



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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1150 Tucker Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-076
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: South block face of Tucker Place, west of the Cordova St. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & 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.

The Alterations proposed by the Applicant would add side and front facing gables to the existing structure. The District regulations require alterations to non-contributing structures to be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure or that the alterations comply with the requirements for new construction. In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that the first of the two criteria is appropriate for use on this project.

Staff has few concerns with the project as proposed and finds that the proposal would be consistent with and reinforce the architecture of the existing structure. Staff would recommend that the brick on the property remain unpainted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions.

1. The brick on the property shall remain unpainted, per Sec. 16-20.009(2); 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

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 636 Brookline St. SW

APPLICATION: CA2-20-079

MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: South blockface of Brookline St, east of Maryland Ave, west of Metropolitan Pkwy

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, deferred from March 11, 2020 meeting.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-079: Approve.

.

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

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a wooden privacy fence. The proposed fence would be 6 feet in height, flat top, and constructed with wooden pickets. The proposed fence does not extend past the front façade of the primary structure and follows the property line in the rear.

After review, Staff finds that the proposed fence is compatible with the Adair Park regulations. As such, Staff recommends approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of
Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 652 Lawton St.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-081
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1994

Property Location: East block face of Lawton St., north of Oglethorpe Ave.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revisions to previously approved plans.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: In 2018, the Commission reviewed and approved application CA3-18-434 and 435. Staff received notification in 2019 that the project was not proceeding according to the approved plans. The current proposal is to review the revisions to the plans previously approved by the commission.

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.

As this proposal involves revisions to a design which was previously approved by the Commission, Staff finds it appropriate to retain all conditions from the previous review for application on this new design. As such, Staff recommends that the project conform with conditions of approval for CA3-18-434 and CA3-18-435 with the exception of those conditions which are amended under the current application.

Front porch

The Applicant is proposing revisions to the design of the previously approved front porch. The first revision involves lowering the height of the visible foundation and adding a wooden band to compensate for the additional height. This alteration appears to be an attempt to compensate for issues which occurred during construction. Staff finds that the proposed condition would be consistent with the construction methods on historic porches on the block face and has no concerns with the proposed change.

The second proposed change involves installing a 36” porch railing. The District regulations limit the height of front porch railings to no higher than 33”. As such, Staff finds that the proposal would violate the maximum height allowed for railings and recommends the porch railings be no higher than 33”. Staff further recommends any additional railing height necessary to meet life safety code be achieved through a simple plane extension.

Windows

The Applicant is proposing to install larger window as than were approved by the Commission in their original review of the structure. No information relating to the compatibility of the size and scale of these proposed windows with original windows on the block face has been provided. As such, Staff finds there is not enough information for a proper review of the proposed windows. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the size and scale of windows on the front façade of the comparable properties on the block face. Staff further recommends the front façade windows meet the compatibility rule.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions.

1. the project conform with conditions of approval for CA3-18-434 and CA3-18-435 with the exception of those conditions which are amended under the current application
2. any additional railing height necessary to meet life safety code be achieved through a simple plane extension
3. the Applicant provide information detailing the size and scale of windows on the front façade of the comparable properties on the block face
4. the front façade windows meet the compatibility rule
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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 742 Brookline Street, SW

APPLICATION: CA2-20-742

MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Allene and West of Mayland

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Solar Panels

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: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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

SOLAR PANELS

The Applicant purposes the installation of a 24-panel solar system to the roof of the existing permanent structure. District Regulations requires solar panels not to be seen from the public right-of-way if installed.

The Applicant has proposed to install 18 panels on the southeast facing roof on the side of the house and 6 panels on the southwest facing roof on the back of the house. From the photo of front facing house the Applicant provided, Staff agrees looking straight and up at the house (the house is on a hill) the solar would not be visible from the public-right-way.

Staff is not concerned with this proposal

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 775 Brookline St.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-091
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1928

Property Location: North blockface of Brookline St., east of Allene Ave., west of Maryland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and Site Work

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-091: Approve.

.

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

Alterations and Site Work

The Applicant is proposing alterations and site work to the exterior of the primary structure. The alterations are replacing the front door, adding one rear window, replacing the front porch columns and railing, replacing two kitchen windows, and replacing the rear deck. The site work proposed is the installation of a rear yard 6' privacy fence and a front yard 4' wood fence with 50 percent transparency.

After review, Staff finds that a number of items proposed to be replaced are not historic to the primary structure. These are the front and rear doors, all windows on the house, the front porch columns, and the front porch railings. The proposed windows along the front façade maintain the existing openings and existing window style of 4 over 1. The proposed columns match the existing style in mass, size and form. As such, Staff finds no issues with the replacement of non-historic materials, given that they maintain existing massing and proportionality.

Along the replacement windows and doors, the Applicant is proposing details of 1x4 trim, with 1-1/2" sub sills on the new windows. After review, Staff finds that this detailing is compatible with other houses on the blockface. 7 of the 10 houses on the blockface currently use similar trim around both doors and windows. As such, Staff finds no issues with the proposed detailing around the front and rear façade doors and windows.

Along the rear façade of the building, a new deck and a new window are proposed. The new deck would not extend past the sides of the primary structure and would not be seen from the public right-of-way. The proposed window would match in style with existing window patterns on the primary structure, being 4 over 1. Staff finds no issues with the proposed new deck, nor the proposed new rear façade window.

The site work proposed would be adding both a front yard and rear yard fence. The front yard fence would be 4' tall and made of wood, while maintaining an openness of 50 percent to avoid blocking the front façade of the primary structure. The rear fence would be a 6' tall wooden privacy fence. After review, Staff finds no issues with the proposed fences.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve:

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

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: July 29th, 2020 from March 11, 2020 deferred February 26th, 2020, February 12, 2020, January 22, 2020, November 13, 2019 and December 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.

**** Updated responses are in RED BOLD (Final Updates in Purple)**

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 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.

The Applicant had changed the added space to 360 sf for a second story addition. With this reduction comes a shifting of the stairs from the lower level to the upper addition. Staff will yield the build ability to the Architects on the Commission who are accustom to interior renovation, yet which is not the purview of the Commission. However, it is entirely important that the house is buildable.

Staff recommends if the Commission deems the reduction of the addition and the shifting of the stairs makes for a buildable house, Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Roof form/Height on the Addition

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 larger gable roof on the front of the house. This will depart from the smaller gable roof that looks like a shed roof. This is a concern to Staff. Inventory photos, as well as, photos provided by the Applicant show the original front roof over the porch not to be a larger shed roof construction. Staff recommends, the Applicant not add the gable front porch roof and retain the original roof construction that is currently over the front.

The Applicant proposes not to add the larger gable front porch roof and retain the original roof construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant has provided elevations that addresses the concern of the height for the addition to allow for proper head room. The pitch is now 8/12 not 5/12. Additionally, the Applicant has provided plans that reflect an accurate form for the roof. According to the

Applicant the roof is a Hip roof not a Gable roof extending from the front. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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.

The Applicant has added the chimney on to the plans and will not remove it. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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.

The Applicant proposes to install nine over nine double hung windows that are to be vinyl replacing the vinyl windows that are currently on the house. If the Applicant can demonstrate the other 9 over 9 windows presence on the existing structure, Staff is not concerned with proposal since the original windows are not presented on the existing structure.

The Applicant proposes to install one-over-one wood windows on the front of the houses and not replace any other windows on the house. But will repair and kind if need be. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant has shown on the new plans the fenestration patterns that are accurate to the existing plans. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Additionally, the Applicant is removing a side window on the right elevation

Stair

In the interior of the house, the Applicant proposes to construct stairs that would connect the lower level to the upper level. Reviewing the proposed plans, Staff

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.

The Applicant has shown where the original door was centered. The Applicant proposal to shift the door to the center is not problematic to Staff. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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.

The Applicant will not add the two additional windows but will retain the original fenestration pattern on the house.

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.

The Applicant has noted on the plans, the railings will be a two-part top to bottom construction to be no higher than the front windowsill. If needed, a simple plain extension to be installed to meet building code regulations. Staff is not concerned with this proposal,

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.

The Applicant will replace and repair in-kind the wood siding and trim and have a 5 ½ reveal on the siding. Staff is not concerned with this 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 retain all the original trim on the house and replace and repair in-kind, per Sec.16-20I.006(4)(g)(2);
2. The door shall match other doors that predominates on the block to abide by District Regulations per, Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(g);
3. The Applicant shall place the desk on a two-scale site plan so that Staff can determine if the deck is meeting District regulation concerning decks per, Sec. 16-20I.006 and
4. 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 526 Langhorn St.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-047
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: East block face of Langhorn St., south of Latham St and north of Oak St.

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? Yes. Deferred at the March 11, 2020 Public Hearing. *Updated text in italics.*

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.

While not a requirement of the Commission's review, Staff strongly suggests the Applicant's plans not be sealed or released for construction until after the Commission has approved the design for their project.

Compatibility comparisons

The District regulations are specific on how compatibility rule measurements are to be taken. Measurements are to be taken from only contributing properties on the same block face. The Applicant has included 5 properties from the same block face as the subject property (508, 512, 516, 520, and 530 Langhorn St.) as well as an additional property on a separate block face (498 Longhorn St.) which is not one of the comparable properties for this project. Staff will review the proposed structure using only those 5 contributing properties permitted by the Zoning Ordinance on the same block face as the subject property.

The Applicant has provided a compatibility study including all 5 contributing structures on the block face. Staff will use this analysis in their review of the revised drawings.

Building façades

Per the District regulations, the allowable front yard setback of new construction is determined by the compatibility rule. No information showing the front yard setbacks of the comparable properties has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable front yard setback range for the subject property based on the comparable structures.

The Applicant has provided information showing that the block face has an allowable front yard setback range of a minimum of 23', based on 530 and 520 Langhorn, and a maximum of 25' 6" based on 508 Langhorn. Based on this information, Staff recommends the front yard setback conform to the range established by historic homes on the block.

Per the district regulations, the height of new structures is based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant has provided information detailing the allowable height range based on contributing structures on the same block face as being a maximum of 22' and a minimum of 16'. The proposed structure contains a height of approximately 32' which exceeds the height allowed by the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed structure be re-designed to be no higher than 22'.

The revised plans show a single story structure with a height of 19' as measured from grade at the front façade to the peak of the roof. Staff finds that this method of measurement is consistent with the methods used to measure the comparable properties. As such, Staff finds the height requirements and Staff's previous recommendation has been met.

Per the District regulations, the first floor height is based on the compatibility rule but specify that the foundations of the property should be no less than two entrance risers each of which shall be not less than seven inches in height. The regulations for first floor height also prohibit slab on grade construction. No information detailing the first-floor height of the comparable properties has been

received. Further the proposed structure is shown to contain a slab on grade foundation. Staff recommends the Applicant provide the first floor height range of the comparable properties. Staff further recommends the proposed structure be redesigned to contain a compliant foundation.

The Applicant has revised their plans to show the structure with a first floor height above grade of 2' 8". Based on the information provided by the applicant, Staff finds that this condition has been met.

The proposed structure contains a mix of horizontal lap siding and vertical board and batten siding. Per the District regulations, vertical board and batten siding are not a permitted building material. Staff recommends the vertical board and batten siding be removed from the design and replaced with horizontal lap siding. Staff further recommends any cement siding used be smooth faced.

The revised plans have eliminated the board and batten siding in favor of horizontal lap siding on the front and side facades. Staff finds this recommendation has been met but retains the recommendation requiring all cement siding to be smooth faced.

The proposed structure contains a large openwork ornament in the front facing gable. Staff finds that the proposed ornament is inconsistent with the historic structures on the property and recommends the openwork ornament in the front gable be removed from the proposed design.

The revised plans show the openwork ornament eliminated from the plans. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Per the District regulations, building materials are subject to the compatibility rule when they are visible from the public right of way. Staff finds that this regulation would require materials on the front and sides of the property to conform to the compatibility rule. Many of the building materials including but not limited to the porch columns, porch flooring, windows, doors, and trim material are not listed on the plans. Staff recommends all exterior building materials on the front and side façades be listed on the plans and meet the District regulations.

The updated plans show many of the materials proposed for use on the structure. However, Staff noted that the material of the windows has been omitted from the plans. As such, Staff recommends the windows on the proposed structure be wood and any simulated divided lite muntins be dimensional, integrated to the sash, and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass.

The Applicant proposes rustic barn style shutters for the front façade of the property. Staff finds no evidence of historic shutters on comparable properties to justify the inclusion of shutters on the subject property. Staff further finds that barn style shutters are incompatible with the style of historic shutters in the District, of which there are very few. As such, Staff recommends the barn style shutters be removed from the front façade.

The revised plans show the shutters have been eliminated from the project. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Windows and doors

Per the District regulations, the ratio of open to solid on new construction is based on the compatibility rule. Staff has concerns with the lack of openings on the side façades. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the fenestration pattern on the side façades of the comparable properties on the block face. Staff further recommends the side façade fenestration pattern of the proposed structure meet the compatibility rule.

Based on a visual inspection of the block face comparable properties, Staff finds that the revised fenestration proposal meets the compatibility rule. As such, Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

The District regulations require the scale, size, proportion and location of all openings on new construction to meet the compatibility rule. Staff has not received information detailing the scale, size, and proportion of the openings on the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the scale, size, and proportion of the openings of comparable properties on the block face. Staff further recommends the proposed fenestration scale, size, and proportions meet the District regulations.

Based on the information provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the window scale, size, proportion, and location meet the compatibility rule.

In looking at the front façades of comparable properties on the block face, Staff finds the predominate fenestration pattern is for the front door to be centered on the front façade and be flanked by window openings on either side. As such, Staff recommends the front façade design be changed to show a front door centered on the façade flanked by windows. Staff further recommends the front door be wood with a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion, placement, and style.

The revised plans show a centered wood door with a rectangular lite opening flanked by double grouped windows. Staff finds that these recommendations have been met.

Foundations

As mentioned earlier in this report, slab on grade foundations are not permitted in the District. In addition to this requirement, the District has specific requirements for foundation materials. The predominate foundation materials on the block face are either brick or granite. As such, Staff recommends the foundation on the proposed structure be constructed of either brick or granite.

Roofs

Per the District regulations, the shape and pitch of new roofs are subject to the compatibility rule. While no information detailing the allowable roof pitch has been received, Staff finds that the predominate roof shape is a front facing gable. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed roof shape, but recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable roof pitch based on the contributing structures on the block face.

The revised plans show a roof pitch of 6:12. Based on the comparison analysis provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the predominate roof pitch is 7:12. As such, Staff recommends the roof pitch be revised to 7:12.

Porch

The District regulations require new porches to contain balustrades, columns, and other features consistent with the architectural style of original porches on the block. In looking at the comparable properties, they all contain columns that have a masonry base, and are either squared or round. Staff finds the square column proposed would fit the pattern of historic porches on the block but recommends that a masonry base which meets the compatibility rule as it relates to materials, size, and style be added to the front porch columns.

The revision shows a brick veneer porch with boxed wood columns and a wood railing terminating in wood posts on either side of the porch steps. The porch steps themselves are wood. Staff finds that the block face comparable properties contain masonry steps and any posts on the front porch are likewise comprised of masonry. As such, Staff recommends that the porch steps and rail posts be replaced with masonry matching the style of the comparable porches on the block face.

As the original porches on the block face do not contain their original railing, Staff recommends any new railing meet the District regulations and be constructed of a two-part rail with butt jointed pickets. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that side nailed pickets will not satisfy the previous condition.

Staff retains this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: *Approval with the following Conditions:*

1. The front yard setback conform to the range established by historic homes on the block, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(a);
2. Any cement siding used shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d);
3. *The windows on the proposed structure be wood and any simulated divided lite muntins be dimensional, integrated to the sash, and permanently affixed to the exterior of the glass, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3);*
4. *The roof pitch be revised to 7:12, per Sec. 16-20G.006(7)(d);*
5. *The porch steps and rail posts be replaced with masonry matching the style of the comparable porches on the block face, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);*
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: 704 Aline Drive
APPLICATION: CA3-20-052
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1961

Property Location: East of Skipper Drive and West of Laverne Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order placed on the house 2/14/2020 for painting unpainted masonry.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

VARIANCE

The Applicant has received a Stop Work Order on the property due to the Applicant painting unpainted masonry and the Applicant is requesting a variance to allow the paint to remain on the house. Painted unpainted masonry in historic districts in the City of Atlanta is prohibited. The Applicant has submitted the Variance application and has provided the answers to the following questions that must be considered before a variance is granted:

- 1) What are the extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular property?
The Applicant states “to be able to keep the exterior painted brick Alabaster White.”
- 2) How will the Zoning Ordinance create an unnecessary hardship?
The Applicant writes, “It wouldn’t. By allowing to keep the outside painted white, the property immediately attracted a buyer interested in buying within the community and went under contract.”
- 3) What conditions are peculiar to the property?
The Applicant declares, “renovated, and has helped make the neighborhood more appealing.”
- 4) If relief is granted would it cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair intent of Zoning?
The Applicant answers, “ If granted, buyer would purchase property, paint used to paint exterior is harmless of any chemicals that would harm the outside community, also by having a new member who is productive in the community will only add value to the community.”

The Applicant has not sufficiently answered the questions or provided a reason to vary the requirement of unpainted brick. The Applicant has not demonstrated any exceptional conditions or peculiarity of the property; nor has the Applicant stated any hardship or how if he is granted relief how this would not be detrimental to the community or ordinance. Staff reasons if the Applicant is granted relief, a flood gate of people painting brick would happen possibly causing deterioration of the brick widespread. This would be very detrimental to the community.

With this said, Staff has denied the Applicant’s variance request to keep the paint on the brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1429 (aka 1341) South Ponce De Leon Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-016/061

MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Druid Hills Landmark District **Other Zoning:**

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East block face of Oakhill Ave., south of the Lillian Ave. intersection.

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

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

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Variance Request

The requested variances are to reduce the Fairview Rd. front yard setback from 73' (required) to 20' (proposed) and to allow an accessory structure between the principle structure and the South Ponce De Leon Ave. and Fairview Rd. frontages.

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 there are hardships present due to the lots configuration with street frontages along the entirety of the north, east, and south property lines. As such, Staff finds that it would be impossible for an accessory structure to be placed so that it was not between the principal structure and the street frontage. Staff further finds that the lot configuration also creates a hardship where the property is subject to 3 front yard setbacks.

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

As identified in the previous criteria, Staff finds that the lot configuration and site conditions present a hardship for compliance with the Landmark District regulations.

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

Staff finds that while there are other properties in the District with multiple street frontages, a lot containing 3 street frontages is rare. As such, Staff finds that

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 variances would not impair the Commission's ability to enforce the Landmark District regulations on other properties and would not create a detriment to the public good.

Staff supports the requested variances and recommends approval.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing new playground equipment in the south and east yards of the property. Generally, Staff finds that the proposals are substantially similar in design to playground equipment that would be expected at a school of the subject property's size. Staff has no general concerns with the proposal and recommends approval of the design as submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-062: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-061: 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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 793 Tift Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-095
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Adair Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1995

Property Location: West block face of Tift Ave., north of the Gillette Ave. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition.

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

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

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. 16-20I of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The proposal before the Commission is for a rear addition. In general Staff has few concerns as the alterations have no potential to damage historic resources as the structure is not historic. However, Staff does find that the inclusion of siding with the same width as the new structure would be appropriate as there is no need to differentiate new work from historic work. The resulting siding width would also be consistent with that found on historic structures. As such, Staff recommends the reveal of the new siding match the reveal of the existing siding.

The project also proposes the inclusion of a deck on the side of the structure for side access. The regulations in their current form do not permit decks where visible from the street. As such, Staff recommends the side deck be removed from the plans or replaced with a covered stoop.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions.

1. The reveal of the new siding shall match the reveal of the existing siding, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(4);
2. The side deck shall be removed from the plans or replaced with a covered stoop, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(f)(4); 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

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 135 Sunset Ave.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-20-086
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Sunset Avenue Historic District **Other Zoning:** SPI-19 (Subarea 6)

Date of Construction: 1900

Property Location: West block face of Hogue St., south of Irwin St., north of Old Wheat St.

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

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 & Sec. 16-20P

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-2PC of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

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 structural issues and notes the engineer's assessment that the most cost effective method of addressing the issues is demolition. However, Staff finds that the engineer's report does not speak to the major and imminent threat to public health and safety as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The Applicant also notes an evaluation by the City of Atlanta regarding the home which states the structure is 50% deteriorated. However, Staff would note that this analysis does not remove the requirement for the Applicant to provide independent analysis. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public health and safety exists.

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

The Applicant has provided estimates for repairing the existing structure as evidence that repair is unfeasible. However, this criterion speaks to the feasibility of repair and not the financial cost associated. Based on the information provided, Staff finds that repair of the existing structure would be possible.

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.

The property was purchased before the historic designation. The Applicant is aware of the historic significance of the district due to the prominent figures in the City's history who lived there while the owner was the occupant of the structure.

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.

The Applicant owns the property outright. Staff finds that since the property was purchased many years before the District was designated this criterion would not apply to this request.

- (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.**

The Applicant states that the subject property does not produce income.

- (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 states that there is no mortgage or financing 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.**

Staff would note that the Applicant did not provide responses to the real estate taxes paid for the previous 4 years, but did provide information on the 2 most recent assessed property values. As the real estate tax information is public record, Staff has provided this information for the Commission's convenience.

2016	\$262.10
2017	\$276.81
2018	\$453.39
2019	\$904.85

2018 Assessed value- \$14,200.00

2019 Assessed value- \$26,800.00

- 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 has stated there were no appraisals completed on the property in the previous 2 years.

- 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.**

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. Given the age of the structure and given that the structure was purchased decades before any designation on the property, Staff finds that this criterion does not apply to this situation.

- 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 has stated that the property is owned by James Marshall.

- 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 is 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:

The Applicant has stated that they have received requests to purchase the lot for \$100,000.00 after demolition of the primary structure. However, the Applicant states that they have not listed the property for sale or engaged an agent to sell the property.

a) Any real estate broker or firm engaged to sell or lease the property.

No response received.

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

No response received.

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

No response received.

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 Applicant cites the engineer's report. Staff would note that the recommendation provided by the Applicant cites the cost effectiveness of rehabilitating the existing structure but does not speak to the feasibility of rehabilitating 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.

Staff has not received information detailing the cost to demolish the structure and build a new structure meeting the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a response to this criterion.

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.

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a response to this criterion.

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 cites their Engineer's letter which gives their opinion that demolishing the property would be more cost effective than rehabilitating the structure.

- 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.**

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. However, Staff finds that this criterion is not applicable to the subject property as a single-family residential structure on a small lot.

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

The Applicant has responded that they are aware of funds available through State and Federal grants but that the home is not "significant." Staff would suggest the Applicant research the various financial incentives available to properties which are located in historic districts and which still retain much of their character.

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

Staff has not received photographs of the interior and exterior of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographs of the interior and exterior of the structure.

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 and documentation provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the existing building is in a state of disrepair. Staff defines a major and imminent threat to public health and safety as a situation where a building is in immediate threat of collapsing and causing harm to people on the public ROW. Based on the information submitted, Staff finds a major and imminent threat has not been proven and that there is not enough information at this time to establish that demolition is the only method available to address the issues on the property. Further, the materials submitted by the Applicant show that it would be possible to repair the structure without demolition but discounts this possibility for financial reasons. 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 require the submission of this information before making any recommendation as to the appropriateness of demolishing the structure.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide responses to criteria 1, 10b, 10c, and 12.

cc: Applicant
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

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 300 Woodward Ave.
APPLICATION: RC-20-099
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 2017

Property Location: North block face of Woodward Ave., west of the Harden St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N) No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance request's impact on the HD Zoning.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

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

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.

The requested variance would allow an increase in the permitted size of an accessory structure at this address from 30% (allowed) to 42% (proposed) of the square footage of the principal structure. Unlike variance requests from Chapter 20K of the Zoning Ordinance, the Commission does not have purview to approve or deny the variance request, but is instead asked to review the request and provide a letter of comment to the Secretary of the BZA regarding the potential impacts to the Historic District with particular emphasis on any affects the request would have on the Commission's ability to enforce the Historic District zoning regulations. As such, Staff will not review the Applicant's responses to the variance criteria, but will instead focus on the potential impacts of the request should it be approved by the BZA.

The square footage, height, and use requirements for accessory structures in the Grant Park Historic District are governed by the underlying zoning. The setbacks and placement of accessory structures are governed by the Historic District zoning. As such, Staff finds that an increase in the allowable square footage of the Accessory Structure would not affect the Commission's ability to enforce the setback requirements of the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations. Staff would note that regardless of the BZA's decision on the variance request, the review of the new accessory structure would require a review by the HP Studio Staff via a Type II *Staff Review* Application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the BZA.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Intersection of Central Avenue and Decatur Street
APPLICATION: RC-20-096
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020 from March 25, 20020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: N/A

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Art Structure

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-20-096 for De-accessioning at
Central and Decatur Street
July 29, 2020

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

The City of Atlanta Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs Public Art Program proposes to de-accessing an art piece by William F Conway at the GSU intersection of Central and Decatur Street. The reasoning for the de-accessing is the site is inappropriate for the art piece and the upkeep is exhausting with the constant depositing of shoes, dumping of debris and various sundries of undesirable items. The Renew Landmark Art is funding the demolition and disposal of the art piece. A new bridge and walkway are proposed on the site.

Staff has no objections to the de-accessing of the art piece. As the Applicant has stated and it can be shown, since the 1996 Olympics, the site has become a place where debris is stored, which makes the site less desirable. Additionally, the Applicant has stated a valid reason for de-accessioning.

Since the Applicant has shown there is a valid reason set under the "De-accessioning Policies and Procedures of the Atlanta Public Art Master Plan, Staff is in full support of the proposal.

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: Freedom Park
APPLICATION: RC-20-097
MEETING DATE: July 29, 2020 from March 25, 20020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: N/A

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Art Structure

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

RC-20-097 for De-accessioning at Freedom Park
North Avenue and Euclid
July 29, 2020

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

The City of Atlanta Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs Public Art Program proposes the de-accessing "One Woman Rising by Phil Proctor located at Freedom Park at North Avenue and Euclid Avenue. The reasoning for the de-accessing is the Chelko Foundation, who is the fiduciary agency for the art piece has stated the cost for maintenance and repair has become exorbitant and is out of their budget. The Foundation is no longer raising funds for the upkeep. The Chelko Foundation also has made note that the stature is damaged to where it is irreparable. The Foundation will pay for the removal and de-installation and disposal of the piece as well as re-seed the grounds to match the existing turf at Freedom Park.

Staff has no objections to the de-accessing of the art piece, while hating to see an art piece leave the area, Staff do realize that if the maintenance of the art piece cannot be retained then the art piece goes into dilapidation to where it is no longer adding value to the area.

The Applicant has shown there is a valid reason established under the "De-accessioning Policies and Procedures of the Atlanta Public Art Master Plan. Staff is in full support of the de-accessing.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File