



# CITY OF ATLANTA

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 312 Auburn Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-223  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Martin Luther King's Landmark District (subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

**Date of Construction** 1930

**Property Location:** West of Hilliard Street and East of Fort

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Store front, Signage and Whitewash

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The work has already been completed.

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

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

**COMPATIBILITY RULE**

The Compatibility rule shall govern the proposed work set forth by the applicant. The District Regulation states, the compatibility rule shall apply to a principal structure's general façade organization, proportion, scale, roof form, pitch and materials, door and window placement, and other architectural details including but not limited to brackets, decorative trim, corner boards, bottom boards, fascia boards, columns, steps and attic vents. 312 Auburn is in Subarea 4. The Compatibility rule will apply for the block.

## **ALTERATIONS**

The following alterations are stated for this property: new storefront with new signage and lighting; construction of stairs in the rear of the property; whitewash the exterior masonry.

### ***Storefront***

It appears from research the request to change the storefront from a concaved entrance which acted as a covering with three storefront windows with metal framing and divides had been changed as of 2020. There is now a standard opening with windows that are vertical and metal with a transom divide above. Windows and doors constructions in subarea 1 through 4 are governed by the compatibility standard. From further research the described windows do not depart from what is visible on the block, vertical but not all the same size. Many have the transom above the main window. The window changes are not problematic for Staff. The changing from the concaved opening to a standard upfront storefront is different but not so problematic. The concaved opening possibly can be unique to this commercial building, however, to have it line up with the other storefronts could also be accurate in the historic interpretation.

Staff does recommend that the windows not to go fully to existing sidewalks but instead the Applicant shall mimic the treatment of the full windows like many on the block to where the window fall short of touching the sidewalk. As well the transom shall not be translucent to where it shows original top framing of the original door. Staff recommends the Applicant to not a translucent appearance at the top of the transom to where it can be seen.

The doors will remain the same with glass replacement. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Signage and Lighting**

On the front the Applicant proposes to add signage that will be placed under the second first story window, sits between the storefront windows and first story window above the transom. Staff is not concerned about this signage. It meets the City sign ordinance for subarea 4. Staff wonders how the Applicant intends to attach the signage. Staff recommends the Applicant attach the signage in a manner that will not detrimental to existing brick. And if removed, will not leave permanent damage to the masonry.

The lighting the Applicant proposes is situated above the signage attached by a light bar. Staff recommends the light installation abide by the District Regulation by minimizing light spillage, cutoff luminaries that have a maximum 90-degree illumination to be located at a minimum height of eight feet above the sidewalk.

### ***Stairs on Rear Exterior***

The photos the Applicant provides of the exterior rear stairs, show stairs that are dilapidated. The Applicant proposes to replace the stairs. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

***Whitewash the Masonry***

The Applicant proposes to whitewash the masonry on the building. District Regulations prohibit painting of unpainted masonry. However, the masonry on this building has been painted prior. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.**

1. The full windows shall not extend to the sidewalk but should mimic the full windows that are reflective on block per, Sec.16-20C.001(2);
2. The Applicant shall install the transom over the window and doors so that the original framing is not exposed, per Sec.16-29C.001(2);
3. The Applicant shall attach the signage in a manner that is less intrusive to the masonry, per Sec.16-28A.027(4);
4. The light spillage shall have a cutoff luminaire that have a maximum 90-degree illumination to be located a minimum 8 feet above the sidewalk, per, Sec.16-20C.004(1)(i) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 134 & 148 Peachtree St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-227 & RC-20-228  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Rhodes-Haverty Building, LBS **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (subarea 7) / A&E District

**Date of Construction:** 1929 with alterations in 1967.

**Property Location:** Southwest intersection of Williams St. and Fairlie St.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** 19<sup>th</sup> century commercial / Skyscraper.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New signage.

**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:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-227:** Approval with conditions.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-228:** Confirm the delivery of comments.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-28A of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

**CA2-20-227 – Rhodes-Haverty Building Landmark Building/Site**

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a new static sign to the northeast façade of the landmark building. This signage is permitted under the new Arts and Entertainment sign overlay district, under which several signs have already been installed on buildings in the area. Staff would note however, that this is the first such sign to be proposed under this overlay on a designated landmark or historic building. The Sign Ordinance gives the Commission authority to review signs proposed on locally designated historic resources in the Arts and Entertainment overlay district under Sec. 16-28A(010)(55)(g). These regulations refer to the general requirements for signage on historic or landmark structures. Staff's commentary will take these requirements into account.

The sign is proposed to be installed in a "void" created by gaps in the fenestration. This area of the building originally had much less visibility due to the existence of several historic structures which are now demolished. The Applicant has provided information detailing the existence of signage on some of these demolished structures in approximately the same area as the current proposal. Given that the area of the building where the sign would be located was not largely visible when originally built and given that there is evidence of signage associated with this location on now demolished properties, Staff finds that the signage is appropriate size, scale, and design of the structure. Staff is likewise not concerned that the signage would obscure significant architectural features on the property.

The materials of the proposed sign would be a permanent metal frame over which a membrane containing the messaging would be stretched. Staff has no concerns with the use of metal in signage as this would fit with the time period of significance for the landmark structure.

As with all signage proposed for inclusion on historic resources, Staff finds that the installation method used in the project has the potential to damage historic materials. As such, Staff recommends the signage be anchored at the masonry joints and not anchored through the masonry face. Staff further recommends that the signage be designed so that it is easily removable in the future with minimal damage to historic materials.

**RC-20-228 – Margaret Mitchell Square**

The Applicant is proposing landscape alterations to the existing planter on site. The current proposal includes the removal of a tree, and installing new as yet undetermined evergreen plantings. In their narrative, the Applicant states that the tree has become overgrown and impedes the viewshed of the park. Their narrative also states that the project is intended to re-activate the square.

Staff suggests the Applicant discuss their landscape improvements and whether there are tree species which would allow for the retention of a tree on the site while also allowing for activation of the space. Staff also suggests the Applicant consider the use of trees that have a compatible growth habit with the viewshed desired for this project to avoid the loss of mature canopy on this site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-227:** Approval with the following conditions:

1. The signage shall be anchored at the masonry joints and not anchored through the masonry face, per Sec. 16-20.009;
2. The signage shall be designed so that it is easily removable in the future with minimal damage to historic materials, per Sec. 16-20.009; and,
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION RC-20-228:** Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

cc: Applicant

File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 210 Auburn Avenue  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-232  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Martin Luther King's Landmark District (subarea 5) **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 for signage

**Date of Construction** 1969

**Property Location:** West of Jesse Hill and East of Piedmont

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Cladding, Signage and Windows

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

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

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

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

## **ALTERATIONS**

The following alterations are stated for this property: Cladding for the exterior and new signage.

### ***Exterior Front***

The Applicant proposes to clad the upper concrete section of the entrance of the parking lot with aluminum panels. Along with this cladding, the Applicant proposes to paint the concrete and the brick on the front façade. Staff is concerned with the aluminum panels. The proposed material would not be compatible with the current material in the subarea. Staff recommends the Applicant does not install the aluminum but find another material that is seen on the block.

### ***Signage***

The Applicant proposes a 24' plus or minus wide sign that will sit above the entrance of the parking deck. The signage position is problematic to Staff. The ordinance states that no portion of the sign shall extend above the top of the building. The Applicant proposes to place the signage over the top of the entry of the parking deck. This placement would be a contradiction to the regulation. Staff recommends the Applicant install the sign to where it is not over the entrance to the parking deck but placed where the current sign is located.

### ***Lighted entry***

The Applicant also proposes a downward lighting that will mount under the entrance to the parking deck. It doesn't appear as if the light will have spillage into the public-right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### ***Glass***

On the left façade the Applicant proposes to install glass windows that will mimic the windows on the right elevation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.**

1. The aluminum panels shall not be installed. Instead a panel material shall be installed that is indicative of the block, per
2. The Applicant shall install the sign where the current sign is located and not place over the top of the parking deck entrance per, Chap.28A(12)(4)(c) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 190 Walker Street  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-245  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1997

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

**ALTERATIONS**

The Applicant proposes to replace ten steel framed windows on a commercial loft with steel units to match what is presented on the loft. The proposed replacement is due to deteriorating windows conditions on the windows over time. From the additional photos the Applicant supplied the current windows support these claims. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1091 St. Charles  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-244  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East of North Highland and West of Briarcliff

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Variance for Height and FAR on a Accessory Structure.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-200

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

### **VARIANCE**

The Applicant is proposing a variance on a height requirement of 16ft to 18 ft and a variance of 25% on the FAR of the principal structure to 33% of the principal structure.

The Applicant must address the four following criteria for a variance: exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular property; zoning ordinance creating a hardship; conditions peculiar to this property; if granted relief how the relief would not create a detriment to the public or defy the zoning ordinance.

#### ***Exception Conditions***

The Applicant states that exception conditions are tied to development of the build environment. The alley is approximately 2 feet above the grade on the back of the lot which causes any build up (added slab) to be taller thus 2 feet, which they must do to enter and exist the garage. Additionally, there's only 14' between the garage and the house. There wouldn't be room for both a parking pad and a garage.

#### ***Hardship***

The Applicant states that “Our existing house and proposed new construction is a relatively modest size in keeping with the Bungalow style. B) Alley is approx. 2' above the grade of the garage so we must raise the slab to access the garage from the alley. Not allowing the use of the alleyway will require street parking which is not a desire at all.

The size of the back area also would not allow placement of a parking pad in the back area for the second. Prohibiting the build of a two-car garage would relegate us to only have a one car garage. Most of houses have a two-car garage.

The bonus of alleyway access to the garage is it reduces lot coverage from the existing 53.5% to 48.1% because we can remove driveway concrete and have one less car on the street”

#### ***Peculiar Conditions***

The Applicant writes, “Due to the grade differences between the lot and the alleyway, we need to raise the slab to access the garage from the alley. Without raising the slab, we would be unable to build a rear-facing garage. B) A rear-facing garage with access from the alleyway enables us to reduce the lot coverage from the existing 53.5% to 48.1% because we can remove a significant amount of driveway concrete. C) The 2-car garage allows us to remove driveway concrete and maintain the same amount of off-street parking. Our proposal includes a reasonably sized in-law suite over the 2-car garage. D) Our existing house and proposed new construction are a relatively modest size in keeping with the Bungalow style. Increasing the house size to cover the reasonably sized accessory building would require a disproportionately sized bungalow.

#### ***Not Detriment to Public or Zoning Ordinance***

The Applicant states “Granting a variance would not block light or air to the adjoining properties nor would it create a fire or maintenance issue. The proposed project would add value to the property commensurate with the neighborhood.” As well as permit the Applicant the ability to use the alley to access the 2-car garage.

***Staff Assessment***

Staff deems the Applicant has made a compelling argument for allowing the variance. The City is always encouraging the use of the alleyway for access to a property. If the Applicant must add a 2 feet pad to allow the height to match, Staff does find that problematic. The added pad is need but will not be seen from the public-right-way or be imposing on the principle structure.

As with the two-car garage which will put the Applicant over the 25% FAR requirement by 8%, Staff agrees with the Applicant the Applicant should be able to have a two-car garage that will be in line with others houses in the neighborhood.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1160 St. Louis  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-246  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1988

**Property Location:** East of Briarcliff Road and West of North Highland

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

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-200

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

**Dormer Additions**

In the attic of the noncontributing principal structure the Applicant proposes to redesign unused space that will not affect the footprint of the existing structures. The Applicant proposes dormers to allow for added head space. The proposed dormers will tuck under the existing main roof and will not extend beyond. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**Siding and Windows**

*Sidings*

The Applicant proposes to match the siding with the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

*Windows*

The proposed windows on the left and right elevations will match the double hung six over six casement windows that are existing on the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 864 Rose Circle  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-226  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020 deferred from September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1935

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Double Deck Construction, Fence Construction, Ornamentation removal and Alteration.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **DECK**

With the removal of a single deck and an awning due to rotting wood and improper construction at the base, the Applicant proposes a double deck that will sit at the rear of the existing house. The upper deck will be screened and the lower deck will remain open. From the diagram presented by the Applicant this double deck will not exceed the rear or side yard setbacks, nor will the deck extend beyond the sides of the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **FENCE**

The Applicant proposes a 6ft wood privacy fence on the perimeter of property; allowing for a 1 foot space on the left side between the chain link fence belonging to the neighbor to the left. Staff is not concerned with the proposal of the actual fence construction. However, the Applicant has indicated a removal of the chain link fence that belongs to the neighbor. This is problematic to Staff. Staff cannot sanction the removal of the neighboring fence. If the Applicant wish to remove the chain link refenced, the Applicant must get permission from the neighbor. The Applicant has verified that there will be no remove of the neighbor's fence. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **SIDING/Ornamentation**

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing siding on the left and right sides of the house and replace the siding with wood shingles. Staff clarified that the shingles under the gables on the sides are asphalt shingles that can be removed. The Applicant proposal for replacement shingles to be wood shingles is fine once the Applicant can demonstrate through photographic evidence that the wood shingles mimics the shingles that were original to the house. If not, the Applicant shall install wood siding that would be permissible to the District Regulations.

## **GENERAL REPAIR**

The Applicant proposes to repoint and repair the mortar on the existing masonry. Photos provided indicates the mortar needs repair. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; such work is considered general repair.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall demonstrate through photographic evidence that the proposed wood shingles mimics the shingles that were original to the house Or the Applicant shall install wood siding that are permissible to the District Regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1111 Montreat Avenue

**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-065

**MEETING DATE:** October 14, 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.

## **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, 1119 Montreat, 1125 Montreat, 1127 Montreat, 1131 Montreat and 1135 Montreat.

### **Setbacks**

The Applicant proposes the house to have a front setback of 60 feet from street to front façade. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

### **Height and Pitch**

The Applicant has proposed 20 feet for the new construction. The Applicant has shown that the lowest height on the blockface is 15 feet and the highest is 23 feet. 20 feet is acceptable. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Roof form**

The predominate roof form on the blockface some form of gable construction, either a front facing porch gable or front facing stoop Gable. The Applicant proposes a front facing gable porch. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Siding**

The Applicant proposes a 6- inch reveal smooth cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is a permissible material in the District and the other compatible houses have various sidings applied. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Windows**

The proposed windows are three over one double hung wood windows with wood trim. This proposal is not problematic to Staff.

### **Porch**

The Applicant proposes a porch that will not extent fully over the front façade with side stair coming off he right side. From the comparable houses on the blockface, this porch or steps will not depart from those on the blockface. Staff is not concerned with the porch 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

### **Foundation**

The Applicant proposes CMU foundation that is reflective of the predominate foundation material on the blockface. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **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.

### **Walkway**

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant proposes a walkway compose of smooth concrete. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **Driveway**

On the Applicant’s site plan, the driveway appears to be wider that allowed. 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 RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**

1. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations that centers on driveway construction: maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare, per Sec.16-20M.012(4)(c) and
2. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

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

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1121 Merrill Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-070  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** North block face of Merrill Ave., east of Hall St, west of Lawton St.

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

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

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Rear deck.

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** Yes. Deferred August 28, 2020. *Updated text in italics.*

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** The subject property received a Stop Work Order in March of 2019 for work that was not properly permitted including the replacement of windows, siding, and the addition of a front porch. An online permit was submitted in January of 2019 but was not completed by the Office of Buildings as the work proposed exceeded the threshold allowed for online permitting.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral

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

#### Alterations

The Applicant proposes the removal and reconfiguration of the existing vinyl windows, the existing non-original front door, and the replacement of the existing vinyl siding. Staff is not concerned with the removal of the windows and siding as they are non-historic elements. However, Staff finds that the regulations require the retention of the original window openings. As such, Staff recommends the plans be changed to show the original window and door openings maintained at their original size, scale, and location on the front and side façades. Staff recommends all siding on the property be a horizontal lap siding product. Staff further recommends that if cement siding is used as a replacement siding material that it be smooth faced. Lastly, Staff recommends the replacement front door meet the District regulations.

*The Applicant has provided updated drawings which show the original configuration of the structure. However, the window and door locations are still shown as changing places on the proposed drawings. As such, Staff retains the recommendation relating to the window and door openings.*

*The revised drawings show horizontal lap siding as the structure's cladding material. As the siding material type is not specified, Staff retains the recommendation regarding smooth faced cement siding.*

*The Applicant proposes a ¾ lite door of unspecified material. The District regulations require the size and type of replacement doors to match the compatibility rule. Staff was able to locate one original door on the block face belonging to the structure at 1111 Merrill Ave. The door in question is a two-panel door with a ¼ rectangular lite opening. As such, Staff recommends the proposed door be a wood two panel door with a ¼ rectangular lite opening.*

#### Additions

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition that will not encroach on the side setbacks of the existing structure. Additionally, the addition will conform to the Oakland City Historic District rear yard setback requirements. From the plans, the addition will contain a foundation comprised of materials compatible with the foundation of the principal structure. Staff does recommend that the plans be changed to show the rear corner boards retained in-place and the existing eave lines carrying through on the side façades to allow for the proper interpretation of the structure.

*The updated plans show the rear corner boards retained in place and the eave and cornice lines of the roof being retained as part of the proposed addition. Staff finds these recommendations have been met.*

With regards to the proposed front porch, Staff finds that the proposed porch does not match the historic porches on the block face. Staff also has concerns with the porch being centered on the front façade as shown on the proposed drawings. In looking at the block face in question, Staff finds that the predominate patten is split between houses with the door located on the right side of the front façade and those containing centered front doors. The structures containing doors centered on the front façade typically contain a stoop with or without a gabled or shed covering. On the structures that contain covered stoops, the stoops are typically minimal and cover an area that consists of the

front door and a 4' by 4' landing. As such, Staff has no concerns with the inclusion of a stoop covering but finds that it should match the dimensions of the original stoops on the block face and should be centered over the location of the original front door opening. As such, Staff recommends the plans be changed to show a front stoop located over the original front door opening on the left side of the front façade. Staff further recommends that the proposed front stoop be reduced in size to match the dimensions of original porch stoops on the block face.

*The Applicant has provided updated plans which show a front stoop over the proposed centered front door. Staff finds that the recommendation regarding the stoop size has been met, but retains the recommendation regarding the door/stoop location.*

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

1. The plans shall be changed to show the original window and door openings maintained at their original size, scale, and location on the front and side façades, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
2. If cement siding is used as a replacement siding material that it shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
3. *The proposed door shall be a wood two panel door with a ¼ rectangular lite opening*, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
4. The plans shall be changed to show a front stoop located over the original front door opening on the left side of the front façade, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1070 Lucile Ave. SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-187 & CA3-20-258  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** South blockface of Lucile Ave, east of Lawton St., west of Peoples St.

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

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

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** CA3-20-187 deferred from the September 9, 2020 public hearing.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-258:** Approve.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-187:** Approve with conditions.

.

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

**Variance**

The Applicant is applying for a variance to use the Lawton side of the block (between Lucile Ave. and Oak St.) for compatibility of the new construction.

**Extraordinary and Exceptional Conditions**

The Applicant states that there are no structures of like use to base compatibility on. The only contributing structure on the Lucile Ave. blockface is a quadraplex.

**Unnecessary Hardship**

The Applicant states that compatibility based on the current blockface would create an unnecessary hardship as there is only one contributing structure on the current blockface and it is not of like use.

**Peculiar Conditions of the Property**

The Applicant states the current blockface only has two structures on it, one non-contributing of like-use and one contributing which is not of like use.

**Relief not causing Detriment**

The Applicant states that if relief is granted, the proposed new construction would be consistent with contributing structures on the Lawton blockface and West End as a whole.

**Part of a Special Use Permit**

This application does not form any part of the subject matter of a pending application or ordinance for a zoning change or Special Use Permit.

Staff finds that the Applicant request for a variance has met the five criteria to be granted. Due to the only contributing structure on the immediate blockface being multifamily, the compatibility study would only be based on this building. As the proposed new construction is a single-family home, basing compatibility on a multifamily structure would force the design to reflect a use that is not accurate to what the proposed construction would be. Additionally, the proposed blockface for compatibility is a part of the overall block that the property is located. Staff finds that by allowing the variance, the Applicant will be able to conform to the overall standards of the district and better reflect the style of single-family homes in West End.

**Staff finds the Variance request meets the five criteria listed above.**

**New Construction**

The Applicant is proposing a new construction of a single-family home at 1070 Lucile Ave. Due to the lack of contributing structures of like use on the immediate blockface, the Applicant has applied for a variance in order to use the Lawton side of the same block for compatibility (see above). The analysis of will be based on the latest plans received (8/18/2020 – MainFloor.1.2.3.pdf) and will base compatibility on the Lawton side of the block (numbers 508, 502, 496, 492, and 486).

### Setback

The proposed setback is greater than 30'. Based on the compatibility study, the minimum setback can be 12' (486 Lawton) and 22 ft' (496 Lawton). As such, Staff recommends that the building setback be no less than 12' and no greater than 22'. Staff would also note that as this property is at an angle compared to the neighboring house at 1076 Lucile Ave., a setback closer to the street would create the illusion that the two houses are closer in their setbacks than they actually are.

### Building Mass

The proposed mass of the building contains two indentations, one along the front façade, just left of the front door, and another on the left side of the proposed structure. As the contributing structures on the Lawton side of the block are geometrically simple in their massing, Staff recommends that mass of the building be simplified to have straight façades, with no indentations.

The proposed ground to first floor height is 3'-5/8". As Staff was unable to determine the existing ground to floor height for the contributing buildings on Lawton, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide this information in order to determine whether the proposed height is compatible. In the event that it is not, Staff recommends that the ground to floor height be changed to fall within the range of existing buildings.

### Building Materials

The proposed material for the foundation is 8" CMU. Based on compatibility, the material that predominates the blockface is brick. As such, Staff recommends that the foundation material be brick.

The proposed material for siding is described as horizontal siding. Based on compatibility, the material that predominates the blockface is wood lap siding. As such, Staff recommends that the siding be wood.

The proposed material for the chimney is brick. As this matches what predominates the blockface, Staff finds no issues with the chimney material.

### Roof

The proposed height of the roof is 22'-7" with a slope of 12:7. The proposed roof shape has 3 separate ridges with differing heights, a false gable with a roof return, and a diamond gable vent. Based on the compatibility study, the allowed heights must be between 22'-9" and 23'-9" and the slope must be between 12:6 and 12:9. The contributing structures each have a different roof shape, so there is no shape the predominates the block. Staff recommends that the roof height be raised at least 2" in order to meet the minimum threshold for compatibility. Staff also recommends that the roof shape be simplified to have a single ridge of the same height and have a true front facing gable without a roof return. This would better reflect existing contributing structures on the Lawton blockface. Additionally, Staff recommends that the gable vent be square to meet compatibility.

### Front Porch

The proposed front porch would have 6x6 posts on top of brick piers, skirt made of brick, wood flooring that run parallels with the front façade, wooden steps and handrailing, and wood porch

railing. Based on compatibility, the predominating features on the blockface are wooden square posts without piers, brick skirting, flooring that runs perpendicular to the front façade, concrete steps, masonry cheek walls, and wooden porch railing. As such Staff recommends that the brick piers be removed, the flooring run perpendicular to the front façade, the steps be made of concrete, and the wooden handrails shall be masonry cheek walls. Additionally, Staff recommends that the porch railing be constructed using a two-part butt-jointed method and the top rail not exceed 33” to accurately reflect those that are existing.

Staff also recommends architrave be added to separate the porch roof from the posts, as that is what predominates the blockface. Lastly, Staff recommends that the front porch span the entirety of the front façade to accurately reflect what predominates the blockface.

### Windows

The proposed front façade windows are one over one double windows. Based on compatibility, the front façade windows that predominate the blockface are one over one single windows. As such, Staff recommends that the front façade windows be single, rather than double.

The ratio of openings to solids on compatible houses range from 4:1 to 7:1 along the side façades, and 3:1 to 5:1 on the front façades. As the proposed house has a ratio of 3:1 on the front façade, 5:1 on the left façade, and 6:1 on the right façade, Staff finds that the ratio of openings to solids to be compatible.

Based on the plans provided, the front and left façade windows match, however the right façade windows show a three over one window style. Staff recommends the right façade windows be one over one style to create a consistent visual look. Additionally, the plans show four different window sizes that vary between rectangle and square. Staff recommends that the windows be proportional in size to each other.

### Front Door

The proposed front door is a Victorian-style door. As Staff was unable to determine the compatibility for the rectangular light openings on the existing doors on the blockface, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide compatibility information relating to the size, scale, style, and proportional placement for the rectangular light openings and adjust the design accordingly. Additionally, Staff recommends that the proposed front door be made of wood, per district regulations.

### Deck

The proposed deck does not extend past the sides of the proposed structure. As such, Staff finds the deck to be in line with district regulations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve CA3-20-258**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with the following conditions CA3-20-187:**

1. The setback shall be no less than 12’ and no greater than 22’.
2. The building mass shall be simplified to have straight façades, with no indentations.

3. The Applicant shall provide information showing the compatibility of ground to floor height for Staff to review.
4. If the proposed ground to floor height is not compatible, it shall be changed to fall within the range of compatible heights.
5. The foundation material shall be brick.
6. The siding material shall be wood lap siding.
7. The roof height shall be raised at least 2”.
8. The roof shape shall be simplified to have a single ridge of uniform height and have a true front facing gable without a roof return.
9. The gable vent shall be square.
10. The brick piers shall be removed and the wooden posts shall extend to the porch floor.
11. The porch flooring shall run perpendicular to the front façade and be tongue-in-groove.
12. The porch steps shall be made of concrete.
13. The porch handrails shall be masonry cheek walls.
14. The porch railing shall be constructed using a two-part butt-jointed method and the top rail shall not exceed 33”, except when required by building code.
15. An architrave shall be added to the front porch.
16. The front porch shall span the entirety of the front façade.
17. The front façade windows shall be single windows.
18. The right façade windows shall be one over one.
19. The windows shall be proportional in size to each other.
20. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the rectangular light openings on the contributing structures for Staff to review.
21. The rectangular light opening on the proposed door shall fall within the compatibility information to be provided by the Applicant.
22. The front door shall be made of wood.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1091 St. Charles  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-195  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020 Deferred from August 26, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East of North Highland and West of Briarcliff

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Additions and Accessory Structure and Alterations.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-200

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

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

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

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

**COMPATIBILITY RULE:**

In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. Synthetic materials may be used if visually indistinguishable from the original materials. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same 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 block face."

**ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to add space on the second level to accommodate for a new master suite. This added space will cause the roof to pier over the existing roof line essentially creating a new roof form. From the photographs of the compatibility comparisons provided and from further research the new proposed addition will be compatible with other houses on the blockface. Additionally, the architecture follows the architecture on the existing structure. The Applicant has indicated horizontal siding as the material for siding departing from the predominate brick on the existing house; a great demarcation from old to new. Staff is not concerned with this addition proposal.

**ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

The Applicant proposes to transform an existing accessory structure that sits at the rear of the property into a two-story carriage house that will also have a 2-car garage. The Applicant has submitted for a variance (CA3-20-244) on the height requirement of 16 feet to 18 feet and FAR of 25% of the principal structure to 30% of the principle structure. Staff's ruling is the Applicant has met the justification for the variance requested. Staff is not concerned of this proposal.

**ALTERATIONS**

*Porch*

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing center post on the front porch, which is not original and install a 4x4 P.T post clad with 1x10 cementitious trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

In front-facing gable roof, the Applicant proposes to remove the stucco and install cementitious siding with cementitious trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Windows*

The Applicant provided a detail window schedule for the existing and propose windows.

**Existing windows**

The window schedule is much appreciated, the Applicant has provided photos to determine the viability of the windows. From the photos provided most of the windows are original and appear to be in very good conditions. Staff would suggest the Applicant retain those existing windows as much as possible. However, if necessary, in replacing, Staff recommends the windows to be repaired or replaced in-kind to the shape, size, style and material of the windows which appear to be wood. Windows K, M and N which shall be replaced in-kind and mimic the rest of the windows on the house for compatibility. Additionally, window L, which appears to be in the rear of the house, is non-original and proposed to be replaced by the Applicant. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. H and I will be replaced in-kind but will be changed to floor to ceiling. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**Proposed windows**

Staff has no concerns for the proposed windows on the new proposal which are in the rear of the house.

**FENCE**

The Applicant proposes to install wood 4ft fence and 6ft fences that will be on the corners, sides and rear of the property that will enclose the accessory structure. The proposed locations and heights of the wood fencing meets the District Regulations. Staff is not concerned with the proposal. Also, the Applicant proposes to install an arbor gating feature on the corners of the front of the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**DRIVEWAY**

The Applicant proposes to reinstall the concrete on the existing driveway. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**GENERAL REPAIRS**

The Applicant proposes to repair the masonry on the principle structure. Repointing masonry is considered a general repair. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**

1. The existing windows shall be retained as much as possible. When windows are to be replaced, they shall be done in-kind to the style, size, shape and material of the original windows with appears to be wood, per, Sec.16-20O.007(2)(i)
2. Windows K, M, and N shall be replaced in-kind and mimic the rest of the windows on the house for compatibility, Sec.16-20O.007(2)(i) and
3. The final plans shall be reviewed and approved by Staff.

CA3-20-195 for 1091 St. Charles  
September 23, 2020  
Page 4 of 4

Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2710 Loghaven  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-202  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020 deferred from September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1955

**Property Location:** East of Chalmers and West of W. Simons Terrace

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

## **Applicant responses in Red Italics**

### **COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

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

### **DOCUMENTATION**

On the site plan the Applicant does not supply the FAR information. Also, the Applicant has not shown the proposed dormer on the site plan. Staff recommend the Applicant update the site plan to include the FAR information as well as the proposed dormer.

***The Applicant has submitted a new site plans which includes FAR information. The Applicant has removed the proposed dormer.***

### **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to add 675 square footage to the existing structure to allow for a master suite and laundry room. This addition does not exceed the side setbacks or rear setback and does not go beyond the sides of the house. Staff deems the position of this is addition is fine. However, Staff will need to know the FAR information to determine if the addition fits all the underlying requirements for development.

***The far is fine on the proposed addition. The Application has provided the information.***

### *Dormer*

The Applicant proposes what appears to be a decorative dormer. Such dormer installation would be governed by the compatibility standard, which is based on what predominates on the blockface. The Applicant has not provided any information that show a dormer is a predominate feature on other contributing houses on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information showing a dormer or the Applicant remove the dormer and retain the vent which is original to the house.

***The Applicant has decided not to build the dormer. The Applicant will retain the vent.***

### *Deck*

Staff is not concerned with the proposed deck.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### *Front of the house*

The Applicant has not stated but demonstrates that there will be a significant change to the front of the house. The Applicant is proposing to change the front porch with a gable roof covering to a full porch with a shed roof coverage. This is very problematic to Staff. Changing the front porch will essentially create a different house form. Additionally, the District regulations require original porches be retained. The Applicant has not provided any photos or evidence to demonstrate that a new porch is merited. If a new porch is merited, the replacement roof should be a replica of what is existing to retain the original style of the house. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the original porch and roof form. If the porch is deteriorating, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidences show the condition of the porch for replacement. If the porch is deemed acceptable for being removed, Staff recommends the porch mimic the existing porch.

***The Applicant will not change the original porch form but update and restore it back to his look. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.***

### *Windows*

As with the porch, the Applicant has not specified the window changes, but they are shown on the plans. The Applicant is proposing three-over-one windows on the front façade. The problem with this proposal is these types of windows are not original to the style of house. The style of windows that are on the existing house are the appropriate windows for this style house and appear to be original. Additionally, the Applicant has not provided any photographic evidences to support the removal of these windows. Staff recommends, the Applicant retain the existing windows and repair in-kind any windows that are existing.

***The Applicant has updated plans and proposes to retain the existing windows in the front—picture with three side windows. This will be compatible with others on the blockface.***

### *Foundation*

On the plans, the foundation appears to be to brick, however from research the foundation and the front porch floor is concrete. Staff have no evidence that the foundation or front porch is brick. If the Applicant is proposing to change the foundation and front porch floor to brick, Staff finds it problematic. If the concrete foundation is the original material, it shall remain so.

***The Applicant has provided photos that demonstrates that the foundation is concrete blocks. The Applicant proposes CMU foundation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.***

### *Side Porch*

The proposed work is to install a side porch. Porches are governed by the compatibility standard. However, the Applicant has not provided any comparisons to show that a side porch is predominate feature on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence showing other house on the blockface with side porches.

***The Applicant has provided evidence demonstrating the existing house has a stoop and not a side porch. Staff is not concerned with the stoop. And the plans indicate that the buildout will remain a stoop.***

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

CA3-20-202 for 2710 Loghaven  
September 23, 2020  
Page 4 of 4

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 389 Brookline St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-205 & CA3-20-206  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1930.

**Property Location:** Northeast corner of Brookline St. SW and Brookline St. SW, south of the Elbert St. intersection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-206:** Approval.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-205:** 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.

**Variances**

The requested variance is to allow a reduction in the allowable rear yard setback from 15' (required) to 7' (proposed); and a variance to allow garage doors facing the Brookline St. half depth front yard. Staff would note that additional variances were applied for by the Applicant which are no longer relevant due to the adoption of revised regulations for the Adair Park Historic District.

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

The Applicant cites the unusual lot shape and frontage configuration as the extraordinary and exceptional conditions on the lot. Staff finds that the subject property is located on a dual frontage of Brookline St as the street turns north to create a triangular pocket park at the Brookline St/Elbert St intersection. The Applicant also states that the position of the structure on the lot restricts the total space where an accessory structure could be placed.

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

The Applicant states that due to the placement of the structure on the lot, an accessory structure garage could not be constructed as anticipated by the District regulations. The proposed addition would further limit the amount of space that an accessory structure could be built. With regards to the rear yard setback, the Applicant again cites the placement of the structure on the site in close proximity to the rear yard setback which would require any addition longer than 7' to obtain a rear yard setback variance.

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

The Applicant again cites the unusual lot shape, frontage, and placement of the structure on the lot. Staff agrees that the items identified by the Applicant are unique to the subject property and have a direct impact on the project.

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

The Applicant states that the granting of the variances would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning ordinance. Staff agrees with the Applicant that the public good would not be harmed and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance would not be impaired as these variances would not automatically apply to any other property due to the unique hardships present on the lot.

**Special exceptions**

The Applicant requests special exceptions to allow a special exception to allow to allow a 4' high wall in the half depth front yard where otherwise a 4' high fence is permitted, and to allow a retaining wall higher than 4' in the half depth front yard.

The Applicant has provided responses to several of the special exception criteria. Staff would note that the Commission is only required to find that the Applicant has satisfied one of the four criteria in order to issue a special exception.

With regards to the 4' high privacy wall request, the Applicant has provided responses to three of the four criterion. However, the Applicant has necessitates not provided information justifying concerns for the privacy, safety, and security of persons or property on the site. The Applicant also states that the topography of the site necessitates the use of the half depth front yard as a rear yard. However, Staff finds that this response does not relate to how the topographic concerns require the use of a privacy wall instead of the permitted fence. As such, Staff does not support the request to include the 4' high privacy wall in the half depth front yard. Staff recommends the privacy wall be removed from the half depth front yard and be replaced with a fence that meets the District regulations.

With regards to the retaining wall, Staff finds that the Applicant's justification based on the topography of the site is valid. The grading required to accommodate the basement garage necessitates a taller retaining wall than would otherwise be required. As such, Staff has no concerns with this request.

### **Addition**

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition to the structure. In general Staff finds the design of the structure meets the District regulations with a few exceptions. Firstly, Staff recommends that the new windows on the addition and the replacement windows for the non-original windows on the historic structure be wood or a wood fiber product. Lastly, Staff recommends the proposed driveway be no wider than 10' exclusive of the flare at the street. Staff would note that the driveway width requirement would not preclude the widening of the driveway to accommodate the entry of two cars into the garage deeper on the lot.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-206:** Approval with the following conditions:

1. the privacy wall be removed from the half depth front yard and be replaced with a fence that meets the District regulations.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-255:** Approval with the following conditions:

1. The new windows on the addition and the replacement windows for the non-original windows on the historic structure shall be wood or a wood fiber product, per Sec. 16-20I.006(2)(b)(3);
2. The proposed driveway shall be no wider than 10' exclusive of the flare at the street, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(c); and,
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 818 Springdale Road  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-234  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1910

**Property Location:** West of By The Way and East of Ponce de Leon

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

**ADDITIONS**

The Applicant proposes the following additions to the existing structure: 245 sf addition to the rear of the house; added 683 sf patio, 2.4' retaining wall and pergola.

*Rear Addition*

The Applicant proposes to remove an existing 156sf of space for exterior renovations that will add an additional 89sft to the rear of the existing structure. This addition will not extend beyond the sides of the house and will not be visible from the public-right-away nor violate any setbacks or FAR requirements. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Patio*

The 618sf existing patio will be demolished to be replaced with a 683sf patio. The added space of the patio will use the existing footprint of the existing patio but will extend he footprint by 65sf. This extension will not violate any setback requirements and will not be visible from the public-right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Retaining wall*

A small 2.4' retaining wall is proposed to sit next to the patio. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Pergola*

The Applicant proposes a pergola to sit in the rear of the existing structure between the addition and patio. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1308 Fairview Rd.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-247  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1913.

**Property Location:** North block face of Fairview Rd.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Georgian Eclectic, designed by Neel Reid in 1913.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Site work

The Applicant proposes replacing the existing curved paver front walkway with an angular bluestone paver walkway. In general, Staff finds that there is not sufficient information to determine whether the materials of the front walkway are original to the site, but the layout likely is original. As such, Staff does not support the request to change the layout of the walkway. Further, bluestone pavers would not have been used in the time period of construction. More common materials would have been exposed aggregate concrete or brick pavers. As such, Staff recommends the existing front walkway be retained in its current location.

The Applicant proposes a series of changes to the rear of the structure. While all four sides of the property and lot are subject to the Commission's review, Staff finds that the proposals would be hidden from public viewshed and would differentiate the work as modern additions to the site. As such, Staff has no concerns with the site work proposed at the rear of the property.

#### Alterations

The Applicant is proposing the removal of a non-historic portion of the front and right façades of the home where the original wrap around porch was enclosed into living space. The wall surface will be replaced with a new wall and door combination that will be heavily transparent and the extant porch elements will be retained. Staff finds that this treatment would re-introduce the historic spatial relationships of the structure and has no concerns with the proposal.

#### Rear addition

The Applicant proposes a rear addition which will be installed in the location of a non-historic sunroom addition. Staff finds that the proposal meets the District regulations for setbacks and lot coverage. Additionally, Staff finds that the overall character and massing of the addition is appropriate for inclusion on the home. However, Staff has concerns with the materials proposed on the addition. Firstly, the addition proposes two different cladding materials: horizontal lap siding and shingle siding. Staff finds that the horizontal lap siding is appropriate given that the previous addition was clad in this material. As such, the impact on the site would be minimized by continuing the use of horizontal lap siding on this new addition. As such, Staff recommends the rear addition be clad in horizontal lap siding.

The Applicant also proposes a fieldstone foundation for the new addition. Staff finds that the proposed addition should contain a foundation which is compatible with the brick foundation on the original structure. As such, Staff recommends the fieldstone foundation be changed to brick. Staff further recommends an expansion joint be used to differentiate the new foundation from the original portions of the structure.

Lastly, the Applicant is proposing new casement windows on the proposed addition. Staff has no general concerns with the use of a different window type provided the style is consistent and does not introduce multiple dissimilar window styles and types to the structure. As the proposed windows are all of the same type and style, and are generally compatible with the windows on the main portions of the structure, Staff has no concerns with the windows proposed. However, Staff does recommend the windows on the proposed addition be unclad wood with true divided lites.

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

1. The existing front walkway shall be retained in its current location, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
2. The rear addition shall be clad in horizontal lap siding, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
3. The fieldstone foundation shall be changed to brick, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
4. An expansion joint shall be used to differentiate the new foundation from the original portions of the structure, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
5. The windows on the proposed addition shall be unclad wood with true divided lites, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i); and,
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 472 Broyles

**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-248

**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** vacant.

**Property Location:** East block face of Broyles Ave., south of the Glenwood Ave. intersection.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New duplex.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Site plan

The R-5 underlying zoning allows a .60 FAR for duplexes. Per the site plan provided by the Applicant, the proposed structures would have a FAR of .36. As such, Staff finds that the floor area regulations have been met.

The R-5 zoning regulations require the lot coverage of the property not to exceed 55% of the lot area. The site plan provided by the Applicant shows that the proposed structure and improvements would cover 47.5% of the lot. As such, Staff finds that the project meets the lot coverage requirements.

Design

The District has both qualitative and quantitative requirements for new construction. Staff has reviewed the Applicant's proposal and has found that the proposed structure meets the design requirements of the Grant Park Historic District. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed structure.

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

1. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1037 Sparks St.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-253

**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** North block face of Sparks St., east of the Peoples St. intersection.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Rear addition and front stoop addition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Front stoop addition

The Applicant is proposing a new gable front stoop. In looking at the block face, few of the minimal traditional cottages contain original front porches. The structures on the block face exhibit a mix of shed, hipped, and gable roof porches. Staff finds that of the porch/stoop roof forms on the block face, the gable and shed roof would be consistent with the Colonial Revival influences of the Minimal Traditional style. As such, staff has no concerns with the inclusion of a gable front porch on the subject property. Staff does recommend that the architrave be removed from the proposed gable to conform to the simplistic ornamentation of the existing structure. Staff further recommends the horizontal band porch railing be removed from the plans and replaced with a two-part butt joint railing with vertical pickets.

Rear addition

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition to the existing structure. In general, Staff has few concerns with the design of the structure. Staff recommends any cement siding used on the proposed addition be smooth faced.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a new double grouped window on the left side of the front façade. Staff finds that the original window configuration based on the inventory photographs is for three single unit windows on the front façade. As such, Staff recommends the double window unit be removed from the plans and all existing windows on the front and side façade remain in their original location and sizes.

No information regarding the Applicant's plans for the existing windows has been submitted. Staff recommends the Applicant provide detailed photographic documentation keyed to a floorplan for any window proposed for replacement. Staff further recommends only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-historic or beyond repair be replaced with windows that meet the District regulations.

No information regarding the Applicant's plans for the existing siding has been received. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit photographs of all areas of siding proposed for replacement. Staff further recommends only those portions of siding which Staff has determined to be beyond repair or not original to the structure be replaced with siding that meets the District regulations.

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

1. The architrave shall be removed from the proposed gable to conform to the simplistic ornamentation of the existing structure, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
2. The horizontal band porch railing shall be removed from the plans and replaced with a two-part butt joint railing with vertical pickets, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
3. Any cement siding used on the proposed addition shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
4. The double window unit shall be removed from the plans and all existing windows on the front and side façade remain in their original location and sizes, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);

5. The Applicant shall provide detailed photographic documentation keyed to a floorplan for any window proposed for replacement, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
6. Only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-historic or beyond repair shall be replaced with windows that meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
7. The Applicant shall submit photographs of all areas of siding proposed for replacement, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
8. Only those portions of siding which Staff has determined to be beyond repair or not original to the structure shall be replaced with siding that meets the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a); and,
9. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 567 Holderness St.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-254 & CA2-20-255  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** West block face of Hopkins St., north of Greenwich St., south of the Sells Ave.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Construction of a SFR.

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

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** In May of 2020, Staff was alerted to concerns that the house was being built taller than was approved by the Commission and other issues with the as built design not matching the design approved by the Commission. In an investigation of the situation, Staff discovered that the height comparison provided by the Applicant was inaccurate, leading to the Commission approving a height range which was 10' taller than the tallest historic home on the block face. Other inaccuracies in the construction, including an as built first floor height which exceeded the allowable maximum by 2 feet, were also discovered.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-254:** Denial.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-255:** Deferral.

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

**CA3-20-254 – Variance**

The requested variance is to allow an increase in the allowable height from a maximum of 17’ as measured from grade at the front façade to the midpoint of the roof to 23’ as measured from grade to the midpoint of the roof, and to allow an increase in the allowable first floor height from 1’6” to 3’ 6”.

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

The Applicant cites the existence of two storm sewer easements that severely restrict the site as the extraordinary and exceptional condition on the lot.

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

The Applicant states that the regulations as proposed would require a 1 story home to be built. Staff finds that this assessment is inaccurate as the regulations speak to the maximum height of the house and not the number of stories. Staff also finds that the horizontal constraints of the lot do not require a first floor height which exceeds the maximum on the block face. Staff finds that there are several creative design solutions which could allow for a home with more than one story that meets the height requirements as well as all other requirements of the West End Historic District zoning regulations. Staff further finds that this argument does not tie to the first criterion, as the hardship on the property are horizontal site constraints which do not require the structure or first floor height to be built taller than would otherwise be permitted.

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

The Applicant again cites the limitations of the buildable area of the lot. Staff agrees that the buildable area is limited but finds that site constraints do not require a structure or first floor height to be built taller than otherwise allowed as there are multiple design solutions that could be used to address the issues.

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

The Applicant states that the granting of the requested variances would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta. Staff disagrees with this statement as the compatibility rule is intended to protect the public good by ensuring that new development conforms to, and does not detract from, to the character of the historic structures on the block.

Staff finds that the Applicant has not satisfied the variance criteria. While the lot constraints do constitute a hardship for horizontal expansion, Staff finds that the hardship does not directly relate to the project requiring an increased building or first floor height over what would otherwise be allowed. As such, Staff does not support the variance request.

**CA2-20-255 – Revisions to previously approved plans**

CA3-20-254 and CA3-20-255 for 389 Hopkins St.

Sept. 23, 2020

Page 3 of 3

Given Staff's recommendations to the variance requests, Staff finds that major redesign and reconstruction would be required for the property to comply with the Zoning Ordinance. Staff additionally finds that this process could result in a design which is largely different from the one previously approved by the Commission which was based on the incorrect comparison analysis provided by the Applicant. As such, Staff recommends a deferral of the application to allow the Applicant time to re-design the project to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-254: Denial**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-255: Deferral.**

cc: Applicant

Neighborhood

File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 382 Sinclair Ave

**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-256

**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1925

**Property Location:** West block face of Sinclair Ave., north of the Washita Ave. intersection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-255:** Approval with conditions.

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

Rear addition

The Applicant proposes a full width rear addition with a two story rear porch. In general Staff finds that the design of the proposed addition is compatible with the historic home. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed addition.

Dormer additions

The Applicant is proposing two dormers on the existing side roof planes. The proposed dormers would be placed on the roof plane so as to not engage or otherwise disturb the main ridge line of the historic structure. The proposed dormers will contain six lite casement windows which are compatible in style with the original windows on the structure. The dormers would also be clad in horizontal lap siding with a reveal consistent with the reveal of the siding on original portions of the home. Staff has no concerns with the design of the proposed dormers.

Accessory Structure

Accessory structures are subject to Staff Review and approval. Staff would note that the proposed accessory structure meets the requirements of the District, and Staff finds no issue with the proposed design.

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

1. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1715 and 1723 South Ponce de Leon Avenue, NE  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-261  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** #1715 – reconstructed after 2010, #1723 – 1920s

**Property Location:** South Ponce de Leon Avenue corridor, southern corner of Clifton Road

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** #1715: house–yes, garage–yes; #1723: house–yes, outbuilding yes.

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** All site work, alterations, additions, and new construction.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior renovations to existing contributing buildings and interiors of proposed new construction.

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** #1715 – house reconstructed per Landmark District standards and previous Commission conditional approval.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Defer until October 14, 2020 meeting.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20B.

Property Configuration and Characteristics:

The project involves two properties that each currently contain contributing buildings (see below). While shown on the submitted materials (and in the DeKalb County tax records) as one property, the City of Atlanta official plat records show the two-property configuration, which is configuration that will be used for the Staff's and Commission's review. The western property is the corner lot with 125 ft. of frontage along South Ponce de Leon Avenue and approximately 381 ft. of frontage along Clifton Road on its west side. The eastern lot - #1723 – has 110 ft. of frontage along South Ponce de Leon Avenue, is approximately 565 ft. deep with its rear property one abutting the side property line of a house that faces Hardendorf Avenue. Further, #1723 appears to have a slight overlap with the terminus end of the Hardendorf Avenue right -of-way for approximately 10-12 ft.

Each property contains a dominant principal, two-story, brick historic house and secondary, accessory / outbuildings. #1715 has a one-story, wood frame garage that faces Clifton Road and #1723 has a one-story, wood frame outbuilding. Vehicle access to #1715's garage is via Clifton Road and vehicle access to #1723 is via a driveway from South Ponce de Leon Avenue.

The houses are situated on the crest of small hill that generally spans both lots, with both lots sloping down from the house sides but mostly to the north (towards South Ponce de Leon Avenue) and to the south or rear yards. The #1715 lot also slopes down to Clifton Road. At the rear of both lots are clusters of hardwood trees with their front and side yards generally have open lawns with fewer trees.

Approach to Comments / Design Review:

The Landmark District regulations base several requirements on the uses of a property and in the case of residential properties, the number of residential units on each lot. #1715 has two residential units, making it a "two-family" property under the Landmark District regulations. #1723 has three residential units, making it a "multi-family" property.

Given the preliminary nature of the submitted plans, the Staff comments below will focus on the most significant concerns it has about the proposed project. If a regulatory topic is not noted below, it can be assumed that at *this preliminary stage of the design of the project and as such the Staff's preliminary design analysis, it is not a substantial concern of the Staff at this time. However, changes to the project design (which the Staff anticipates) will require new / additional Staff analysis which will include revised, new or different comments then those noted below.*

Allowed Uses, Density, and Required Parking:

The Landmark District regulations allow for single-family, two-family, and multi-family uses on individual properties in the Ponce de Leon Avenue subarea, both in existing and added / separate buildings, under certain parameters. In this application, the existing historic house on each lot will contain one living unit. One additional living unit will be added to #1715 (for a total of two) and two additional living units will be added to #1723 (for a total of three). #1715 meets the minimum lot size of a two-family property, while #1723 meets the minimum lot per unit requirement for a multi-family property. Both properties meet their on-site parking requirements.

Site Plan Comments:

- The site plan does not show the existing / City of Atlanta recognized lot line between #1715 and #1723. As noted above, the City of Atlanta has and will consider the project to consist of two distinct lots.
- The site plan does not graphically show the accurate setbacks (which are based on the uses of each lot), including those along the lot line between the two lots.
- The lot coverage calculations need to be redone such that there is an independent calculation for each lot, based on its identified use: #1715 – “two-family” and #1723 – “multi-family.” Further, the calculations need to include only those site components, that according to the Landmark District, should be included in those calculations.
- The site plan needs to include calculations for Building D and E confirming compliance with the slope limitations for building single-family units in those locations.
- The setback of Building C does not meet the Clifton Road setback of 50 ft. It is not clear if the addition to Building B meets this setback either.
- The Staff finds that while the tree protection and replacement plan appears to meet the basic City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance requirements, it does not include calculations documenting compliance with the additional Landmark District tree regulations which require replacement of each tree removed, not just recompense paid. Further, it would appear that some tree removals could be avoided such as those to the west and south of Building A and those around the “common family lawn”, among potentially others. In addition, it would appear that Buildings D and E could be moved further north, thereby retaining more trees as a buffer to the south and at the same time retaining more of the “rear yard” aesthetic and functionality of the subject lot in relationship to the property to the south.
- Notwithstanding the additional comments below specifically about the design of Building C, the off-street parking for Building C cannot be within 50 ft. of the Clifton Road right-of-way.
- The vehicle access to Building D and E is approximately 20 ft. wide or wider at some locations creating a large, incompatible amount of paved surface, particularly in the rear 1/3 of #1723. In addition to the aesthetic / compatibility concerns about this amount of paving, this paving configuration could lead to serious stormwater flows off the southern end of that pavement.
- The driveway from South Ponce de Leon to and beside Building A is proposed for expansion, including but not limited to what appear to be “passing pads” for two-way traffic. This would not appear to meet the District regulation of retaining historic paving patterns.
- No information is included about the required pool fence or any other fencing / retaining walls that might be required for the project.
- Additional information needs to be included regarding the stormwater management facilities on the property. While not a specific requirement of the Landmark District, the Staff is concerned that if there are significant changes necessary for these facilities (size, location, outfalls, etc.) to comply with other City of Atlanta requirements, those changes could adversely affect the site plan features that are specifically related to the requirements of the Landmark District. Further, one of these facilities is located in the front yard of #1715 and the other is located very close to the rear property line of #1723, close to the adjacent property. Given their size and potential to impact the design of the project (and the potential change in the project due to the Staff’s comments contained herein, the Staff would request additional information about the design and location parameters for the stormwater management facilities and that they reflect / respond to the current and future iterations of the project design.

Comments that Apply to All or Multiple Buildings:

- No elevations were included in the submission for Buildings A and B. The depiction of the houses (retained and altered/added to) and new consisted of renderings and annotated photo-renderings. Further, not all materials are indicated on the submitted designs / plans.
- Building C, D, and E – While containing less square footage than Building A (and to some extent Building B), they do not appear as secondary or supporting buildings to the two, main historic buildings on the properties – Building A and Building B. This is due to their size, and in the case of Buildings D and E, prominent architectural articulation. Creating this visual and physical hierarchy is critical to maintaining the prominence of the two historic buildings on the site, which are and should continue to be the dominant presence. With the addition of more structures on the site, those additional structures should be designed to reinforce, as much as possible, the overall arrangement of the property – a single, prominent house with outbuildings.
- Building C, D, and E contain multiple materials - including brick, stone, stucco, wood, and window walls - used in various proportions. This mixture of materials on a single building is not compatible with the architectural style of the District.
- The use of large “window walls” and all glass, large, metal French doors is incompatible with the Landmark District.
- Paired or grouped windows do not contain trim separation between individual units simulating historic window spacing.

Building A Comments:

- There are no renovations or alteration notes for the existing building or an indication that those type of actions will not happen.
- The use of triple hung windows is incompatible with the architectural style of the existing house.
- It is not clear if the left side of the addition (wrapping around to the rear) contains an upper-level terrace, which if the case, is not compatible with the architectural style of the existing house.

Building B Comments:

- There were no plans or notes submitted regarding the renovation of the existing garage.
- The window wall on the first floor facing Clifton Road is incompatible with the architectural style of the existing portion of Building B and with the Landmark District as a whole.
- It is not clear the design or style of the door on the right side of the first floor next to the existing (and presumably renovated) garage building.
- There is an awkward relationship between the addition and the existing portion of Building B, and the addition and the existing garage building. This might be due to the accuracy of the rendering, but nonetheless the Staff is concerned about these connections.
- It appears that the first floor of the addition projects west towards Clifton Road. This projection is not compatible with the architectural style of the existing Building B.
- The interior side elevation appears to have an inset balcony and banks of large (floor to ceiling?) window/doors, both of which are incompatible with the architectural style of the existing Building B.

Building C Comments:

- The Clifton Road elevation includes a front door entrance component, front porch / stoop, fenestration pattern and architectural articulation that is incompatible with the architectural style of the Landmark District.
- The overall incompatible size and massing of the house (which should visually be secondary to Building B) is heightened by the very simple and unarticulated facades, particularly along Clifton Road.
- The off-street parking and associated 3-car garage are highly visible and would be significantly incompatible with the architectural style of the existing Building C and the District as a whole. The Staff is not aware of any garages in the Landmark District that required this amount of cut into the natural grade and/or do so in such a highly visible location. This garage and driveway area would also require a large retaining wall creating a severe “hole” in the grade.
- The rear projection to the house includes a different material (simulating a later addition) but has continuous roof shape and form, which contradicts that design narrative.

Building D Comments:

- The use of the quad-grouped windows is not compatible with the Landmark District, though it would appear that the overall architectural style of the house is based on the Prairie Style, which might lend it itself to this type of window grouping.
- In addition to the concerns about materials noted above for all the buildings, Building D uses those materials with different extents. For example, the brick lower portion of the building ends as different elevations on the exterior facades.

Building E Comments:

- The use of the quad-grouped (or even larger groups) windows is not compatible with the Landmark District, though it would appear that the overall architectural style of the house is based on the Prairie Style, which might lend it itself to this type of window grouping.

Pool Building Comments:

- No renovation / addition plans were included in the submission.

Summary Comment:

While the Staff agrees that adding living units to each of these properties (as has been done with other Ponce de Leon Corridor properties in the past) is possible and can be done in a compatible manner, there are outstanding issues with this particular proposal that need to be addressed, including: several components of the site plan, the overall architectural design, and individual architectural components. The Staff would recommend that the Applicant revise the proposal to address the concerns noted in this Staff Report.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer application to the October 14, 2020 Commission meeting.**

cc: File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of  
Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 141 Martin St.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-235  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** Southblock face of Cherokee Pl, east of Connally St., west of Grant Terrace

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

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

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

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

**Relevant Code Sections:**

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-235:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Site Work**

The Applicant is proposing site work to the existing landscape at Phoenix Park III. The work to be done would be the installation of a terraced amphitheater and added sidewalk.

After review, Staff suggests that the terraces in the amphitheater have some type of material or grading for feet. As the current plan shows Bermuda grass to be the main landscaping, Staff worries that after periods of rain if the terraces would become inundated with water. Additionally, Staff did not see any form of wheelchair access to the levels of the amphitheater. Staff suggests that connections be made from the existing sidewalks to the edges of the sitting walls to accommodate wheelchair access.

**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](http://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:** 2852 Cascade Rd  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-236  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** South blockface of Cascade Rd., east of Harbin Rd., west of Woodland Terrace.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Installation of public art.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:**

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-236:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Installation of Public Art**

The Applicant is proposing the installation of public art at the Cascade Springs Nature Preserve.

After review, Staff suggests that the benches proposed match those that are standard in other City of Atlanta parks, in order to create a consistency across the city. Additionally, Staff suggests the addition of a hardscaped path leading to the art installation to allow for disability access.

**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](http://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:** 380 Peachtree St.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-237  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** East blockface of Peachtree St., north of Ralph McGill Blvd., south of Pine St.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Installation of public art.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:**

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-237:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Installation of Public Art**

The Applicant is proposing the installation of public art at the Mayor's #1 Park.

After review, Staff suggests some form of identification for the art work in order to describe the piece and/or artist. This would help give context to the art for the public. Additionally, Staff suggests that the benches proposed match those that are standard in other City of Atlanta parks, in order to create a consistency across the city. Staff also suggests the addition of park lighting, as other than the installation lighting, it appears that the park has none.

**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](http://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:** John Lewis Freedom Parkway NE  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-238  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** North blockface of John Lewis Freedom Pkwy, east of Highland Ave, west of Moreland Ave.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Installation of public art.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:**

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-239:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Installation of Public Art**

The Applicant is proposing the installation of public art at the existing landscape along the John Lewis Freedom Parkway Trail.

After review, Staff suggests some form of maintenance plan for the space, in order to layout who will be responsible for upkeep.

**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](http://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:** 1016 John Lewis Freedom Parkway NE

**APPLICATION:** RC-20-239

**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** North blockface of John Lewis Freedom Pkwy, east of Highland Ave, west of Moreland Ave.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Installation of public art.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:**

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-239:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Installation of Public Art**

The Applicant is proposing the installation of public art at the existing landscape along the John Lewis Freedom Parkway Trail.

After review, Staff suggests some form of identification for the art work in order to describe the piece and/or artist. This would help give context to the art for the public. Staff also suggests that the style of trash cans be consistent with standard trash cans seen in other parks throughout Atlanta, in order to convey a sense of continuity across the city. Lastly, Staff recommends some form of maintenance plan for the space, in order to layout who will be responsible for upkeep. Staff would like to note that the granite fines with polymer and the mesabi black granite banding materials will have a higher cost of maintenance due to the looseness of the material.

**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](http://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:** 44 Northwood Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-249  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1922.

**Property Location:** West block face of Northwood Ave., west of the Palisades Rd. intersection.

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

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Exhibits characteristics of revival style architecture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Applicant proposes a rear addition that is generally in keeping with the design of the existing principal structure. From a visual inspection of archival photos, the subject property appears to have been altered in the past, with a large addition massed to the rear of the structure and possible alterations to the front façade. As such, Staff finds that it is important to clearly distinguish the new work from the previous alterations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant consider methods of differentiation such as a visual break caused by the retention of the existing rear corner boards on the side facades of the existing addition. Staff would also recommend the Applicant consider moving the north façade of the addition back a few feet to be completely behind the existing north side façade of the street facing façade of the home. Lastly, Staff recommends the Applicant consider using materials that are compatible with the original materials on the property.

**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](http://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:** Flat Shoals Ave  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-257  
**MEETING DATE:** September 23, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** N/A

**Other Zoning:**

**Date of Construction:**

**Property Location:** Flat Shoals Ave., between Metropolitan Ave. and May Ave.

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

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Installation of public art.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:**

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

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-257:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Installation of Public Art**

The Applicant is proposing the installation of public art on the public right-of-way at various crosswalks along Flat Shoals Ave. The proposed site work is the painting of five crosswalks.

After review, Staff suggests a maintenance plan for the space, along with detailing the upkeep of the crosswalks. This would allow for a clear delineation of who is responsible for what, and when. Staff has no issues with the Streetbond paint to be used.

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

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File