-565
MEETING DATE: November 25, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-3.

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: West blockface of Skipper Dr, south of the Harwell Rd. intersection, north of the Eleanor Ter. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Split level ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Staff Response to the Application Submitted

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

The Applicant has submitted an engineer's report detailing the extent of the fire and their assessment of the structural integrity of the home. Based on this analysis, the Engineer finds that the structure is in danger of collapsing. The report also documents possible environmental contamination due to deteriorated building materials.

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

The Applicant has provided information showing that the house could be re-framed, but that the work would be equivalent to the demolition of the structure due to the damage to the internal structural support.

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.

Per the Applicant's response the property owner is the original owner of the structure when it was built in 1960 and the property was designated after the purchase of the home.

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.

Per the Applicant's response, the property was purchased in 1959 and the home was built in 1960. The Applicant states there was no relation to the previous property owner. The Applicant also states that there is no economic return received from the property.

(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.

Per the Applicant's responses, the property is a residential structure which does not generate income. The Applicant estimates maintenance cost at \$1000 a month including taxes, utilities, and upkeep.

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

The Applicant has stated there is no mortgage on the property. .

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.

| | |
|------|---------|
| 2015 | \$10.18 |
| 2016 | \$10.18 |
| 2017 | \$10.18 |
| 2018 | \$45.57 |

2015 Assessed value- \$6,880.00
2016 Assessed value- \$24,240.00

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.

The Applicant states there have been no recent appraisals.

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.

According to the Applicant, the fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation was \$100,700.00 in 2008. The Applicant also states that the current fair market value of the property is \$60,600.

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.

The Applicant states that the property is a residential home. Per the Applicant's previous responses, the owner of the property is the occupant of the home.

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

According to the Applicant, there are not tax records available.

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.

According to the applicant, this question does not apply.

b) Reasonableness of the price or rent sought by the applicant.

According to the Applicant the property is not for rent or for sale.

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

According to the Applicant, no advertisements have been placed and the property has not been listed.

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 from 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.

The Engineers report provided by the Applicant states that the structure would not meet the City of Atlanta's minimum building code and recommends demolition of the structure.

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.

Per the Applicant's response and documentation, the estimated cost to demolish the property would be \$18,700 and the estimated cost to rehab the property would be \$185,000.00.

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.

According to the Applicant the value of the property in its current condition is \$30,000.00. The Applicant has not provided documentation regarding this value. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation regarding the market value estimate of the structure in its current condition. According to the Applicant the estimated value after renovation would be \$230,000.00

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.

The Applicant states that the cost of renovation (\$185,000.00) would be too high for the property owner due to their age and would result in the owner breaking even at best.

e) The infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer of 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.

According to the Applicant, construction above or below is infeasible. Staff finds that the transfer of development rights would generally not apply to a residential lot such as the subject property.

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

The Applicant has provided information, taken from the Certificate of Appropriateness Application package, which shows the various economic incentives available to owners of historic homes. The Applicant has also responded that none of the programs apply to their situation. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing why the various economic incentives would not apply to their situation.

12. Also, please provide photographs of the existing conditions of the building, both exterior and interior.

The Applicant has provided interior and exterior photographs.

Comment on Application Materials by the Bureau of Buildings

One of the requirements of the Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness process is for the Office of Buildings to comment on the application materials via a written report. Staff has submitted a request to the Office of Buildings to inspect the property and produce a report regarding this property. When the inspection and report are complete, Staff will include the report in the file for future reference.

Overall Comments

Based on the pictures provided, Staff finds that the existing building is in a state of disrepair. It is clear that the most of the interior roof structure would need to be replaced, the exterior walls need to be repaired and in some instances replaced, the interior floor systems need to be replaced and there are likely issues with the foundation due to the structure being open to the elements.

As previously mentioned, a major and imminent threat to public health and safety exists when the building is in danger of collapsing. Based on the information submitted, Staff finds a major and imminent threat has been proven.

As Staff has determined that a major and imminent threat to public health and safety has been proven, Staff finds that any alternatives presented would be moot as this time. However, as discussed above, the Applicant has not submitted several of the items required for the issuance of a Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness based on a Threat to Public Health and Safety. Staff finds it appropriate to condition any approval of the demolition on the submission of that information and documentation. Staff also finds it appropriate for the Applicant to submit comprehensive photographic documentation of the exterior of the home on archival quality paper in case future owners wish to recreate the historic structure. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit comprehensive photographic documentation of the exterior of the home on archival quality paper.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide documentation regarding the market value estimate of the structure in its current condition;
2. The Applicant shall provide information detailing why the various economic incentives would not apply to their situation;
3. The Applicant shall submit comprehensive photographic documentation of the exterior of the home on archival quality paper; and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documents.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File