



## 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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1050 Sparks St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-602  
**MEETING DATE:** January 8, 2020

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1925

**Property Location:** Southwest corner of Sparks St. and Peoples St.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations and rear addition.

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Commission reviewed and approved application CA3-19-291 at the July 10, 2019 meeting with 14 conditions. In Octobr of 2019 Staff received information from concerned neighbors showing that the roof had been removed and replaced and that all siding on the sides and rear had been removed.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** 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.

**Roof replacement**

The Commission's original approval did not anticipate the removal of the original roof structure. Per Staff's conversation with the Applicant, once interior demolition began the roof structure collapsed and was removed. In stead of applying for a revision at that time, the roof was reconstructed. The plans show a 8:12 roof replacing the previous 8:12 roof. From the photographs provided, Staff is not able to verify that the new roof visually matches the original roof structure. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographs showing the entire front façade of the structure. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide documentation showing that the new roof was constructed with an 8:12 slope.

**Siding**

Per the Commission's approval, the removal of original siding was conditioned upon Staff's final review of the condition of the original siding. After reviewing the photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff found after a visual inspection of photographs provided by the Applicant that the siding on the left side of the structure did not appear repairable but did not have information showing the front and right facades could not be repaired. As such, Staff instructed the Applicant that the siding on the left side of the structure could be removed but the siding on the front and right side of the home would need to be retained. After the Applicant sent a photograph which appeared to show siding on the right side of the structure being removed, Staff further clarified in an additional email that the expectation was for siding on the front and right side would need to be retained in-place with any repair to the interior wall members occurring within the existing walls.

The Applicant has stated that the original siding on the structure was removed from the front and right-side façade and that the intent is for the siding to be replaced on the structure in its original locations. Photographs provided by the Neighborhood have confirmed the removal of the siding. Staff recommends the Applicant confirm the condition and storage method of the original siding through detailed photographs. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide photographs of the original siding after it is installed for the Office of Design's records. Lastly, Staff recommends any new siding added to the structure be wood.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide photographs showing the entire front façade of the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation showing that the new roof was constructed with an 8:12 slope, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
3. The Applicant shall confirm the condition and storage method of the original siding through detailed photographs, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
4. The Applicant shall provide photographs of the original siding after it is installed for the Office of Design's records, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
5. Any new siding added to the structure shall be wood, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b); and,
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 200 Walker Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-629  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2019

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Caslteberry Hill Landmark District (Subarea 2)      **Other Zoning:** None

**Date of Construction:** 1930

**Property Location:** East of Stonewall Street and West of Fair Street

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance and Sec. 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code.

**ALTERATIONS**

The Applicant proposes to replace in-kind six steel windows on the first floor of the existing building with double hung windows to match the existing windows on the bottom section of building.

While the photos provided by the Applicant, illustrates the six steel windows to be in good condition, Staff does recognize that the proposed window will be in accordance with the lower Store front windows on the building. The Applicant has not provided the rationale for the replacement. The District regulations states that “the removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided” These windows are distinctive material that were design not to be store front windows. replacing them will be problematic. Staff recommends the six steel windows not to be replaced but instead be repaired in-kind to retention the historical values and to abide by the District regulations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The six steel windows shall not be replaced but instead be repaired in-kind to retention the historical value of the building and to abide by the District regulations, per Sec. 19-20N.007(1)(b) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 399 Pavillion St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-630  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1911

**Property Location:** South block face of Pavillion St, west of Augusta Pl, east of Oakland 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. 16-20K

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-439: Approval.**

**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

The Applicant is proposing altering the exterior of the primary structure by removing the existing siding on all elevations. The existing siding will be replaced with hardiplank, matching in size, lap, and pattern.

After review, Staff has no issues with the proposed removal of the existing siding. As the existing siding is not historic material, Staff finds that no historic material will be destroyed. Additionally, Staff does not find the proposed replacement of siding to compromise the historic character of the primary structure.

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

1. 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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 299 Ormond St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-635  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** South block face of Ormond St., east of the Hill St. intersection.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations to the street facing facade.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** alterations to the side façade and rear additions.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

**Street facing façade alterations**

The Applicant is proposing replacement of the existing front door, replacing the glazing in the existing window sashes, and the removal of the non-historic vinyl siding. Staff would note that the removal of the non-historic vinyl siding was approved separately under a Type II Staff Review application. Staff has no concerns with the proposed glazing replacement in the existing sashes. However, Staff would suggest the Applicant consider alternative methods of increasing the energy efficiency of the windows which would preserve any historic glazing materials, such as interior storm windows.

With regards to the door replacement, Staff has not received a photograph clearly showing the existing front door. The inventory photographs for this property show the structure with the existing screened porch, which obscures the front door from view. As such, Staff cannot determine the historic nature of the door or its condition. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographs showing the existing front door for Staff to review. Staff further recommends the proposed door replacement be approved only after Staff has found the existing door is either non-historic or beyond the point of repair.

With regards to the historic siding on the front façade, Staff finds that it is common for wood siding extant under modern siding to contain some areas where repair and replacement may be necessary. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide photographs of any areas of the historic front façade siding in need of repair or replacement for Staff to review. Staff further recommends that repair or replacement of specific portions of the front façade siding be approved only after Staff has confirmed the need for repair or replacement.

**Rear addition and side façade alterations**

The proposed rear addition and the side façade alterations are not subject to review or approval by the Commission as they do not involve street facing façades. However, Staff would note that both the alterations and additions meet the requirements of the underlying R-5 zoning.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide photographs showing the existing front door for Staff to review, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(2);
2. The proposed door replacement shall be approved only after Staff has found the existing door is either non-historic or beyond the point of repair, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(2);
3. The Applicant shall provide photographs of any areas of the historic front façade siding in need of repair or replacement for Staff to review, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(2);
4. Repair or replacement of specific portions of the front façade siding shall be approved only after Staff has confirmed the need for repair or replacement, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(D)(2); and,
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood

**File**



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 705 Laverne Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-638  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1966

**Property Location:** East of Peek Road and West of Aline Drive

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Stop Work Order applied in November 2019.

**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.

### **COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

### **ALTERATIONS**

The following alterations are proposed: siding replacement, window replacement, doors replacement, add wood on the side of the carport, wrap chimney and add gutters.

#### ***Siding***

The Applicant proposes to replace all the vinyl siding with cedar wood groove siding on the principle structure. Siding replacement is governed by the compatibility standard. The regulations state "The compatibility rule shall apply to all building façade materials on all façades, and in addition to all other applicable regulations, as follows: the presence and dimensions of the exposed face of lap siding and wood shingles." Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic information and dimensions of houses on the blockface to support the cedar wood groove siding proposed.

#### ***Windows***

On the front elevation, the Applicant proposes to remove the three siding windows with one ribbon sliding window. District Regulations requires original windows to be retained and repaired in-kind if necessary. If original windows cannot be retained and repaired in-kind, replacement windows must be replaced the same in light design, function, materials, shape, and size. The Applicant has not provided any photographic information to allow Staff to determine the feasibility of the windows. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic information to determine the conditions of the windows. Additionally, the ribbon window would not be an in-kind replacement. Staff recommends, the ribbon not to be installed.

#### ***Doors***

The Applicant proposes to replace the solid front door which doesn't appear to be original with a solid mahogany wood frosted glass door, replace the side left elevation door with the same type of door. Replacement doors are governed by the compatibility standard, the proposed door the Applicant list is reflective of the time period for doors. However, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide a photo of the proposed door to verify.

#### ***Carport***

The Applicant proposes to add wood siding to the carport so that water would not come through the designed brick pattern. The distinctive brick pattern is a design element for mid-century ranch house. District regulations express that the intent of the regulation is to preserve the environment, physical layout, and examples of early and mid-20th century architecture in the district. If the

Applicant applies wood to this feature, it would remove the distinctness it was intended to display. Staff recommends the Applicant not apply the wood siding on the carport wall.

***Chimney***

The Applicant proposes to wrap the existing chimney with siding. Siding would not have been a permissible material on the chimney. Staff recommends the Applicant not wrap the chimney in siding but leave the chimney it is original material—brick.

***Gutters***

The Applicant proposes installing gutters on the principle structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Gutters installation would be considered general repair.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.**

1. The Applicant shall provide photographic information with the dimensions of the siding on houses on the blockface to support the cedar wood siding proposal, per Sec.16-20Q.006(1)(g)(h)(i);
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic information of the windows of other houses to determine the condition and feasibility of them, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(a);
3. The ribbon window shall not be installed, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(d);
4. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the proposed door to determine compatibility, Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(d);
5. The Applicant shall not apply the wood to the carport, per Sec. 16-20Q.001(2);
6. The chimney shall not be wrapped in siding, per Sec.16-20Q.006(5)c) and
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1073 Peeples.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-642  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1943

**Property Location:** North block face of Peeples St., west of the White Oak Ave. intersection.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small House / Minimal Traditional Cottage

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

**Plan issues**

In reviewing the proposed changes to the structure, Staff noted several drafting errors present on the drawings. Firstly, the fenestration pattern on the side façades does not match the existing structure. Secondly the plans show two different roof forms: the front and rear elevations show a side gabled roof and the side elevations show a hipped roof. The correct roof form for the structure is a side gabled roof. Secondly, the plans show the structure with one single side to side roof form, while the photographs of the structure appear to show at least two roof forms with one principal roof and a composite or shed roof covering. Staff recommends the plans be re-drawn to show the accurate window pattern on the side façades and the correct roof forms.

**Window and door replacement**

The Applicant proposes to replace all windows on the property in-kind. However, photographs of all windows proposed for replacement have not been provided. In looking at the interior photographs provided by the Applicant Staff notes at least one set of original six over six double hung windows are still extant. Staff finds that the retention of these historic windows is required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide unobstructed photographs of each window proposed for replacement that have been keyed to a general floorplan. Staff recommends any original windows which Staff determines to be in a repairable condition to be retained and repaired. Staff further recommends only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-original or beyond the point of repair be replaced with new six over six windows. Lastly, Staff recommends that if simulated divided lite windows are used as replacement products that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

The Applicant also proposes replacing the existing non-historic door. Staff has no concerns with the doors removal but recommends the design of the door meet the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the door be a wood panel product or a fixed glass panel in a wooden frame.

**Siding replacement**

The Applicant proposes the removal of the existing vinyl siding and installing new lap siding. Staff finds that the typical installation method used for vinyl siding would be to attach the vinyl siding over the original siding. As such, Staff recommends that after the vinyl siding is removed the Applicant provide photographs to Staff documenting the condition of any original siding. Staff further recommends any siding which has been determined by Staff to be original and repairable be retained and repaired in-kind. Lastly, Staff recommends only the portions of siding which Staff has determined are beyond the point where repair is feasible be replaced with new wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding.

**Column replacement**

The Applicant proposes installing new wood columns to support the existing porch stoop. Staff has no concerns with the introduction of these features but recommends the stoop columns meet the compatibility rule in regards to their dimensions and style.

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

1. The plans shall be re-drawn to show the accurate window pattern on the side façades and the correct roof forms;
2. Any original windows which Staff determines to be in a repairable condition shall be retained and repaired, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);

3. Only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-original or beyond the point of repair shall be replaced with new six over six windows, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
4. If simulated divided lite windows are used as replacement products the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n);
5. The design of the door shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
6. The front door shall be a wood panel product or a fixed glass panel in a wooden frame, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
7. After the vinyl siding is removed the Applicant shall provide photographs to Staff documenting the condition of any original siding, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
8. Any siding which has been determined by Staff to be original and repairable shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
9. Only the portions of siding which Staff has determined are beyond the point where repair is feasible shall be replaced with new wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
10. The stoop columns shall meet the compatibility rule in regards to their dimensions and style, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);
11. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 706 Pearce Street, SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-19-643  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** East of Mayland and West of Tift Avenue

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Applicant was issued a BB on 12/23/19 for exterior and interior work.

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

### **ALTERATIONS**

On a 2549 sf house, the Applicant proposes to repair in-kind elements on the front porch, replace windows on the front façade in-kind, re-build a planter box on the side elevation, apply a new roof overhang, replace the siding in-kind and install new roof shingles.

#### ***Porch***

The Applicant has proposed to repair elements on the front porch in-kind. The Applicant proposes to repair and paint the railing spindle on the front porch. The photos the Applicant provided for the existing structure, does not show a full-on front porch view. From a side photo it appears the railings and pilasters are in good condition and can be repaired in-kind if necessary. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### ***Door***

The Applicant proposes to install a new 30x6/8 Craftsman door on the front façade. District Regulations require architecturally significant doors to remain on the principal structure. The Applicant has not provided any photographic evidence illustrating if the existing door is architecturally significant. Staff recommends the Applicant provides a photo of the existing front door to determine replacement.

#### ***Windows***

On the right elevation and the front façade of the principal structure the Applicant proposes to replace the existing windows and repair the rotten windowsills. From the photos provided by the Applicant it appears as if the windows are not original to the main structure. The removal of the windows does not present an issue with Staff, since the windows are not original and not architectural significant. However, the proposed windows must be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors. Staff recommends the proposed windows be compatible in scale, size proportion, placement and style to existing windows on the principle structure. Staff is not concerned with the repair in-kind of the wood windowsill.

#### ***Planter Box***

In the window replacement and sill repair, the Applicant proposes to rebuild the planter that exist on the main structure. The planter isn't an original characteristic to the principal structure; since the planter will be send from the public right-way, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence of planter boxes in the subarea to establish predominance a requirement of the District Regulations or repair in-kind the planter since no removal will occur.

#### ***New Roof Overhang***

A proposal by the Applicant to apply a new roof overhang on the front façade but has not provide any photographic evidence or explanation to support new roof overhang. Staff recommends the Applicant provide the supporting evidence for the new roof overhang.

***Siding***

The Applicant proposes to repair in-kind on the principal structure. From photos of the siding, the siding appears to be in very good condition and looks to be wood. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

***Roof Shingles***

Roof shingles roof replacement is a general repair. The Applicant proposes to replace the shingles on the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall provide photos of the front door to determine eligibility for replacement of the door, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(1);
2. The proposed window shall be compatible in scale, size, style and proposition to windows on the existing structure, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(b)(5);
3. The Applicant shall provide evidence of planter boxes in the subarea or repair in-kind the planter box since removal will not occur, per Sec.16-20I.006 (4)(a)(3);
4. The Applicant shall provide supporting evidence to why the roof overhang needs replacing, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(f);
5. 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](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:** 136 Estoria St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-531  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

#### 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)?** Yes. Deferred November 25, 2019. *Updated text in Italics.*

**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.

*The plans have been updated to conform with the minimum rear yard setback of 70'. Staff finds that this recommendation has been met.*

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.

*The addition has been revised to show dormers which do not engage the principal roof line and which occupy 32% of the roof planes on which they are located. Staff finds that the revised addition meets the District regulations.*

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 retains this recommendation.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-19-531:** Approval with the following conditions:

1. The existing rear corner boards shall be retained in place, per Sec. 16-20A.006(14)(c)&(e); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve the final plans and documentation.

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1121 Oakland Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-583 (Financial Hardship)  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020 Deferred from January 8, 2020

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1945

**Property Location:** East of Arlington and West of Avon Avenue

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** roof form, porch, siding, windows

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The Applicant was nearly finished with the renovations when he received a Stop Work Order. The Applicant originally received permits for only interior work, thinking he had permission did exterior work as well. Urban Design Commission required the Applicant to return the principal structure back to its' originality. Applicant is petitioning for financial hardship.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to Allow the Applicant to provide the information listed in the recommendations.**

**\*\* Updated comments in RED**

**BACKGROUND**

The Minimalist Traditional Cottage has been transformed into a Gable roof cottage. In doing the work, the Applicant has changed the roof, windows, sidings and added a porch. At the May 2019 Urban Design Meeting, the Commission voted, the Applicant had to return the principal structure back to its original form. The Applicant has reported due to the lack of funds returning the house back to its original form is impossible. It is now the burden of the Applicant to state and demonstrate the financial burden.

District Regulation states

The commission shall consider the following factors in determining whether an economic hardship exemption in whole or in part will be granted: The present income of the property owner(s) and those occupying the property; The age of the property owner; The length of time the property owner has resided in the neighborhood or in the residence for which the exemption is sought; The availability of other sources of funds that are appropriate to the circumstances of the applicant, including loans, grants, and tax abatements; The costs associated with adherence to these regulations; The degree of existing architectural significance and integrity of the structure; and The purpose and intent of this chapter.

The commission shall consider these factors and shall grant an exemption, in whole or in part, as appropriate upon a finding that the applicant's economic hardship outweighs the need for strict adherence to these regulations.

**STAFF ASSESSMENT**

The Applicant has provided a market analysis that demonstrates the profitability of the pending house. In doing this, the Applicant has also provided a comparison of other houses in the District regarding their prices. 1121 Oakland values is as high as the other comp in the District. The Applicant has also provided current listing of neighboring houses. However, what the Applicant doesn't do is show or state whether these neighboring houses are in their original state, which his is not. What this shows and demonstrates is that right now Oakland City is a profitable community. Which is good. However, it doesn't demonstrate how profitable the house would be if returned to it originality.

The market analysis or listings doesn't really give a screen shot into the Applicant's financial affairs or address whether this Applicant is able to financially restore the house back to what is once was. The Applicant does provide information regarding his 2018 tax returns and the settlement on the property. His current income is minimum at best if only going by the tax return. And the Settlement Statement indicates the Applicant owes a significant amount on the

house. However, the Applicant doesn't address if he has access to other sources or funds to restore the house back to its originality. The Applicant does provide an invoice from J&S Remodeling Llc. detailing what it cost to transform the house initially from its original state.

However, the Applicant does not provide any definitive information on what it will cost to bring the house back to its original state. It could be much less. Staff does not know. With that said, Staff finds it hard to determine the feasibility of the Applicant's request. Staff recommends the Applicant provide more financial information that show his inability to undertake the work needed to bring the house back or meet to seek a resolution.

The Applicant has provided additional financial information to support the request for financial hardship: printout of charges occurred on the AAA card and an estimate to restore the house back to it originality.

### **CHARGES**

Although the Applicant has provided charges which are presumed to be from the initial construction on the principal structure, Staff finds the charges not to be clear as to what the charges were for. For example, on 12/09 there is a charge for \$186.66. Staff can not determine what this charge would be for. There are several charges to The Home Depot, and they may have been for the work done at 1121, without descriptions, it is impossible for Staff to discern that. Staff recommends, the Applicant flush these charges out more by providing actual descriptions. This should allow Staff to determine if cost is related to the actual construction.

### **ESTIMATE**

The estimate the Applicant is detailed and provided much need information to determine the cost to bring the house back to its' originality. While this may be the case, Staff does question for example the cost of gutters and down spouts. Considering the gutters and down spouts are new on the house and perhaps can be reused why would gutters and downspouts be \$900. Staff recommends the Applicant get more than one estimate to get the best cost analysis for the project.

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral to Allow the Applicant to provide the information listed in the recommendations.

1. The Applicant shall flush out charges by providing actual descriptions, per Sec. 16-20M.001;
2. The Applicant shall get more than one estimate to get the best cost analysis for the project, Sec.16-20M.001 and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA3-19-583 for 1121 Oakland Street  
January 22, 2020  
pg. 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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 778 Delmar Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-626  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** North block face of Delmar Ave, east of United Ave.

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

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

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

**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 CA3-19-439:** Approval.

**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.

Subdivision

The Applicant has submitted a subdivision application (SD-19-042) with the Office of Zoning and Development for the purpose of subdividing the existing lot into 2 conforming R-5 parcels. The existing home on 778 Delmar will be maintained and preserved and the Applicant states that a new duplex will be proposed on the new lot facing Lynwood St. at a later date.

After review, Staff has no concerns with the proposed subdivision. As the Grant Park Historic District regulations require resulting lots to conform with the historical platting of the district, Staff finds most residential lots to be rectilinear in shape, with frontages between 50-70 ft. and sides from 150-200 ft. This was determined via the use of cadastral maps for the district. Additionally, Lynwood Ave. has experienced the subdivision of lots with the dimensions noted previously (notably CA3-17-069). Based on the historical platting for the district, as well as the previous precedent in subdividing lots along Lynwood Ave., Staff recommends approval.

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

1. 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

**KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP**  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1057 Washita Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-631  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

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

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

**Date of Construction:** 1900

**Property Location:** South block face of Washita Ave between Sinclair Ave. and Euclid Ave.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Four Square (porch removed)

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

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Replacement materials.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

**Front porch addition**

The Applicant proposes removing the existing non-historic deck and replacing the feature with a new front porch which conforms to the design of historic front porches on the block face. The Applicant has submitted information showing that this structure, originally a single-family dwelling, had the front porch removed. The proposed front porch would replicate the location and setback of the original front porch. Staff finds that the front porch dimensions, materials, and design meet the Historic District regulations for such. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed front porch.

**Front door alterations**

The Applicant proposes the removal of both non-historic front doors, replacing the right-side front door with a new front door, and replacing the non-historic left side front door with a window. The Sanborn Fire Insurance maps shows the structure was originally a single-family dwelling which would have contained a single front door. The predominate pattern for front doors on this block is for the front door to be centered on the front façade with windows on either side. While not a requirement of the District regulations, the proposal would not conform to this historic pattern. However, Staff finds that the proposal would allow for the front façade to come closer to the original form of the structure. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal but would encourage the Applicant to investigate, if it has not been done already, the original fenestration pattern of the front façade to determine whether a central front door with windows on either side was the original arrangement of the front façade.

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

1. 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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 215 Degrass Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-640  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1907

**Property Location:** East block face of Degrass Ave.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The project involves revisions to a design that was approved by the Commission in 2013 under CA3-13-028.

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

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

**Previous approvals**

As noted in the findings of fact, the current project is a revision to the previous approval issued under CA3-13-028. Staff has requested the files for this case from archives, but has not yet been able to review the plans to check whether the current proposal is consistent with the Commission's approval. As such Staff finds it appropriate to recommend that except for the current proposed revisions, the plans match the design of the project which was approved under CA3-13-028. Staff further recommends the conditions of approval for application CA3-13-028 remain in effect on the current proposal.

**Dormer additions**

The Applicant is proposing the inclusion of two new dormers on the property. Staff has no concerns with the design of the dormers on the right side of the property. However, Staff does have concerns with the proposed dormer over the stairs on the left side of the structure. The proposed dormer would involve the removal of portions of the existing eaves in order to accommodate a new window. Staff finds that this proposal would result in a loss of historic materials that would impact the spatial relationships of the existing property. Staff further finds that the preferred method for dormer additions is to continue the eave line across the addition to ensure minimal disturbance to the historic structure. As such, Staff recommends the left side dormer addition be redesigned to allow the eave line to continue across the face of the dormer.

**Rear gable extension**

The Applicant proposes extending the previously approved rear gable addition. As Staff is not in receipt of the previously approved plans at this time, Staff cannot verify whether the project is moving closer to the rear property line the previously approved project. The existing structure has a setback of approximately 31' and the proposed additions would reduce that rear setback to approximately 28'. Staff has not received compatibility information detailing the allowable rear yard setback. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable rear yard setback. Staff further recommends the rear yard setback conform to the range established by the comparable properties on the block face.

**Alterations**

The Applicant is proposing a series of fenestration and cladding changes to the property. While not noted as a proposed change, Staff finds that the existing and proposed front doors on the drawings do not match. Staff does not have a clear photograph of the front façade, but the available photographs appear to show either a full lite wood door or a storm door currently existing. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their plans for the front door and whether any replacement is proposed.

With regards to the proposed siding changes, the Applicant is proposing new lap siding in place of the existing asbestos siding on the existing non-historic rear addition. Staff has no concerns with the proposed change but recommends the proposed lap siding be wood or smooth faced cementitious siding.

On the right-side façade, the Applicant proposes the removal of two non-historic round windows on the right side façade. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

On the left side façade, the Applicant proposes the removal of two sets of non-historic paired double hung windows and proposes three double hung windows, consistent with the style of the first-floor windows on the property, in their place. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

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

1. Except for the current proposed revisions, the plans shall match the design of the project which was approved under CA3-13-028;
2. The conditions of approval for application CA3-13-028 remain in effect on the current proposal;
3. The left side dormer addition shall be redesigned to allow the eave line to continue across the face of the dormer, per Sec. 16-20L.005(1)(b)(ii);
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable rear yard setback, per Sec. 16-20L.006(2)(b);
5. The rear yard setback shall conform to the range established by the comparable properties on the block face, per Sec. 16-20L.006(2)(b);
6. The Applicant shall clarify their plans for the front door and whether any replacement is proposed, per Sec. 16-20L.005(1)(b)(ii);
7. The proposed lap siding shall be wood or smooth faced cementitious siding, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(p); and,
8. 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

**KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP**  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1017 Lawton St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-644  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1947

**Property Location:** West block face of Lawton St., north of the Peoples St. intersection.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small House / Minimal Traditional Cottage

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

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** n/a.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

**Window and door replacement**

The Applicant proposes to replace all windows on the property in-kind. However, Staff has received only one photograph of an original window on the property. In looking at the photograph provided by the Applicant Staff notes at least one set of original six over six double hung windows are still extant. Staff finds that the retention of these historic windows is required by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide unobstructed photographs of each window proposed for replacement that have been keyed to a general floorplan. Staff recommends any original windows which Staff determines to be in a repairable condition to be retained and repaired. Staff further recommends only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-original or beyond the point of repair be replaced with new six over six windows. Lastly, Staff recommends that if simulated divided lite windows are used as replacement products that the muntins be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

The Applicant also proposes replacing the existing non-historic door. Staff has no concerns with the removal of this door but recommends the design of the door meet the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends the door be a wood panel product or a fixed glass panel in a wooden frame.

**Siding replacement**

The Applicant proposes the removal of the existing vinyl siding and installing new lap siding. Staff finds that the typical installation method used for vinyl siding would be to attach the vinyl siding over the original siding. The Applicant states that the original siding is in a state of disrepair but has provided photographs of only one section of siding. As such, Staff recommends that after the vinyl siding is removed the Applicant provide photographs to Staff documenting the condition of any original siding. Staff further recommends any siding which has been determined by Staff to be original and repairable be retained in-place and repaired in-kind. Lastly, Staff recommends only the portions of siding which Staff has determined are beyond the point where repair is feasible be replaced with new wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding.

**Porch column replacement**

The Applicant is proposing the removal of the non-historic metal columns and proposes wood columns for a replacement. Staff has no concerns with the removal of the non-historic columns or the use of wood as a replacement material but recommends the design of the side porch columns meet the compatibility rule.

**Rear addition**

In general, Staff finds the design of the proposed addition conforms to the style of the home and is clearly a secondary feature. However, Staff finds that the proposed addition would introduce a large amount of blank wall space on the right elevation which is inconsistent with the fenestration pattern of the existing structure. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant add more windows to the right-side elevation.

With regards to the left side elevation, Staff recommends the existing rear corner boards be retained in-place.

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

1. Any original windows which Staff determines to be in a repairable condition shall be retained and repaired, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
2. Only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-original or beyond the point of repair shall be replaced with new six over six windows, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
3. If simulated divided lite windows are used as replacement products the muntins shall be integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n);
4. The design of the door shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
5. The front door shall be a wood panel product or a fixed glass panel in a wooden frame, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(5);
6. After the vinyl siding is removed the Applicant shall provide photographs to Staff documenting the condition of any original siding, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
7. Any siding which has been determined by Staff to be original and repairable shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b);
8. Only the portions of siding which Staff has determined are beyond the point where repair is feasible shall be replaced with new wood or smooth faced cementitious lap siding, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
1. The design of the side porch columns shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);
2. The Applicant shall add more windows to the right-side elevation, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
3. The existing rear corner boards shall be retained in-place, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(b); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 291 H.E. Holmes Drive (Berean S.D.A. Church)  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-001  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** West of Hightower Ct and East of Collier Road

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL**

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

**COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

**ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to construct an addition to the existing structure to allow for a new elevator, providing access to all the three floors of the church. The addition will be located on the south wall of the North wing of the building and will not be visible from the public right-of way facing the front or side views. But will be visible from the rear parking lot of the church.

The Applicant proposes to use brick veneer, matching the existing brick. Photos provided by the Applicant for comparisons of non-residential properties illustrate the massing of each property and is reflective of the overall massing on the blockface. The addition the Applicant proposes aligns with other structures and is not problematic with Staff. The proposed addition will be constructed primarily on the east elevation. The roof line will not exceed either of the existing roofs of the church: the main sanctuary or the east wing. The exposure of the addition on the south elevation north wing and the west elevation is minimal at best. Staff is not concerned with the overall construction of the elevator addition.

**MATERIAL**

The Applicant has proposed brick veneer that will match in color with the existing brick on the church. Material is governed by the compatibility standard. From the photos that the Applicant provided, Staff can not clearly discern if veneer is a material used on the other churches. However, being the location of the addition is in the rear, Staff is not concern with the material.

**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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1304 Oak St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-002  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** Southeast corner of Oak St. and Hopkins St.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

**Plan issues**

In reviewing the proposed plans, Staff has found inconsistencies in the existing structure and the structure shown on the existing/proposed elevations. The most notable inconsistencies are the fenestration pattern on the right-side elevation, the lack of an inset on the right side elevation addition, and the inclusion of windows with a nine over nine lite pattern when the existing structure contains one over one windows. Staff recommends the plans be updated to show the correct fenestration pattern and style, and accurately reflect the built conditions on both the existing and proposed elevations.

**Rear additions**

The Applicant is proposing two rear additions which will result in a square footage increase and the inclusion of a rear porch on the property. The Square footage addition would be massed under a rear facing gable and the porch would contain a shed roof. In general Staff finds the design of the proposed additions to be consistent with the architectural style of the existing structure and consistent with the style of additions on historic structures in general. Staff would recommend that the rear porch columns be simplified to appear clearly secondary to the columns on the front porch. Staff further recommends the door shown on the plans be updated to reflect the design of the proposed door. Lastly, Staff recommends the materials be listed on the proposed elevations.

**Site work**

Per the plans provided by the Applicant, Staff understands that a new carport is proposed for inclusion somewhere on the property. Staff would note that while this feature are not subject to a review by the Commission, Staff is required to review the proposed accessory structure for compliance with the Historic District zoning regulations. A site plan showing the location of the car port has not been provided. As such, Staff cannot determine whether the carport conforms to the 7' side and 15' rear yard setback prescribed by the underlying R-4A zoning or whether the carport conforms to the Hopkins St. half depth front yard setback. Further, information showing the allowable height of the accessory structure based on the height of historic accessory structures on the block face has not been received. Without both a site plan and compatibility information regarding the allowable accessory structure height, Staff will not be able to complete a review of the proposed accessory structure. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a site plan showing the location of the proposed car port along with compatibility information demonstrating the allowable height of the accessory structure.

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

1. The plans shall be updated to show the correct fenestration pattern and style, and accurately reflect the built conditions on both the existing and proposed elevations;
2. The rear porch columns shall be simplified to appear clearly secondary to the columns on the front porch, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
3. The door shown on the plans shall be updated to reflect the design of the proposed door, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
4. The materials shall be listed on the proposed elevations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
5. The Applicant shall provide a site plan showing the location of the proposed car port along with compatibility information demonstrating the allowable height of the accessory structure, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(g); and,
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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Interim Director, Office of  
Design

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 586 Candler Park Dr. (Mary Lin Elementary School).  
**APPLICATION:** RC-19-625  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1930 with additions in 1950, 1958, & 2017.

**Property Location:** West block face of Candler Park Dr., south of the North Ave. intersection.

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

**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. 16-20

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

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

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

**Site work**

The proposed work consists of an awning to be installed over an existing pathway. No other work is proposed in relation to this project. In general, Staff finds that the work will have no impact on the historic portions of the structure and will be screened from view on the public right of way. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed work.

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

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 880 Cherokee Avenue ( Lion's Bridge)  
**APPLICATION:** RC-19-634  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

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

**Historic Zoning:** N/A      **Other Zoning:** Brookwood Conservation  
**Date of Construction:** 1882  
**Property Location:** Grant Park  
**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes,    **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Historic Landmark Bridge  
**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Bridge Repair  
**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A  
**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 16-20K  
**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No  
**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

**REPAIR and RESTORATION**

The Grant Park Conservancy proposes to repair and restore the oldest Grant Park's the Lion's Bridge an established landmark in the City of Atlanta since 1883. This work will consist of repair and replacement of missing elements; clean and repoint the stone work of the south wall; catalog and disassemble the north wall, build new foundation to prevent settling cleaning of the marble bench and base and replacement of internal plumbing with connectivity to water and electric. In doing the proposed work, the Applicant has stated original materials in the original configuration and location will be employed. Patio pavers will be installed between the bridge wall connecting to adjacent pathways. Additionally, grading to the mitigate erosion issues and prevent reoccurring of the wall destruction.

Staff applauded the much-needed repair and restoration of much a distinguish historical feature in Atlanta's history and have no concerns. Staff does have two questions: why must the north wall be disassembled? And why use pavers instead of going back with the original flooring which probably was concrete? Staff does suggest the Applicant consult the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for the Treatment of Historic Properties for said proposal but especially for the cleaning of the marble bench and base. Additionally, Staff would suggest the Applicant install solar generated path lighting in strategic locations to illuminate a clear way to the pathways.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 37 Palisades Road  
**APPLICATION:** RC-19-645  
**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2020

---

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

**Historic Zoning:** N/A      **Other Zoning:** Brookwood Conservation

**Date of Construction:** 1927

**Property Location:** West of Northwood Avenue and East of Parkdale Way

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Exterior Windows/French Door Unit

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 16-20B

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

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

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

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

**ADDITIONS**

The Applicant proposes several interior renovations including an added butler's pantry, powder room and laundry closet all within the existing footprint. Being that all of these proposals are interior and out of the purview of the Commission, Staff is not concerned with these proposals.

**ALTERATIONS**

In addition to the interior renovations and additions, the Applicant proposes new windows, a new French door unit, removal of windows on the side elevation and repair brick veneer from insulation and removal of existing windows. From the photos provided by the Applicant, it appears that new windows and a French door unit are reflective of what was there prior and may not be original to the house.

Although the proposed work would not jeopardize the overall structure and integrity, Staff is concerned with the removal of historic windows and trim that surrounds these windows. Staff would rather see the Applicant use another method to achieve its final goal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File