



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: 2051 Butler Way, NW
APPLICATION: CA3-19-235
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020 deferred since July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Whittier Mill Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/A

Date of Construction: 1900 (circa)

Property Location: West of Fabian dead ends on Butler Way

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

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. 16-20J

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

COMPATIBILITY RULE

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 a second story addition to accommodate an interior remodel. The new addition will not go beyond the existing deck. The Applicant will extend the deck out to the sides of the house but will not exceed the sides of the house. The roof line will tuck under the existing roof line and not exceed it and the massing does not appear massive because it sits to the rear. The Applicant proposes asphalt shingles on the roof. Staff is not concerned with the proposed addition.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to add vinyl windows with SDL slides to the addition to match the existing SDL aluminum window on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The existing siding on the house is cementitious, the Applicant proposes to install cementitious siding to match the existing.

Foundation

Concrete is proposed for the new foundation. This will match the existing concrete foundation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Concrete is a permitted material for the foundation.

Trim and Corners boards

The proposed trim and corner boards will match the proposed siding. Staff does not have a concern with the proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Chimneys

The chimneys will remain on the existing houses. The Applicants to place caps on each and repoint the masonry on the chimney. Staff does not have a concern with this proposal. The caps can easily be removed and will not take away from the historical importance of the existing house. And repointing helps the longevity of the chimney.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1107 Montreat Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-20-066
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020 deferred from March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: East of Hall Street and South of Donnelly

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Updated review is in **Red**.

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

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

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided five comparisons for review: 1115 Montreat, 1121 Montreat, 1125 Montreat, 1131 Montreat and 1135 Montreat. Staff has found more houses that should be available for comparison.

After carefully examining the blockface, the six houses the Applicant provided are enough for the compatibility analysis.

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed 20 feet for the new construction. The Applicant has not provided the height for 1135, although this is the case, three of the five comparable houses are 21 feet. Therefore, the Applicant’s proposed height meets the District regulation. Staff is not concerned with his proposal.

Applicant states the lowest house height on the blockface is 1121 Montreat at 15 feet and the highest height on the blockface are 1115 Montreat, 1125 Montreat and 1131 Montreat at 21 feet. The Applicant proposal of 20 feet is fine. Staff has no concern for this proposal.

Roof form

The Applicant has not provided information on roof forms but instead provided information on the prevailing house styles in the District. While the house style maybe be an indicator of a roof form, it is not always. Therefore, to abide by the District regulations, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide compatibility information for the roof form.

Research shows the houses on the blockface for comparison show the roof form as

1115 Montreat - Front facing Gable over front porch with Hip extension and two side gables over side porches

1121 Montreat-Hip

1125 Montreat-Side Gable with shed roof over porch

1131 Montreat-Hip with shed roof over porch

1135-Gable

The Applicant proposes a gable roof over the new construction. Roof form is subjected to the Compatibility Standard which states the predominate roof form shall be constructed. On this blockface, there isn't a predominate form. The proposed gable roof is not out of character for the District. Staff has no concern with the roof form.

Floor Elevations

While the Applicant has not provided compatibility for the floor elevation. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the comparable houses for comparison.

The Applicant has proposed an FFE of 3 feet from top of grade. The lowest of comparable—1121 Montreat from top of grade is 2. While the highest from the top of grade is 1115 Montreat at 6 feet. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes a 6- inch reveal cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is a permissible material in the District. However, siding is also governed by the compatibility standing and the Applicant has not provided any compatibility information on siding. for the reveal. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility on the blockface for the siding.

After careful review of the District Regulations, cementitious siding is a permissible siding material for new construction. Staff is not concern with the proposed material. Staff does recommend the Applicant shall abide by the compatibility standard for reveal to be abide by the Compatibility Standard.

Windows

The proposed windows are three over one double hung wood windows with wood trim. This proposal is not problematic to Staff. As the Applicant has stated and shown, the prevailing window pattern from the comparable properties is three over one vertical although the Applicant doesn't state the material. In addition to the District regulations requiring windows style to be determined

by the compatibility standard, District regulations also requires if muntins or mullions are used, such muntins or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass. Staff recommends if muntins or mullions are to be used, the Applicant abide by the District Regulations.

Nothing has changed for this recommendation.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a full porch, front facing wood steps, brick columns with cap ends on the actual 12 inches sq. columns and wood railings. The District regulation states that “the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.” The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for porches. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed porch. Staff also recommends the railings be a two-part top to bottom construction. The height should be no higher than the front windowsill and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension

There are two houses with two front porches, one with a full porch. The other with a partial front porch with two side entries. The predominate porch form on the blockface is a stoop with side and front entry and gable shed roof. The Applicant proposes to construct a full front porch with a side entry and decorative columns. While the design of the porch is a good design, it does not meet the Compatibility Standard set for this blockface. As mention a stoop is the predominate porch form and simpler columns. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the Compatibility Standard and design a front porch that is reflective of a stoop with less decorative columns with either a front or side entry and a gable shed roof.

The recommendation for a plain extension will not be needed. However, the rails construction still should be a two-part top to bottom construction.

The Applicant has proposed continued cementitious 6-inch reveal siding in the roof with exposed rafters. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

With the design possibly changing, Staff reserve to comment on this proposal.

Doors

On the front door, the Applicant proposes a solid wood panel door with glass lights and a transom light. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

This recommendation has not changed.

Foundation

The Applicant has proposed a brick foundation for the front of the house and a stucco foundation for the remainder of the house. The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for the foundation comparison, which is a requirement of the District regulations regarding prevailing foundation material on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the foundation.

Research have shown for the comparable houses on the blockface, three of the houses have a brick foundation. There are no houses that have stucco foundation. The Applicant proposal for stucco would not be comply with Compatibility Standard for the District. Staff recommends, the Applicant use brick for the entire foundation.

Sidewalk

On the site plan the Applicant has shown a 6ft sidewalk with 4 ft planting strip. District regulation requires a sidewalk and states that “the sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.” Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

This recommendation has not changed.

Walkway

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant has not shown on the site plan a proposed sidewalk. Staff recommends, the Applicant install a walkway to abide by District regulations.

This recommendation has not changed.

Driveway

On the Applicant’s site plan, what appears to be the driveway. The driveway falls short of an extension. Staff recommends the Applicant abided by the District regulation that centered on driveway construction which reads, “if constructed, independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare.”

The Applicant has proposed a driveway that appears to be too wide for the site. As before, Staff recommends the Applicant abides by the District regulation that centers on driveway construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall abide by the Compatibility Standard for installing the siding reveal, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(m);
2. If muntins and mullions are to be used on the windows, the Application shall abide by the District regulations that governs muntins and mullions installation, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(o);
3. The Applicant shall abide by the Compatibility Standard for the proposed porch and build a stoop porch with columns that are reflective of columns on the blockface with a gable shed roof with side or front entry, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
4. The rails shall be a two-part top to bottom construction for the rails, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
5. The Applicant shall install a brick foundation to with the Compatibility Standard, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(r)(10);
6. The Applicant shall provide a walkway for the proposed construction, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d);
7. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations that centers on driveway construction, per Sec.16-20M.012(4)(c) and
8. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 989 Dimmock Street
APPLICATION: CA3-20-067
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020 deferred from March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

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

Contributing (Y/N): No
Construction

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.
CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

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

New Comments in **RED**

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided only two comparisons for review: 983 Dimmock and 961 Dimmock. However, from research, Staff has found more houses that should be available for comparison. To abide by the District regulations, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the houses on the blockface that can be compared to the new construction.

The Applicant has provided six comparable houses for analysis: 961 Dimmock, 967 Dimmock, 983 Dimmock, 1001 Dimmock, 1005 Dimmock and 1007 Dimmock. Staff is satisfied with this list.

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed 20 feet for the new construction. While this maybe an acceptable height, without the proper comparisons, Staff can not accurately say. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the comparisons for the height and pitch determination.

The highest height is 24 feet and the lowest is feet. Staff is not concerned with the height of the new construction. The predominate pitch is 6/12 and Applicant proposal is 6/12.

Roof form

The Applicant has not provided information on roof forms but instead provided information on the prevailing house styles in the District. While the house style maybe be an indicator of a roof form, it is not always. Therefore, to abide by the District regulations, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide compatibility information for the roof form.

From the house comparison, the predominate roof form on the blockface is a Hip roof. The proposal for a Hip roof for the new construction is fine. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Floor Elevations

While the Applicant has provided floor elevations for 983 and 961 Dimmock, the Applicant has not provided information on other structures. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the comparable houses for comparison.

The Applicant proposed FFE is 24 above grade which is consistent within the range of 12 being the lowest and 24 being the highest.

Siding

The Applicant proposes a 6- inch reveal cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is a permissible material in the District. However, siding is also governed by the compatibility standing and the Applicant has not provided any compatibility information on siding. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility on the blockface for the siding.

The cementitious siding is fine for the new construction and the predominate siding on the blockface. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

The proposed windows are three over one double hung wood windows with wood trim. While the three over one double hung wood windows does not appear to be problematic to Staff, the Applicant only provided two comparisons on the blockface or provide photos to allow Staff to determine the appropriate style of window that need to be installed. District regulations requires windows style to be determined by the compatibility standard as well if muntins or mullions are used, such muntins or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass. Staff recommends Applicant provided the window information for all the comparable houses on the blockface.

As thought, the double hung wood windows with wood trim is not a problem for the windows proposal. Staff still recommends the Applicant abide by the District regulations centering on the muntins and mullions.

Fenestration Pattern

While the fenestration pattern presented by the Applicant is not problematic to Staff abiding by the District regulations, all the windows are vertical in orientation.

The proposed windows are vertical in orientation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a full porch, front facing wood steps, brick columns with cap ends on the actual 12 inches sq. columns and wood railings. The District regulation states that “the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.” The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for porches. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed porch. Staff also recommends the railings be a two-

part top to bottom construction. The height should be no higher than the front windowsill and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension

The Applicant has proposed continued cementitious 6-inch reveal siding in the roof with exposed rafters. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The comparable houses the Applicant provided, all show a full porch. Staff is not concerned with the proposal for the full porch. Staff recommends still stands regarding the railing construction.

Staff also recommends the Applicant design the columns that are reflective of the columns that on the blockface which are simpler in design.

Doors

On the front door, the Applicant proposes a solid wood panel door with glass lights and a transom light. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

Staff comments still stands.

Foundation

The Applicant has proposed a brick foundation for the front of the house and a stucco foundation for the remainder of the house. The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for the foundation comparison, which is a requirement of the District regulations regarding prevailing foundation material on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the foundation.

From the comparable provided, the predominate foundation material is CMU. While the predominate foundation material is CMU. Staff recommends the Applicant use brick for the foundation to match the brick on the front steps.

Sidewalk

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

Internet research shows a concrete slab where a side walk should be. Staff recommends concrete slab be removed and the Applicant abide by the District regulation in construction of the sidewalk.

Walkway

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant has shown on the site plan a proposed sidewalk, but Staff deems this was probably labelled in error. Staff recommends, the Applicant label he walkway correctly on the site plan.

Staff comments stands.

Driveway

On the Applicant's site plan, what appears to be the driveway is also mislabeled as a sidewalk. Staff recommends, the driveway be labelled correctly. Also, the driveway falls short of an extension. Staff recommends the Applicant abided by the District regulation that centered on driveway construction which reads, "if constructed, independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare." Staff also recommends the Applicant consider the use of the alleyway for driveway access.

On the site plan, the Applicant has demonstrated a planting strip. While there are no comparable to compare, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Staff commend still stand for construction of the driveway. Staff also would like to suggest to the Applicant the use of the alleyway as mode get to the back of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

1. The Applicant shall comply with the District regulations on mutins and mullions if they shall apply to the window installation, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(o);
2. The rails shall be a two-part top to bottom construction with the top rail being no higher than the top of sill of the front window; any need extension for the safety code can be achieved through a simple plain extension, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
3. The Applicant shall design columns that are reflective of the columns on the blockface which are simpler in design, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
4. The foundation shall be brick to match the brick steps, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(10);
5. The Applicant shall abide by the regulations set forth in District regulations for the construction of the sidewalk as well as remove the concrete slab that is there, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c);
6. The Applicant shall label the walkway correctly on the site plans, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d);
7. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulations for driveway construction per Sec.16-20M.001(7) and
8. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 884 Oakhill Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-085
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

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

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

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 & 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: In 2018, Staff the City received notice of interior work being completed without a permit. That work was permitted under an Express Permit which allowed interior work to the structure only. The scope of this approval was violated when exterior alterations including window replacement, door replacement, chimney modifications, and porch alterations were completed. The current proposal is for the review of this unpermitted work.

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.

As the project includes work which was completed without proper permitting or a review by the Commission, Staff recommends that photographs of all 4 sides of the property be submitted so that Staff can confirm the extent of the illegal work which requires a review by the Commission.

Windows

From the publicly accessible street view photographs, Staff finds that the original wood windows were removed and replaced. Given the length of time since the windows were removed, Staff finds it is unlikely that the windows are still on site. As such, Staff recommends the illegally installed windows be removed and replaced with new unclad wood windows matching the style, shape, and size of the original windows.

Porch

The front porch railing, floor, and columns were removed and replaced with new features. Staff finds that the replacement columns match the style and dimensions of the original. With regards to the porch flooring, Staff finds that the replacement material does not conform to the style of the original flooring. As such, Staff recommends the illegally installed porch flooring be removed and replaced with a wood 1x4 tongue and groove flooring material installed perpendicular to the front façade. With regards to the porch railing, Staff finds that the illegally installed side nailed deck railing that is currently on the structure is incompatible with both historic porch railing design and size. As such, Staff recommends that the illegally installed front porch railing be removed and replaced with a porch railing comprised of a two part butt-jointed rail with the top rail set no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows. In looking at the publicly available street view photographs, Staff finds that the front porch does not appear to exceed 3' above grade meaning that a code compliant railing will likely not be required. However, if additional height for the porch railing is required by the Office of Buildings, Staff recommends that the additional height be achieved through a simple plane extension only after the need for additional height has been documented to Staff.

Chimney

From the publicly accessible photographs, Staff has determined that siding was installed over the existing brick chimney. Staff recommends the illegally installed chimney siding be removed.

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

1. Photographs of all 4 sides of the property shall be submitted so that Staff can confirm the extent of the illegal work which requires a review by the Commission;
2. The illegally installed windows shall be removed and replaced with new unclad wood windows matching the style, shape, and size of the original windows, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b);
3. The illegally installed front porch railing be removed and replaced with a porch railing comprised of a two part butt-jointed rail with the top rail set no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(k);
4. If additional height for the porch railing is required by the Office of Buildings, the additional height shall be achieved through a simple plane extension only after the need for additional height has been documented to Staff;

CA2-20-085 for 884 Oakhill Ave.

August 5, 2020

Page 3 of 3

5. The illegally installed chimney siding be removed, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(e);

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: 778 Lynwood Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-164
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-4B

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: Double frontage lot along the north block face of Lynwood St, and the south block face of Ormewood Ave, east of United Ave., west of the Atlanta Beltline.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Subdivision.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: RC-19-507 to comment on the rezoning of the property from R-5 to R-4B

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

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 Applicant is proposing the subdivision of the existing lot into two lots. A rezoning was completed in 2019 to change the zoning to one which would allow for the proposed lot configuration. Unfortunately, Staff was not able to locate a record of this property on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. However, Staff does find that double frontage lots have been subdivided to provide two lots for construction both in the time period of significance for the District and in recent years. In looking at the materials provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that new structures could be built on the resulting lots that meet the District regulations. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed subdivision.

Staff would note that the lack of comparable properties on the resulting Lynwood Ave. frontage would create an issue for measuring the front yard setback of any new construction on that lot. In these instances Staff finds that the Applicant could move to an adjacent block face, Ormewood Ave. for this case, without the need for a variance to use an alternate block face for comparisons. Staff would also note for the benefit of the Applicant, that the new construction of structures on the resulting lots would require the submission of a Type III Certificate for each new principal structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1054 White Oak
APPLICATION: CA3-20-166
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Peoples and East Lee Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20 M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

Compatibility Standard

The Compatibility Standard will apply to this proposal which read: “The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Oakland City Historic District is to ensure that all work requiring a certificate of appropriateness is compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face. To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows: Where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

Addition

The Applicant has proposed an additional 340 square feet to be added to the existing principal structure. This addition will not exceed any setbacks. Staff is not concern with the addition proposal.

Roof

The existing roof is a hip configuration, from the plans submitted it appears the proposed roof addition will not exceed the height of the existing roof and consistent with the slope of the existing roof. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Siding

Photos provided by the Applicant show the siding on the existing house to be wood and in good shape. The Applicant has indicated the siding will remain as is. have indicated the siding will remain as is. Staff therefore recommends the new siding on the addition shall match the existing wood siding with material and reveal.

Foundation

The photos the Applicant provided show the foundation to be brick at the front of the house and siding has been placed over the foundation at the rear of the house. After careful examination of the photos, a section shows CMU at the very rear. The siding on the foundation is not permitted. The Applicant has proposed stucco over the midpoint of the foundation where there is brick. And has proposed to retain the CMU at the very rear with new CMU for the addition. Foundations are subject to the compatibility standard. Staff has no objection to retain the existing CMU and adding in the new CMU to the addition. However, Staff finds the proposed stucco over the existing brick problematic. Foundation are subjected to the Compatibility Standard and the Applicant has not provided any photos of any houses that would support stucco on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant repair and replace in-kind the existing brick at the mid-point to remain consistent with the brick at the front of the house.

Windows

The photos provided by the Applicant show vinyl windows which are not original to the house. The Applicant proposes to install wood that conform to the windows on the blockface and to retain the shape and size of the window opens. Staff is not only concerned with this proposal staff applauds the Applicant for returning the windows back to wood which would have been the material windows on the house.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to install a wood deck at the back of the existing structure which will not be wider than the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes the following alterations on the house: new porch railings, window replacements on the entire house, siding repair, exterior doors replacements, driveway repair and walkway repair.

Porch Elements

Railings

The Applicant proposes to install railings to meet building code for height but maintaining the columns. From the photos the Applicant provides, the railings look to be in very good shape as well as the columns. While meeting code is paramount and from the photo, protection from a fall will be needed. Staff suggest the Applicant only add the plain extension to meet code instead of the replacing the entire rail. Otherwise, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Steps

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace the porch steps in-kind. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Other Alterations

Windows

As stated above, Staff is not concerned with the windows replacement.

Siding

As stated above, Staff is not concern with the siding proposal.

Foundation

As stated above, Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Site Work

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a new driveway. The site plan notes that the existing driveway is brick. With no real clear photo to determine of the driveway condition and driveway material is subjected to the compatibility standard, the Applicant can either use brick or concrete as the material. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Walkway

The Applicant proposes to repair the existing walkway. The existing walkway is brick. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Fence

The Applicant proposes a 6-foot wood privacy fence that will be installed in the rear of the house and will not extend to the front. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall match the siding on existing house wood siding and reveal, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. The Applicant shall replace in-king the brick at the mid-point of the foundation with brick, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(10);
3. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1054 White Oak
APPLICATION: CA3-20-166
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West of Peoples and East Lee Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20 M

Deferred Application (Y/N): No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

Compatibility Standard

The Compatibility Standard will apply to this proposal which read: “The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Oakland City Historic District is to ensure that all work requiring a certificate of appropriateness is compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face. To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows: Where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

Addition

The Applicant has proposed an additional 340 square feet to be added to the existing principal structure. This addition will not exceed any setbacks. Staff is not concern with the addition proposal.

Roof

The existing roof is a hip configuration, from the plans submitted it appears the proposed roof addition will not exceed the height of the existing roof and consistent with the slope of the existing roof. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Siding

Photos provided by the Applicant show the siding on the existing house to be wood and in good shape. The Applicant has indicated the siding will remain as is. have indicated the siding will remain as is. Staff therefore recommends the new siding on the addition shall match the existing wood siding with material and reveal.

Foundation

The photos the Applicant provided show the foundation to be brick at the front of the house and siding has been placed over the foundation at the rear of the house. After careful examination of the photos, a section shows CMU at the very rear. The siding on the foundation is not permitted. The Applicant has proposed stucco over the midpoint of the foundation where there is brick. And has proposed to retain the CMU at the very rear with new CMU for the addition. Foundations are subject to the compatibility standard. Staff has no objection to retain the existing CMU and adding in the new CMU to the addition. However, Staff finds the proposed stucco over the existing brick problematic. Foundation are subjected to the Compatibility Standard and the Applicant has not provided any photos of any houses that would support stucco on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant repair and replace in-kind the existing brick at the mid-point to remain consistent with the brick at the front of the house.

Windows

The photos provided by the Applicant show vinyl windows which are not original to the house. The Applicant proposes to install wood that conform to the windows on the blockface and to retain the shape and size of the window opens. Staff is not only concerned with this proposal staff applauds the Applicant for returning the windows back to wood which would have been the material windows on the house.

Deck

The Applicant proposes to install a wood deck at the back of the existing structure which will not be wider than the main structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes the following alterations on the house: new porch railings, window replacements on the entire house, siding repair, exterior doors replacements, driveway repair and walkway repair.

Porch Elements

Railings

The Applicant proposes to install railings to meet building code for height but maintaining the columns. From the photos the Applicant provides, the railings look to be in very good shape as well as the columns. While meeting code is paramount and from the photo, protection from a fall will be needed. Staff suggest the Applicant only add the plain extension to meet code instead of the replacing the entire rail. Otherwise, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Steps

The Applicant proposes to repair and replace the porch steps in-kind. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Other Alterations

Windows

As stated above, Staff is not concerned with the windows replacement.

Siding

As stated above, Staff is not concern with the siding proposal.

Foundation

As stated above, Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Site Work

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a new driveway. The site plan notes that the existing driveway is brick. With no real clear photo to determine of the driveway condition and driveway material is subjected to the compatibility standard, the Applicant can either use brick or concrete as the material. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Walkway

The Applicant proposes to repair the existing walkway. The existing walkway is brick. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Fence

The Applicant proposes a 6-foot wood privacy fence that will be installed in the rear of the house and will not extend to the front. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Chimney

The brick chimney is missing off the plans. The chimney is a significant feature to the house and must be retain. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the brick chimney in its original place and add it to the plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall match the siding on existing house wood siding and reveal, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q);
2. The Applicant shall replace in-king the brick at the mid-point of the foundation with brick, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(10);
3. The Applicant must retain the brick chimney in its original place and add it in its original orientation on the plans, Sec.16-20M.017(1)(b) and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 262 Iswald
APPLICATION: CA3-20-171
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Cabbagetown Landmark District (Subarea 2) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Memorial Drive and West of Gaskill Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and Alteration

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20A.

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

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The compatibility standard states: "The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, 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 and width as measured at front façade, floor height, 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 in that block face."

For the purposes of the compatibility rule, height and width shall be measured at the front façade.

In any instance where one contributing building of the same architectural style and like use on a block face is higher or wider by more than ten percent than any other contributing building of like use on a block face, such structure shall be eliminated in the application of the compatibility rule.

Those elements to which the rule applies are noted in the regulations by a reference to the "compatibility rule."

DOCUMENTATION

The Applicant has mistakenly labelled floor plans as a site plan. Therefore, a site plan is needed to determine if the addition meets the lot requirements. The Applicant has supplied a site plan.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes an addition to the existing principle structure. The scale and massing of the proposed addition is in scale with the existing house. Staff is not concerned with the addition massing.

Roof

From the provided elevations, the addition does not higher than the existing roofline an tug under the existing house's roofline. The Applicant also proposes to install asphalt shingles that will match the shingles on the existing house. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Siding

The Applicant proposes to install wood 4.25 reveal siding that will match the existing siding on the house. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Windows and trim

The Applicant proposes to install double hang one over one windows with matching trim and drip cap. This proposal will mimic the existing windows on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Corner boards

The Applicant proposes new corners boards on the addition that will match the corner boards on the existing house. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

Deck

A wood deck is proposed on the rear of the addition and from the site plan is not visible from the street. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATION

The Applicant propose to lower the attic window to accommodate the build-back eave. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The Applicant plans to use the same window and will not alter the window size therefore the lowering of the window will not take way from the significance of the house.

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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 695 Lexington Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-174
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: North block face of Lexington Ave., west of the Metropolitan Pkwy intersection.

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

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

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

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

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

In reviewing the submitted documentation, Staff found that sufficient compatibility comparisons were not submitted. As such, a full review of the proposal is not possible at this time. Staff's report will serve as a list of the comparison deficiencies as opposed to an assessment of the appropriateness of the application.

Site plan

The Applicant proposes a 20' front yard setback, and has submitted a partial measurement of the front yard setbacks along Lexington Ave. The District regulations require compatibility measurements to be made using all structures fronting Lexington Ave. As such, Staff finds that the comparison analysis is insufficient to review the front yard setback of the property. Staff recommends the Applicant submit complete compatibility comparisons showing the allowable front yard setback.

The Applicant proposes a driveway which terminates 15.5' past the point where it intersects with the front façade. The District regulations require the driveway to extend 20' past the front façade. As such, Staff recommends the site plan be revised to allow the driveway to extend 20' past the front façade.

Staff finds that the required walkway leading from the sidewalk to the front door has not been provided. Instead, a walkway leads from the front porch to the driveway. Staff recommends the site plan be revised to show a walkway leading from the front door to the sidewalk.

Compatibility comparisons

The visible portions of new construction in the District are governed by the Compatibility rule. The measurements required for a complete compatibility comparison are as follows: Front yard setback, building height, building materials, fenestration pattern, fenestration scale, size, and proportion, roof shape and pitch. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a complete compatibility comparison using the methods prescribed by the zoning Ordinance.

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

1. The Applicant shall submit complete compatibility comparisons showing the allowable front yard setback, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(1);
The site plan shall be revised to allow the driveway to extend 20' past the front façade, per Sec. 16-20I.006(6)(a);
2. The site plan shall be revised to show a walkway leading from the front door to the sidewalk, per Sec. 16-20I.006(5)(b);
3. The Applicant shall provide a complete compatibility comparison using the methods prescribed by the zoning Ordinance; and,
4. The Applicant shall submit all updated materials no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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: August 5, 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)?: Yes, deferred July 29, 2020. *Updated text in italics*

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.

The Applicant has submitted a response that the house is unsafe, a fire hazard, and that the engineer's previous report has shown there are signs that the structure is compromised. The letter also cites evidence that the house shows signs of entry and occupation by vagrants and cites matches and drug paraphernalia at the site. Staff finds that this information does not fulfil the requirement to show that the structure is an imminent threat to public health and safety as determined by an independent assessment. Staff retains this recommendation. Staff would note that they define a major and imminent threat to public health and safety as a structure that is in danger of a collapse that would harm someone who is standing on the public right of way. Staff would also note that the expected information to satisfy this requirement would be a letter from an engineer or architect where they state that a threat to public health and safety exists and where the cost of repair vs. demolition is not a consideration of their opinion. Staff would also expect this letter to be stamped by the professional issuing the letter.

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.

The Applicant has provided information showing that the demolition of the structure would cost between \$12,000.00 to \$15,000.00. The cost to build a new structure would cost approximately

\$448,700.00. Staff would note that per the information previously provided by the Applicant, the cost to remedy any threat to public health and safety through a renovation of the existing structure would cost between \$356,334.00 and \$373,393.30.

- 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.

The Applicant has submitted information showing the fair market value of the property as determined by the Fulton County Tax Assessor as \$67,000.00 and that the estimated market value of the property after demolition and new construction would be approximately \$600,000.00. No information showing the estimated value of the existing structure after rehabilitation for continued use has been submitted as is required by this criterion. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide the estimated market value of the existing property after renovation for continued use. Staff would note that this information may need to come from a real estate professional who has experience with historic homes.

- 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.

The Applicant has submitted photographs of both 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.

While the Applicant has provided information to satisfy some of the omitted criterion from the last meeting, Staff finds that the two remaining criterion speak to an essential goal of the Threat to Public Health and Safety argument; namely that demolition is the only feasible method to address the potential harm that a structure would pose to someone standing on the public right of way. Staff finds that without this information, an appropriate determination by Staff on the proposed demolition could not be made.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide responses to criteria 1.
2. *The Applicant shall provide the estimated market value of the existing property after renovation for continued use.*

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: 293 Ormond St.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-20-177
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location: South block face of Ormond St., east of the Hill St. intersection, and west of the Grant St. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: revision to previously approved plans for a second story addition to the rear of the structure.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Façades that do not face the public street.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously reviewed and approved CA3-17-203 & 206 for a variance and rear addition and CA2-18-088 for revisions to previously approved plans. In July of 2019 Staff received notification from neighbors that the structure was being demolished without proper permits and a Stop Work order was issued by the Office of Buildings. The property was then sold to a new owner who is presenting the current application to remedy the demo without permits and apply for the review of a new single family home.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA4PH-20-177:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-178:

CA4PH-20-177

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 states that the property's condition has been reported to them by neighbors. The Applicant also cites the demolished nature of the property and the Stop Work Order for the illegal demolition done by a previous owner. Given that the demolition has already occurred without approval by the Commission, Staff finds that further analysis is moot as the majority of the structure is no longer on site.

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

The Applicant has stated their desire to clean the property and salvage all useable building materials for re-use on a new structure at the site.

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 Applicant has stated they are aware of the historic designation and the current zoning on the property. They have stated that the zoning pre-dates their ownership of the property.

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 states the property was purchased on 12/27/2019 for \$250,000.00 from CDO Enterprises LLC, with whom the Applicant has no relationship.

(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 has stated that this criterion is not applicable to the subject property. Given the structure's demolished state, Staff agrees with this assessment.

(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 the current mortgage is \$202,200.00 with an annual debt service of \$18,703.44.

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.

2019	Atlanta \$3,555.35
	County \$1,161.67
2018	Atlanta \$3,472.36
	County \$1,169.41
2017	Atlanta \$2,695.96
	County \$880.16
2016	Atlanta \$3,300.43
	County \$1,083.27
2015	Atlanta \$3,301.43
	County \$1,093.39

2019 Assessment: \$114,800.00

2018 Assessment: \$112,120.00

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 provided an appraisal of the property at \$250,000.00 in as is condition .

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 stated that the property at the time of acquisition and at the time of application is \$250,000.00. Based on the length of time the property has been designated, Staff finds that the criterion asking for fair market value at the time of acquisition is not applicable to the 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 through an LLC.

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. Given the short length of time that the Applicant has owned the property, Staff finds that this criterion is not applicable to the present situation

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 the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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 has attached an engineer's letter which confirms the level of demolition and the foundation's ability to support a new 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.

The Applicant has provided an estimate of demolition and new construction at approximately \$225,000.00. Staff would note that rehabilitation of the existing structure is not applicable to this situation due to the level of demolition.

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 cites the current value at \$250,000.00 based on the estimates provided for purchase and estimates the cost of new construction at \$745,000.00. Staff would note again the non-applicability of renovations due to the level of demolition.

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 speaks to the condition of the foundation, the only structural element remaining of the historic structure, for re-use.

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 stated the R-5 zoning and historic district zoning would allow for up to a two family structure at this property. As stated before, Staff finds that the level of demolition on the site render rehabilitation moot.

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

The Applicant has responded that economic incentives are not applicable to this situation. While the determination of eligibility for economic incentives are interpreted by the State Historic Preservation Office, the level of demolition could prevent the structure from qualifying for economic incentives.

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

The Applicant has provided photographs of the 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 testimony provided, Staff finds that the existing building has been demolished. 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. As the structure was not subjected to the proper review, it is unclear whether there were structural issues with the historic structure which would have necessitated the demolition of the structure over a less intrusive means of addressing the problems. However, given that the work has already rendered the structure to be unsound, Staff finds that reviewing alternatives to the work which has already been completed would be unproductive. Based on the photographs and testimonies provided, Staff finds that the property constitutes an imminent threat to public health and safety.

Given that the appropriate review was not completed on the structure, Staff recommends the Applicant submit an inventory of all historic building materials still on site. Staff further recommends all historic building materials which Staff has determined are feasible for re-use be used on the new structure in their original locations. Lastly, Staff recommends that any new structure match the design of the original with any new space being provided through rear “additions” and dormers on the side roof planes.

CA3-20-178

Given Staff’s recommendations regarding the demolition, the design of the new construction will require several revisions. As such, Staff finds a deferral of the application is appropriate to allow a re-design of the structure to meet the recommended conditions for demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA4PH-20-177: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit an inventory of all historic building materials still on site;
2. All historic building materials which Staff has determined are feasible for re-use shall be used on the new structure in their original locations;

3. Any new structure shall match the design of the original with any new space being provided through rear “additions” and dormers on the side roof planes; and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-178: Deferral

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 778 Lynwood St.

APPLICATION: RC-19-507

MEETING DATE: October 9, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: Double frontage lot along the north block face of Lynwood St, and the south block face of Ormewood Ave, east of United Ave., west of the Atlanta Beltline.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Subdivision.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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

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

The Application before the Commission for comment is a request to rezone the property from the existing R-5 zoning to the R-4B zoning category. The proposed zoning change would allow for a subdivision of the existing double frontage lot, to create one lot along Woodward Ave. and one lot along Narrow St. The Commission is tasked with providing comments and recommendations to the Zoning Review Board on the proposed change and its impacts on the Historic District as well as the Commission's ability to enforce the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations.

In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that the resulting change would not impact the District other than allowing for a subdivision and new principal structure on the resulting vacant lot. Staff would note that in addition to the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, the subdivision of the lot is required to conform to the historic platting pattern of the District, and would require a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness in order to be approved. Additionally, any new structure on the resulting lots would be required to conform to the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations for setbacks, height, and design and would require additional and separate Type III Certificate of Appropriateness in order to be approved. In looking at the site plan provided, Staff finds that the Applicant has used the underlying zoning to determine the setbacks. Regardless of the underlying zoning, the Grant Park Historic District zoning regulations determine the front, side, and rear yard setbacks. Staff suggests the Applicant review these regulations before finalizing the site plan and designing the proposed structures.

Staff would recommend to the Zoning Review Board that no conditions on the proposed rezoning be added that would impair the Commission's ability to enforce the subdivision, setback, height, and design requirements of Chapter 20K of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff further recommends the Zoning Review Board not condition the rezoning on a site plan as that would impair the Commission's ability to enforce the Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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: 38 Camden Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-20-169
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: North block face of Camden Rd., east of Montclair Dr. and west of Wakefield Dr.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, additions, and Variance

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: RC-20-068 for a more extensive version of the current project.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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 project before the Commission at this time is for revisions to the previously approved design at this property. The revisions proposed would reduce the scope of the visible changes from the public right of way, leaving only the roofline changes and the front porch addition. As in the previous version of the project, Staff has no concerns with the proposed roofline changes as the existing roof forms are not entirely original to the structure. Additionally as noted in the previous Staff Report for this project, Staff finds that the proposed porch addition would alter what is left of the original spatial relationships on the front façade of the structure. Staff would suggest the Applicant consider a more historically accurate front stoop configuration. With regard to the cross-member railing on the second level of the porch, Staff suggests that the Applicant consider using a historically accurate rail constructed with a two part top rail and vertical butt-jointed pickets that would be more sensitive to the original architecture of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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: 3090 McMurray
APPLICATION: RC-20-173
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: East of Childress Drive and West of Lovell

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Playground

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.

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

RC-20-173 for 3090 McMurray
August 5, 2020

Proposed site improvements are slanted for Kimberley Elementary School at 3090 McMurray. The propose work consist of a playground with a prefabricated shade structure, slab steps affixed to the ground and concrete sidewalks to allow for more ADA access to the playground area and pavilion.

Staff has no concern of constructing a functional playground for the elementary school. The shade protection is much need. Staff wonders for the concrete sidewalks and slab steps if a softer material can be installed to protect the kids when they fall. A material that will allow for easy mobility for wheelchairs. Additionally, the Applicant has not mention what kind of ground material will be placed in the playground area. Staff suggest the Applicant should install a material that too can allow for a soft landing in case a kid should fall.

Overall the Staff has no concerns and support 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: 2025 Jonesboro --Dobbs
APPLICATION: RC-20-175
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: West of Merrillyn Drive and East of Harper Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Playground

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.

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

RC-20-175 for 2025 Jonesboro
August 5, 2020

Proposed site improvements are slanted for Dobbs Elementary at 2025 Jonesboro. The propose work consist of a playground with a prefabricated shade structure, slab steps affixed to the ground and concrete sidewalks to allow for more ADA access to the playground area and pavilion.

Staff has no concern of constructing a functional playground for the elementary school. The shade protection is much need and should be extended to the reading area. Staff wonders for the concrete sidewalks and slab steps if a softer material can be installed to protect the kids when they will fall. A material that will allow for easy mobility for wheelchairs. Additionally, the Applicant has not mention what kind of ground material will be placed in the playground area. Staff suggest the Applicant should install a material that too can allow for a soft landing incase a kid should fall. Staff also would recommend shade coverage in the reading area and the boulders are not too high for the kids.

Overall the Staff has no concerns for and support 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: 2025 Jonesboro --Dobbs
APPLICATION: RC-20-175
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: West of Merrillyn Drive and East of Harper Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Playground

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.

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

RC-20-175 for 2025 Jonesboro
August 5, 2020

Proposed site improvements are slanted for Dobbs Elementary at 2025 Jonesboro. The propose work consist of a playground with a prefabricated shade structure, slab steps affixed to the ground and concrete sidewalks to allow for more ADA access to the playground area and pavilion.

Staff has no concern of constructing a functional playground for the elementary school. The shade protection is much need and should be extended to the reading area. Staff wonders for the concrete sidewalks and slab steps if a softer material can be installed to protect the kids when they will fall. A material that will allow for easy mobility for wheelchairs. Additionally, the Applicant has not mention what kind of ground material will be placed in the playground area. Staff suggest the Applicant should install a material that too can allow for a soft landing incase a kid should fall.

Overall the Staff has no concerns for and support 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: 1 Margaret Mitchell (Central Library)
APPLICATION: RC-20-180
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** N/A—SPI-1/SA7

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Downtown Entertainment Sector

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Media Tower/ Signage-Monument

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Signage

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-20-180 for 1Margaret Mitchell –Central Library
August 5, 2020

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

The Applicant proposes to erect a media and control tower on the plaza of 1Margaret Mitchell Street—the Central Library. The new media tower and control room will be located within the Northeastern property line (Carnegie Way NW) and Southeastern property line (Forsyth St NW) at the Plaza and basement levels of the Southeastern plaza area.

The media tower is a monument with regards to the Signage Ordinance in the City of Atlanta. Monuments are permitted in SPI-1 areas if they meet the requirements set in the regulations. Staff has no concerns regarding the media tower and suggest the Applicant consult the Signage ordinance to ensure they are abiding by them fully.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File