



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1155 Princess
APPLICATION: CA2-20-263
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West of Arlington and East of Across from Larosa

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window Replacement

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

WINDOW REPLACEMENT

The Applicant proposes to replace 13 windows with vinyl windows that will match is size and style. District regulations require original windows be retained. If determined they can be replaced, they must be replaced in size and shape. While the material is not of issue with Staff, from the photos the Applicant provided, it is hard for Staff to determine if these windows are original to the structure and if so, if they have merit to be replaced. Staff recommends the Applicant provide detail photographic evidence that will give more detail their proposal of replacement. If the windows merit replacement, the Applicant shall replace in size and shape. If the windows do not merit replacement, the Applicant must repair in-kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide detail photographic evidence illustrating the existing windows. If the windows merit replacement, the windows shall be replaced in size and shape. If the windows do not merit replacement, the windows shall be replaced in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o)(1)(2);
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 152 Berean St.

APPLICATION: CA2-20-283

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Pre-1911.

Property Location: East block face of Berean Ave., north of the Pickett St. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: In late 2019, Staff became aware of interior alterations that had encroached on the exterior of the structure. Staff has confirmed that portions of the roof structure, windows, and doors on the rear of the structure were removed without proper review by the Commission. The current proposal is to review this work in addition to other exterior alterations proposed by the Applicant.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

The subject property was constructed before 1911. At some point in the past the structure was heavily altered to accommodate the triplex use. The structure was also sided with brick, the front porch was removed, and the rear porch was extended to the full width of the structure.

The District regulations contain both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related requirement was met.

Use

The Applicant is proposing the retention of the existing triplex use. The District regulations limit the uses in this district to single family and duplex uses, provided that said duplex use is the original use for the subject property. As such, triplex uses are prohibited in the District and the subject property is non-conforming. Staff has determined that the structure was originally built as a single-family residence based on the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. If the structure is found to be legally non-conforming, the structure would be required to convert to the previous single-family use which would likely require considerable alterations to the proposed plans. Before plans could be referred for permitting by the Office of Design, Staff finds it appropriate to require as a condition of approval that the Applicant secure a letter of legal non-conformity from the Office of Buildings to ensure that the triplex use has the protection of the non-conformities section of the zoning ordinance. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant apply for and receive a letter of legal non-conformity from the Office of Buildings.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing several alterations to the structure. Firstly, the Applicant proposes the replacement of all windows on the structure. Based on the photographs provided, the existing windows are either missing or non-original. As such, Staff is not concerned with the loss of historic materials. The Applicant proposes a wood two-over-one style window. The District regulations requires new and replacement windows to meet the compatibility rule. The District regulations require these comparisons to be made based on historic structures on the same block face which are of the like use and architectural form. Staff finds that the block face does not contain contributing multi-family properties. However, the predominate window pattern on contributing cottage style structures on the block face is one over one. The two-over-one typology is seen only on contributing shotgun homes. As such, Staff recommends all windows on the property be one-over-one wood windows.

The Applicant proposes adding windows to the front façade. The District regulations require the fenestration pattern to meet the compatibility rule. As the subject property constitutes such an extreme departure from the historic character of the block face, Staff finds it appropriate that the new fenestration on the front façade be limited to containing no more windows than appear on the historic cottages on the block face. The historic cottages on the block face contain no more than two windows on the front façade on either side of the main front door. As such, Staff recommends the front façade contain no more than two windows matching the size and shape of windows on the comparable cottages on the block face.

The Applicant proposes the replacement of the doors on the structure. Similar to the windows, Staff finds that the existing windows and doors are either not original or are missing. The Applicant proposes three $\frac{3}{4}$ lite doors on the front façade. The contributing cottages on the block face do not retain their original front doors. As such, Staff finds it appropriate to look at the opposing block face. The majority of contributing cottage structures on the opposing block face contain half-lite doors. As such, Staff recommends the front doors be $\frac{1}{2}$ lite wood doors.

The Applicant proposes to replace the gable stoops over the front doors to create separate entries. However, Staff finds that the contributing cottage style structures on the block face all contain single shed or hipped

roof front porches. As such, Staff finds it appropriate to require the subject property to conform to this comparison. As such, Staff recommends the gable stoop additions be removed from the plan and replaced with a single shed or hipped roof front porch, matching the dimensions and ornamentations of the porches on the historic cottage style structures on the block face.

Lastly, the Applicant proposes the replacement of the existing metal roof. The District regulations require roofing materials to meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff finds that the proposed metal roof does not match the contributing cottage structures on the block face, which all exhibit shingled primary roofs. As such, Staff recommends the roofing material be architectural shingles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall apply for and receive a letter of legal non-conformity from the Office of Buildings;
2. All windows on the property shall be one-over-one wood windows, per Sec. 16-20A.006(15)(b);
3. The front façade shall contain no more than two windows matching the size and shape of windows on the comparable cottages on the block face, per Sec. 16-20A.006(15)(b);
4. The front doors shall be ½ lite wood doors, per Sec. 16-20A.006(15)(b);
5. The gable stoop additions shall be removed from the plan and shall be replaced with a single shed or hipped roof front porch, matching the dimensions and ornamentations of the porches on the historic cottage style structures on the block face, per Sec. 16-20A.006(15)(b);
6. The roofing material shall be architectural shingles, per Sec. 16-20A.006(15)(b); and,
7. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN
Kevin Bacon
Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2880 Valley Heart
APPLICATION: CA2-20-292
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1961

Property Location: East of Collier Drive and West of Chamlers Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Painted brick 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: August 2020, a Stop Work was placed on the property for printed masonry and alterations on the exterior. New owners.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

ALTERATIONS

Windows

The original windows have been removed from the existing structure. Those windows appear to have been metal lit divide 8 over 9 windows from research conducted. Those windows were replaced with one over one wood windows. District regulations states that if original or historic windows or exterior doors cannot be rehabilitated, replacement windows and doors shall match the original or historic in light design, function, materials, shape, and size. Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the District regulations and install windows that will match the original windows in light design, function, material, shape and size.

Gable Roof

The Gable Roof over the front porch has been restored. Staff is not concerned with the restoration. However, the vent that was in the gable front must be reinstalled. Staff recommends the Applicant install the vent that was in the Gable roof.

Shutters

The shutters have been removed from the existing structure. While shutters were a defining feature on ranches, not all ranches did not have shutters. Staff is not concerned with the shutter removal.

Orientation of front steps

The orientation of the front steps on the porch has been moved from a front entry to a side entry. District Regulations states, original or historic porches or stoops, including their component features shall be retained. This has not been done. Staff recommends the original orientation of steps for the porch match which was there originally to abide by the District Regulations.

Painted Brick

The masonry has been painted. Painting of masonry is prohibited in the District. Staff recommend that Applicant remove the paint in a fashion that will not damage the brick which would mean no sandblasting. The Applicant can confer to the Secretary of Standards on Historic Preservation to gain other knowledge on how to remove the paint in an efficient and safe way.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes to retain the concrete driveway, Staff has no concern with this proposal.

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

1. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations and install windows that will match the original windows in light design, function, material, shape and size, Sec. 16-20Q.006(2)(c);
2. The Applicant install the vent that was in the Gable roof, Sec.16-20Q.006(1)(a);
3. The original orientation of steps for the porch shall match which was there originally to abide by the District Regulations, Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(a);

4. The Applicant shall remove the paint in a fashion that will not damage the brick which would mean no sandblasting. The Applicant can confer to the Secretary of Standards on Historic Preservation to gain other knowledge on how to remove the paint in an efficient and safe way, Sec.16-20Q.001 and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1368 Ponce De Leon Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-296 & CA3-20-297
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1915

Property Location: North blockface of Ponce De Leon Ave., west of Oakdale Rd., east of Springdale Rd.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Structures and site work

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:

On November 14, 2018 the Commission reviewed and approved with conditions Application CA3-18-511 for the conversion of the existing historic Tudor style home into a middle school facility. The current project involves a revision to those previously approved plans and a request to reduce the required on-site parking.

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 City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

Special Exception

The Applicant is requesting a reduction in the required on-site off-street parking from 38 spaces to 35 spaces. As proposed, the project would accommodate 48 spaces, however 15 of them are double parked and do not meet the maneuverability standards required by the zoning ordinance. The Applicant cites both the lot shape and the lot coverage maximum as the primary factors preventing the site from full compliance with the District regulations. Staff finds that, while the site is large enough to accommodate additional parking spaces the project as proposed is already close to reaching the maximum lot coverage requirements and the addition of more hard surface to the site would threaten the balance the project has struck between the historic character of the Landmark District and the needs of the new school facilities. Additionally, Staff finds that the reduction would not create a net loss of parking on the property due to the additional spaces that do not meet the maneuverability standards. As such, Staff has no concerns with the request.

Revisions to plans

The Applicant is proposing a revision to the connection between the music building and the main building. The current proposal envisions a full three story connection as opposed to the single story building bridge proposed previously. Staff finds that the character of the addition is consistent with the Commission's previous approval and the inclusion of the additional space would not cause harm to the District as a whole. Staff does recommend that the conditions of approval for CA3-18-511 remain in effect except where they would conflict with the currently proposed revisions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval conditioned upon the following:

1. All conditions of approval for CA3-18-511 shall remain in effect except where they would conflict with the currently proposed revisions; and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 822 Oakdale Rd.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-225

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920.

Property Location: West block face of Oakdale Rd., north of the Ponce De Leon Ave. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Pool, Accessory Building, Site Work

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: At the October 23, 2019 public hearing, the Commission reviewed and approved CA2-19-459 which included alterations to the front landscaping. At the time of the submission, the plans included notations to a future pool/pool house configuration which were not part of the Commission's approval. The current proposal is for the design of both the pool, accessory building, and related site work. In reviewing the proposal, Staff noted several deviations from the Commission's original approval which were completed without proper review. These items are noted in Staff's analysis below.

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.

Several of the items listed below are work that has already been completed. However, Staff will note all items as “proposed” as the work was completed without proper review and the Commission has not had the opportunity to review and approve the changes.

Site Work

The Applicant proposes the replacement of the existing pea gravel driveway with concrete with no alterations to the footprint of the driveway other than the extensions which were previously approved by the Commission. In reviewing the photographs provided by the Applicant, as well as inventory and publicly accessible street view photography, Staff finds that the pea gravel driveway was not the original composition of the driveway. Based on block-face comparisons, Staff finds concrete to be an appropriate replacement material for the pea gravel driveway and has no concerns with this proposal.

In addition to the driveway replacement, The Applicant is proposing an extension of the driveway to the rear of the property in order to accommodate circulation to the proposed garage on the pool building. Staff has no concerns with the extension of this driveway.

The Applicant is proposing a poured concrete pad to the north side of the driveway for the placement of trashcans. Staff finds that the inclusion of the parking pad alters the spatial relationship of the landscaping, which is a character defining feature of the District. Staff further finds that the proposed parking pad is not consistent with and does not conform to the pattern of hardscape on the property as required by the Zoning Ordinance. As such, Staff recommends that the concrete pad in the front yard be removed from the plans.

The Applicant has altered their plans to include a stone paver walkway on the south side of the front yard. Staff has no concerns with either the layout of the walkway or the use of stone pavers as it does not interrupt either the spatial relationships on the property and mimics the general layout of the existing circulation hardscape on the property. Staff does recommend that the walkway on the south side of the front yard be added to the site plan.

The Applicant is proposing widening the front stoop to incorporate a new brick patio the full width of the front façade. Staff finds that this proposal is inconsistent with the historic character of the home and recommends the plans be revised to show a front stoop matching the layout of the original.

With regard to the proposed fencing, the District regulations place the review authority with the Office of Design Staff. The Applicant proposes fencing on the north side of the principal structure as barrier protection against the retaining walls which were previously approved by the Commission. Staff finds that the design of the north side yard fencing meets the District regulations and could not be reasonably located elsewhere and achieve the desired fall protection. However, Staff finds that the fencing on the south side of the structure encroaches on the front yard. Per the District regulations, fencing is prohibited in the front yard. As such, Staff recommends that the south side yard fencing be altered to conform to the District regulations.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of the existing front door and sidelights with new double doors. Staff finds that this configuration harms both historic materials, the original character of the structure, and the spatial relationships which define the front façade. As such, Staff recommends the plans be altered to include a front door and sidelight arrangement matching the historic front door and sidelights.

Tree and landscaping

Staff has been made aware of the removal of several trees from the property. The Landmark District regulations predate the current Tree Ordinance requirements and include several items which exceed the

minimum requirements of the Tree Ordinance. Staff recommends the trees that have been removed be noted on the site plan. Staff further recommends that replacement trees, as required by the district regulations and meeting the requirements therein, be shown on the site plan.

Pool and Accessory Structure

The Applicant is proposing a new pool and pool building to the rear of the structure. Per the District regulations, Staff finds that the proposal does not harm historic materials and would be constructed in such a way that its removal would not harm either the historic structure or impair the interpretation of the site in the future. Staff further finds that the design of the pool and pool building are clearly secondary to the principal structure and that their uses are customary and subordinate to the primary residential use.

The Zoning Ordinance sets the maximum lot coverage for properties in the Landmark District at 35% of the lot area. The subject property has a lot area of 46,017 sf. The proposed impervious surface including the proposed improvements is 12,458 sf or 27% of the lot area. As such, Staff finds that the lot coverage requirements have been met.

For pools and pool buildings, the zoning ordinance requires a minimum side yard setback of 25' and a minimum rear yard setback of 25'. The proposed pool has a south side yard setback of 35' 5" and a north side yard setback of 27' 9". Staff finds that the proposed pool meets the side yard setback requirements. The pool building contains north and south side yard setbacks of 25' and a rear yard setback measured at 100'. Staff finds that the pool building meets the side yard setback requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The concrete pad in the front yard shall be removed from the plans.
2. The plans shall be altered to include a front door and sidelight arrangement matching the historic front door and sidelights, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
3. The plans shall be revised to show a front stoop matching the layout of the original, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i);
4. The south side yard fencing shall be altered to conform to the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20B.003(7)(a); 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 691 Mayland
APPLICATION: CA3-20-159
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Metropolitan and West of Catherine

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: 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.

ADDITION

The Applicant propose to add 572 sf to the existing to main structure for an owner's suite and laundry room. This new addition will not extend over the side yard or rear setback and meets the FAR requirements. Applicant propose to remove the rear overhang to accommodate the addition which will tuck or extend the existing roof line with a 6.51/2 slope that will tuck under the existing roofline. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The proposed new siding is cementitious siding with a 1inch reveal to match and align with the existing siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

On the new addition proposes to install a savage window. Staff applauds this action and has no concern with the proposal.

Foundation

A brick veneer foundation to match the existing is proposed. Staff is not concerned with this action.

Trim, rafter exposure

The Applicant proposes to install trim, drip-caps and exposed rafters on the new addition that will match what is on the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Siding

The Applicant proposes to remove the asbestos siding that is presently on the house and restore the wood underneath. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing concrete driveway with a brick driveway. Driveway material is condition off the compatibility standard. Through research Staff has determined that most of the driveways are concrete. Therefore, Staff would recommend the driveway remain concrete. If the Applicant wants the material to of the driveway be brick, the Applicant must provide compatibility information demonstrating the brick material.

Fences

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing 6 feet privacy at the end of the driveway and add a gate. Staff is not concerned with the proposal.

The Applicant also proposes to add a 6 feet picket fence at the rear of the property. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

- 1) The driveway shall remain concrete to meet the compatibility standard per, Sec.16-20I.006(4)(c) and
- 2) Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

CA3-20-259 for 691 Mayland
October 14, 2020
Page 3 of 3

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of
Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1715 and 1723 South Ponce de Leon Avenue, NE
APPLICATION: CA3-20-261
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District **Other Zoning:** None

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)?:** Yes, from 9-23-2020

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

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Defer until October 28, 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 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 (#1715) 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 and 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 of 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. The current vehicle access to #1715's garage is via Clifton Road and 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 (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 the Staff's corresponding 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.*

The Applicant submitted a revised design proposal and an accompanying project narrative on October 6, 2020, which is the subject of this new Staff Report.

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 size per unit requirement for a multi-family property. Both properties meet their on-site parking requirements.

Regarding the density, the Landmark District regulations do not have the traditional floor area ratio (FAR) limitations that you might find in other City zoning districts. In the case of a two-family property (like #1715), there is no FAR limitation, other than the effective FAR constraints placed on the property due to the minimum lot size, setbacks, height limitations, and most importantly the architectural compatibility requirements.

In the case of a multi-family property (like #1723), the minimum lot size per unit acts as a proxy for a traditional FAR limitation, as well as the setbacks, height limitations, and architectural compatibility requirements. However, having an accurate measurement of the proposed, total square footage is important as can be seen below in the “Lot Coverage” section of this Staff Report.

As such, the Staff would recommend the Applicant breakdown their square footage calculations for both properties to accurately account for all levels of each building, including attic and basement spaces.

In the accompanying project narrative, the Applicant indicated that they wanted “Home A [to] retain zoning as four living units”. As noted above, the multiple living units are allowed by the current Landmark District regulations, under certain parameters. There is no way to “retain” a certain allowance for living units under the Landmark District regulations. If in the future additional living units want to be added to #1723, that action will have to meet the Landmark District regulations enforce at that time.

Lot Coverage:

For #1715 (the “two-family” property), the lot coverage is fixed in the Landmark District regulations and the proposal meets those limitations.

For #1723, the Landmark District regulations refer to the Land Use Intensity (LUI) Table of the Residential General zoning district (RG) which doesn’t calculate lot coverage per se, but does have total and usable open space requirements which do define lot coverage in a different fashion by requiring minimum amounts of open space (total and usable). Further, the floor area ratio (FAR) that would be applied to the chart is not prescribed by the Landmark District regulations (see above), but rather calculated based on the number of units and the size of the units allowed by the District regulations in relation to the net lot area (see above). For that reason, having an accurate calculation of the proposed, total floor area for #1723 is important to ensure accurate open space calculations.

The LUI Table requires that all calculations related to it be done using gross lot area. Therefore to calculate the effective FAR the total residential square footage proposed would be divided by the gross lot area to determine the resulting effective FAR. That FAR is then found on the LUI chart, which then determines the required open space of the gross lot area and usable open space of the gross lot area. The Staff would recommend the Applicant confirm that their lot coverage and open space calculations take into account this calculation method.

Site Plan Comments:

- There are now two site plans – one for each recognized lot (#1715 and #1723) – and they graphically show the accurate setback lines for each lot and include lot coverage / open space calculations for each lot.
- Though noted in the accompanying project narrative, the revised site plan needs to include calculations (in ratios) for Building D and E confirming their compliance with the slope limitations for constructing single-family units in those locations.
- On the revised site plan, Building C and the addition to Building B do not meet the Clifton Road setback of 50 ft. Both Building C and the addition to Building B would require a variance from that setback requirement or those components of the design will have to be revised.
- The Staff finds that while the revised tree protection and replacement plans appear to meet the basic City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance requirements, the Landmark District requirement of “tree-for-tree” replacement has not been met. The accompanying project narrative indicates that 26 trees will be lost and 19 trees planted for #1715, and 47 trees lost and 30 trees planted for #1723. Neither tree replanting approach meets the Landmark District regulations which go beyond the City of Atlanta Tree Ordinance requirements.
- Regarding the overall loss of trees, it would still appear on the revised site plans 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 still 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. Accompanying project narrative notes the need for a turn around for Building D, which does not appear on the proposed site plan.
- The accompanying project narrative notes that the position of Buildings D and E reflect an interest in privacy between those two buildings and other buildings on site. While the Staff acknowledges this interest, the Staff’s larger concern is how all the buildings relate to the overall property and reinforce the appearance of one primary building with a front yard, a generous rear yard, and additional secondary, outbuildings. As a result, the Staff finds that having the buildings closer together internally is more compatible with the Landmark District than internally further apart.
- Notwithstanding the additional comments below specifically about the design of Building B and C, the off-street parking for Building B and C cannot be within 50 ft. of the Clifton Road right-of-way. The accompanying project narrative notes that a T-shape turn around has been added to the driveway area, but it would still appear that there is excess paving not necessary for maneuvering a vehicle in/out of the garages. The inclusion of a garage for Building B facing the driveway area further adds to the potential for parking within the 50 ft. Clifton Road setback. The parking arrangement for Buildings B and C, even in the revised design is not compatible with the Landmark District. This is a significant concern of the Staff. In the accompanying project description, the Applicant notes that this driveway area is located in a “valley” on the property. While there might a small drop in the grade at this point, this in no way eliminates or even reduces the incompatibility of the proposed cut into the natural grade.
- The vehicle access to Building D and E is somewhat reduced in width from the previous design but still appears to be beyond the 10 ft. nominal width that would be required to safely maneuver a vehicle. The Staff finds that an additional reduction in width is possible. Further, it also appears possible to increase the permeability of the paving through alternative paving material, reducing both the potential impact to numerous tree root zones and potential

stormwater runoff. Lastly, the Staff is concerned that all the buildings have their own individual parking / garage areas. Given the overall need to reduce the “footprint” of the added features to the property (for the reasons noted elsewhere in this Staff Report), the Staff would recommend that less impactful provision for vehicles be used in the proposed design – less areas devoted to parking, access, and maneuvering; and less space devoted to garages.

- While the passing pad in front of the house at #1723 has been removed from the revised design, the driveway is still proposed for expansion along its length in front of #1723. This would not meet the Landmark District regulation of retaining historic paving patterns.
- In the accompanying project narrative, the applicant notes that there will be a fence around the proposed pool (required by the public health code), and that no retaining walls over 4 ft. will be used in the project, except for those around the Building B / C parking / driveway area. However, there will be retaining walls for which details are not included in the revised design. (The concerns over the cut into the natural grade for the Building B /C parking / driveway area - and thus the associated retaining wall - are noted elsewhere in this Staff Report.)
- The revised design notes that the stormwater management plan has been updated to reflect the current design proposal and the Staff’s previous comments. However, in the case of the stormwater management facility on #1715 and the southern one on #1723, the accompanying project narrative notes that these facilities will “convey[ed] [their stormwater] directly into the right of way”. While Staff would assume this means that it would be discharged into the storm sewer of these rights-of-way, that is not explicably noted or described.

Comments that Apply to All or Multiple Buildings:

- In the revised submission, some elevations were provided for all five buildings, with pertinent exterior materials noted on each.
- Building A and B – The inclusion of existing and proposed elevations would greatly help in understanding the implications of the design proposals, particularly the rear elevations where the most change is occurring on both buildings.
- Building C, D, and E – While containing less square footage than Building A (and to some extent Building B), in the revised design submission, they still do not appear as secondary or supporting buildings to the two, main historic buildings on the properties – Building A and Building B. In the case of Building C, which is the most visible (from Clifton Road), the house will appear as a regularly size house very close to Clifton Road, very close to Building B, and will be almost as close to Clifton Road as Building B. It will not appear secondary in any respect to Building B.
- In the revised design proposal, Building C, D, and E contain fewer materials and in more cohesive arrangements, though the Staff still has concerns as noted elsewhere in this Staff Report.
- The number of large “window walls” and all glass, large, metal French doors has been reduced on all of the proposed new buildings, and the paired or grouped windows contain trim separation between individual units simulating historic window spacing.

Building A Comments:

- As noted above, the elevations in the revised design do not show the relationship between the existing house and the addition, which is particularly important as it relates to the roof configuration, building off-sets, and massing / proportionality.
- While the accompanying project description notes that Building A will remain as is and/or be preserved, the Staff would assume there will be some work on the exterior of Building A and as such, those renovation notes should be added to the plans for Building A.
- In the revised design, the addition does not contain triple windows, but rather paired windows.
- In the revised design, the left side of the addition (wrapping around to the rear) does not contain an upper-level terrace but rather a single façade plane.

Building B Comments:

- As noted above, the elevations in the revised design do not show the relationship between the existing house and the addition, which is particularly important as it relates to the roof configuration, building off-sets, and massing / proportionality.
- The accompanying project description notes that the garage will be renovated and turned into living space, noting that French doors will be added – added it appears on the Clifton Road façade. The Staff does not support the inclusion of French doors on this façade. No other renovation details are included in the revised design.
- While the window wall on the first floor of the addition facing Clifton Road has been removed and it does not appear to project towards Clifton Road (though the site plan shows a dashed line indicating an inset porch), the concern now is that façade is a stark, “blank” façade that is presented to Clifton Road. This is accentuated by the very simple and undersized porch columns. Further, the design needs to clarify the existence of a porch, whether inset or projecting.
- There is still an awkward relationship between the addition and the existing portion of Building B, and the addition and the existing garage building even with the current elevations. Further, the addition appears to have both a gable roof and a flat roof. Lastly, the rear elevation shows a complicated roof plan, which could be due to the existing roof’s complications, but the elevations do not make the existing vs. proposed roof form very clear.
- The interior side elevation still 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.
- The most concerning component of Building B is similar to Building C – the inclusion of a three-car, below grade garage that will be highly visible from Clifton Road and will in no way be compatible with the existing house or the Landmark District. This needs to be eliminated from design. While the Staff appreciates the landscaping proposal to hide this significant proposal of the project, it will still be a significant/dramatic cut into the natural grade. Further, this cut be located, on its northside, immediately adjacent to the existing garage and in fact would appear to have the actual three-car garage under the existing garage building. It is not clear to the Staff how this design configuration would actually be built without destroying the existing garage building.
- Lastly, the site plan notes a “new green roof” in what appears to be the location of the existing garage though the elevations do not appear to indicate the same treatment and the Staff is not sure how a “green” roof will be incorporated into the wood-framed, pitched roof of the garage.

Building C Comments:

- The overall design of Building C has been heavily revised, but the concern now is that the design includes two different roof slopes, two main eave lines, and two different roof forms. Further, the front entrance area now includes a wide, low sloped gable that is incompatible with proposed house design and the Landmark District, particularly given its relationship to the façade, the very large vent it includes, and its lack of detailing. Further, this gable accentuates the large expanses of blank wall and three too-small windows on the second story of the house. Lastly, the house includes four window sizes, including on the front façade: two square, one-light windows and a dormer window (with four vertical light division vs. the three across on the double hung windows).
- In the revised design, it is not clear to the Staff the architectural style that the building (and in particular the front façade) is conveying.
- 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 still 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. This is a very significant concern of the Staff and needs to be eliminated from the project.
- One side of this driveway cut will be the side of the front entry stairs, further accentuating the severity of this cut into the natural grade.
- The rear façade now contains a two-story porch, which as a design concept is compatible, however its elements appear undersized for its dimensions and scale.

Building D Comments:

- While the design and material composition has been somewhat simplified in the revised design, including the elimination of quad-grouped windows and the reduction in the difference in the extent of the usable of the different materials, the Staff still has several significant concerns.
- There are now four sizes of windows on the house, two different main eave lines, and two different belt sources at the first floor/second floor location on the facades. This creates stark contrasts in the fenestration pattern on all the elevations.
- The front elevation includes an upper level living area over a fully open porch. This conditioned space over unconditioned space arrangement is not typical for a house in the Landmark District, particularly on a front façade. Similarly, it appears that on the rear façade there is an upper level porch that projects out beyond the lower floor. This too is not consistent with the Landmark District.
- The front porch columns have no articulation or delineation – they bleed into the brick façade around them.
- In summary, while the reduction in materials was helpful, the house still appears architecturally disjointed and internally inconsistent.

Building E Comments:

- While in the revised design the window groupings are more compatible with the Landmark District, the Staff still has several significant concerns.
- The most concerning façade of this building is the “rear” façade, which faces south. This will be the most visible façade of the new buildings, except for the front façade of Building C facing Clifton Road. This façade will be a full three stories tall, with a two-car garage within 35 ft. of the Hardendorf Avenue right-of-way and the side of the northernmost house. The Staff is concerned that rear of the building (which is much more visible outside the property than the front) will in fact be visually bigger than the front. This will significantly reduce the building’s appearance as a secondary, “rear yard” building integrated into the overall composition of the property. This building in particular must appear as an accessory structure to the main house on #1723, which should include a significant reduction in the presence of the parking between the building and Hardendorf Avenue.

Pool Building Comments:

- No renovation / addition plans were included in the submission, though the accompanying design narrative indicates that it will be renovated from an apartment to a pool house.

Summary Comment:

While the Staff agrees that adding living units to each of these properties is possible (as has been done in compliance with the Landmark District regulations with other Ponce de Leon Corridor properties in the past), it must be done in a manner that is compatible with the Landmark District and emphasizes the overall, historic composition of each property – that of large, primary/dominant historic house with ample landscaped/green space around it; secondary, generally smaller accessory structures set within the ample landscaped/green spaces; and paving / hardscape indicative of a single-family property.

There are still significant outstanding issues with this proposal that need to be addressed as noted in this and the previous Staff Report, including: the amount and location of paving; the amount, location, and space dedicated to parking; the loss of trees / tree canopy that would otherwise be indicative of established rear and side yards; the size and relationship of the proposed buildings to the two existing, primary historic houses; the compatibility of the architecture and massing of the proposed additions and buildings to the Landmark District; and the internal design consistency of the proposed houses.

In addition, the Commission cannot issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the project until such time as the variance for the setback encroachments has been addressed or the proposal has been revised to not require a variance. 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 28, 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1319 Greenwich St.

APPLICATION: CA2-20-265

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925.

Property Location: North block face of Greenwich St., west of the Hopkins St. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, an addition, and site work

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

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

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

The District regulations have both quantitative and qualitative requirements for additions and site work. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found that the related regulations were met.

Addition

From the plans submitted, Staff finds that the proposed addition is compatible with the design of the existing structure with few exceptions. Namely, the proposed addition does not contain a visible foundation consistent with the foundation on the existing principal structure. As such, Staff recommends that a visible foundation meeting the District regulations in regard to material be added to the proposed addition.

Site work

The Applicant is proposing a full width rear deck on the structure. Staff would note that the District regulations delegate the review authority for rear decks and other site work to the Office of Design Staff. Per the regulations, the proposed deck is no wider than the existing structure. Staff finds that the proposed deck meets the District regulations and has no concerns with this proposed scope.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. A visible foundation meeting the District regulations in regard to material shall be added to the proposed addition, per Sec. 16-20G.006(5)(a); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 326 Collier Ridge
APPLICATION: CA3-20-267
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1948

Property Location: West of Collier Drive and East of Dale Creak

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work was placed on the property 9/23/2020 for working on exterior without coming to the Commission.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes a 552 sq. Ft on the existing structure for an extend master suite. This new extension will sit behind the existing structure and the roofline extend the existing roof structure. Additionally, this new addition will not violate the setbacks or FAR requirements. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

8-inch smooth face cementitious siding on the new addition that will match the existing siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Windows

On the right-elevation, the Applicant proposes a small window on the new addition. In keeping with the District regulation, new windows' scale, size, proportion, and location of all openings; and the design, light patterns, and material of windows and doors shall be established by the compatibility rule, Staff recommends the Applicant abide by the regulation and install a window that matches the existing windows on the structure.

ALTERATIONS

Front Stoop

On the front elevation, the Applicant proposes to add a gable roof over the front stoop. A front stoop as this is determined by the compatibility standard. The Applicant has one property for comparison. This property does demonstrate a gable roof over the front stoop. While Staff does not see the added gable roof problematic, Staff does recommend the Applicant remove the railings which creates more of a Craftsman element than a minimalist style house.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall abide by the District Regulation and install a window on the right elevation of the new addition that matches the existing windows on the structure, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2(f));
2. The railings on the new proposed front stoop shall be removed to conform to the compatibility standard, per Sec.-20Q.005(3) and
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 180 Walker St.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-287

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Castleberry Hill Landmark District (Subarea 1)

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction: 1988.

Property Location: Southwest corner of Walker St. and Haynes St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and site work

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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

The District regulations have both quantitative and qualitative requirements for additions and site work. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found that the related regulations were met.

Plans

The Applicant has provided elevations which show only the rear façade of the addition and site work. Staff finds that side elevations are required in order to determine the appropriateness of the addition. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit side elevations for the proposed additions.

Use

As the project involves the enclosure of new space dedicated towards the Eating and Drinking Establishment use, Staff finds it is appropriate for the Applicant to document that the total space dedicated towards this use does not exceed the maximum 5,000 sf allowed by the zoning regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation showing that the eating and drinking establishment does not exceed 5,000 sf taking into account the space added by the proposed additions and the outdoor dining.

The District regulations have specific requirements for parking related to the eating and drinking establishment use. The total parking on site is proposed to be reduced from 114 spaces to 113 spaces. Staff additionally finds based on publicly available photographic data that a portion of the space dedicated to parking on the existing and proposed site plan is occupied by an accessory structure which further reduces the available on-site parking. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing that the parking requirements for the eating and drinking establishment use has been met.

The Applicant proposes the removal of an existing outdoor accessory dining area and a new covered outdoor accessory dining area. The District regulations prohibit such a use within 100 feet of a dwelling unless said dwelling is in the same building. Staff recommends the Applicant document the new outdoor accessory dining would comply with the distance requirements of the District regulations.

Addition

The Applicant proposes a rear addition to the existing non-contributing structure. Staff finds that the massing and scale of the addition is consistent with the existing structure. Per the District regulations the fenestration, materials and pattern are subject to the compatibility rule. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the fenestration pattern on the proposed additions.

The District regulations specify that brick and true stucco systems are to be the primary façade materials for additions in the District. The regulations further specify that the use of corrugated metal is prohibited on any façade, except for rooftop additions. In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that the Haynes street facing façade of the structure appears to incorporate an existing brick wall into the addition. However, without elevations showing the side façades of the addition, this cannot be accurately determined. Staff would note that this issue would be resolved by the submission of side façade elevations as recommended earlier in this report. From one of the perspective views, it appears that the Applicant is proposing corrugated metal for a recessed façade on the structure. This material would not be permitted by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends that all façade materials proposed for the addition meet the District regulations and be noted on the plans.

Site Work

The Applicant proposes a new ADA walking ramp and a new covered patio for inclusion on the rear façade of the structure. In reviewing the proposal, Staff has several concerns with the project. Firstly, the columns used on the covered seating area mimic a traditional styling. Existing columns on the structure which were constructed before the designation of the District are similar in style, but do not constitute a comparable

element based on the District regulation due to the fact that they are not historic and the structure on which they are located is non-contributing. As such, Staff recommends the seating area columns be replaced with columns that match the industrial aesthetic of the Landmark District.

The plans also appear to show a wood slat infill for the patio piers and a wood slat screen wall next to the patio area. Staff finds that the use of wood for these elements would not be appropriate given the industrial character of the neighboring buildings and the district as a whole. As such, Staff recommends the proposed slat screen wall and patio foundation infill be metal.

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

1. The Applicant shall submit side elevations for the proposed additions;
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation showing that the eating and drinking establishment does not exceed 5,000 sf taking into account the space added by the proposed additions and the outdoor dining, per Sec. 16-20N.008(2)(d)(i);
3. The Applicant shall provide information detailing that the parking requirements for the eating and drinking establishment use has been met per Sec. 16-20N.008(3)(d);
4. The Applicant shall document the new outdoor accessory dining would comply with the distance requirements of the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20N.010(1)(c);
5. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the fenestration pattern on the proposed additions, per Sec. 16-20N.008(1)(d);
6. All façade materials proposed for the addition shall meet the District regulations and be noted on the plans, per Sec. 16-20N.008(1)(d);
7. The seating area columns shall be replaced with columns that match the industrial aesthetic of the Landmark District, per Sec 16-20N.008(1)(c);
8. The proposed slat screen wall and patio foundation infill shall be metal, per Sec 16-20N.008(1)(c); 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 488 Edgewood Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-20-293
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction 1900

Property Location: West of Daniel and East of

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20C

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.

ADDITIONS

The Applicant proposes to construct an addition on a two-story structure. As well, the Applicant proposes a stair tower for a potential roof top patio. The new addition will extend beyond sides of the existing buildings. While this is the case, Staff is not concern with the side projection. Commercial buildings with zero lot line in MLK subarea are typically close together so having the extension go beyond the existing side is not problematic. Staff notes that at the rear there is an existing easement of a concrete flume. Staff recommends the Applicant verify that this setback is appropriate for the District regulations, Additionally, the Applicant proposes to enclose section of the driveway into a courtyard. Staff is not concerned with the additions.

Fenestration

Staff applauds the proposed steel fins the Applicant demonstrates on the addition. This fenestration will allow for a break in the existing material adding a modern flair to the building. However, Staff would like more information on how this will relate with the window fenestration and recommend the Applicant provide the information or Staff recommends, the Applicant install the fins so that they do not appears to be so imposing and dominate on the addition.

East and South Courtyard

The proposed columns on the proposed East and South elevations of the courtyard appears to be heavy and encloses the window. Staff recommends that Applicant remove the heavy columns and either install lighter columns to expose the window or install a window walls to give a lighter touch

ALTERATIONS

Dumpster

The Applicant proposes to construct a brick enclosed dumpster. To comply with the District regulations, Staff recommends the dumpster be concealed with walls six feet in height and constructed or faced with metal, brick, stone, architectural masonry, or hard coat stucco and shall not be visible from any public street.

Roof

The Applicant proposes a new roof on the existing structure. The Applicant does not specify what a roof means. Staff recommends the Applicant replace in-kind the existing roof.

Windows

For the existing windows, when needed, the Applicant proposes to repair in-kind or replace in-kind if windows are original. For windows that are non-original, the Applicant will replace with historic wood windows that will match the original. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval Upon Conditions

1. The Applicant shall ensure the rear set back complies with the District regulation, per Sec.16-20C.004;
2. The Applicant shall provide more information on the how the steel fin will relate to the windows or the Applicant shall install steel fins that are not as imposing on the new addition per Sec. 16-20C.008(1)(b)(iii);
3. The Applicant shall remove the heavy columns with lighter columns or install a window wall per Sec.16-20C.008(1)(b)(iii);

4. The dumpster shall be concealed with walls six feet in height and constructed or faced with metal, brick, stone, architectural masonry or hard coat stucco shall not be visible from the public street, per Sec.16-20C.008(2)(d)(i);
5. The roof shall be replaced in-kind, per Se.16-20C.008(a) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1094 White Oak
APPLICATION: CA4PH-20-266
MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location West of Peebles and East of Lee Street

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interiors

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Applicant demolish the house, without coming through the Urban Design Commission

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

Type IV Demolition

To apply for an application for the demolition of a historic property due to threats to public health and safety the Applicant must prove the existence of the following criterions below:

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

The Applicant proposes the house was a haven for drug activity and hazard to the other house in the community.

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

The Applicant states that they could not find no alternative solutions other than a full demo of property due to the condition of the foundation of deterioration of the wall termites and collapsed roof.

(3) Demonstrate that the costs associated with rectifying the threat would create a condition whereby the investments in the project are incapable of earning a reasonable economic return.

This finding shall be made by considering, and the applicant shall submit to the commission evidence establishing, each of the following factors:

a) The applicant's knowledge of the landmark designation at the time of acquisition, or whether the property was designated subsequent to acquisition.

b) The current level of economic return on the property as considered in relation to the following:

(1) The amount paid for the property, the date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased.

(2) The annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the previous three (3) years; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous three (3) years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.

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

(4) Real estate taxes for the previous four (4) years and assessed value of the property according to the two (2) most recent assessed valuations.

“WE DO NOT HAVE THE TAXES THE OWNER PURCHASED THE HOME APRIL 2020 AND THE HOME WAS ABANDONED FOR ABOUT 10-15 YEARS (WE DO NOT KNOW ACCURATE LENGTH)”

(5) All appraisals obtained within the previous two (2) years by the owner or applicant in connection with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property.

(6) The fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation and the fair market value of the property (in its protected status as a designated building or site) at the time the application is filed.

“HOME WAS PURCHASED ARPIL 2020 FOR \$73500”

(7) Form of ownership or operation of the property, whether sole proprietorship, for-profit or not-for-profit corporation, limited partnership, joint venture, or both.

“HOME WAS PURCHASED UNDER LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY”

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

“PROPERTY WAS PURCHASED APRIL 2020 NO PAST TAX RETURNS EXIST THAT WE COULD PRESENT.”

(9) That the property if not marketable or able to be sold, considered in relation to any listing of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any, within the previous two (2) years. Including testimony and relevant documents regarding:

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

“PROPERTY IS NOT MARKETABLE”

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

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

“NO ADVERTISEMENT HAS BEEN IN PLACE OR THE PROPERTY”

(10) The infeasibility of alternative uses that can earn a reasonable economic return for the property as considered in relation to the following:

a) A report for a licensed engineer or architect with experience in rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures on the property and their suitability for rehabilitation.

b) Estimate of the cost of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal, and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendation and decision of the commission concerning the appropriateness of the proposed alterations.

October 23, 2019

pg. 4

- c) *Estimated market value of the property in the current condition; after completion of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal; and, in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing property for continued use.*
- d) *In the case of a proposed demolition, the testimony of an architect, developer, real estate consultant, appraiser, or other real estate professional experienced in rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure on the property.*
- e) *The infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer or development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances.*

“THE STRUCTURE OF THE HOME WAS INHABITABLE AND STRUCTURALLY UNSTABLE .THE HOME FOUNDATION WAS MADE FROM BRICK AND MOTAR WHICH HAD DETERIATED BEYOND REPAIR AND SUCH REPAIRS WERE INCAPABLE OF BEING MADE AS TO THE POINT THAT THEY WOULD NOT HOLD UP TO TODAYS CODE.THE HOME WAS UNWALKABLE FOR THE ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER TO GIVE MORE DETAIL THAN THAT THE STRUCTURE ANDN CONDITION OF THE HOME WAS BEYOND REPAIR TO HOLD THE NEW CITY BUILDING CODES FOR THAT AREA.”

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

(12) Provide photographs of the existing conditions of the building, both exterior and interior.

Of the requirements listed above to demonstrate that there was a threat to a reasonable economic return, the Applicant provided few evidences to support this criterion. At the time of the demolition, the Applicant has stated that she was not aware of the historic designation. Which is problematic. Nor has the Applicant provided a cost analysis for renovation of the house. She has only provided the value of the house. Without, the cost to the repairs, it is difficult to determine the economic return.

Staff Analysis

Staff deems the Applicant has not proven beyond a shallow of a doubt the house needed to be demolished. What the Applicant has proven is that the house needed repair due to its age and neglect. Because of this, Staff denies the Applicant reasoning for demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 163 Huntington Rd.

APPLICATION: RC-20-262

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1930.

Property Location: East block face of Huntington Rd., south of the Palisades Rd. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-206: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant

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

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing the removal of the existing driveway and replacing it with a small pea gravel parking pad in the front yard, a landscaped area, and a gravel patio in the rear yard. Staff finds that the preferred location for parking in historic neighborhoods is behind the structure so as to not detract from the contributing qualities of the District. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant pursue a more appropriate design for the parking area. Staff further suggests the Applicant consider the use of historically appropriate paving 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 36 Northwood Ave.

APPLICATION: RC-20-279

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1930.

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

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site Work

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-206: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant

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

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing the in-kind replacement of a portion of the existing driveway and sidewalk. IN looking at the plans proposed by the Applicant, Staff finds that the design of the new driveway and sidewalk will match the design of the existing. As such, Staff has no concerns with this work.

Other Work

The Applicant proposes the installation of a new basement on the property. This work is not subject to a review by the Commission.

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

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of
Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: White Street, SW (close to 1090 White Street, SW)

APPLICATION: RC-20-294

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: NA

Other Zoning: NA

Date of Construction: NA

Property Location: White Street, under Atlanta Beltline right-of-way, West End neighborhood

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

Building Type / Architectural form/style: NA

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Public art installation.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: None

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043 **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None.

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

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043.

The proposal is to install a painted mural on the embankments and columns along the side of White Street supporting the Atlanta Beltline bridge above, as well as the railings along the Atlanta Beltline bridge itself.

The Staff has no concerns about the painting of the infrastructure features below the Atlanta Beltline, but would caution about the method of attachment to the Atlanta Beltline bridge railing so to not damage the metal railing if/when the mural is changed, removed or otherwise revised.

The Staff would recommend that given the inclusion of a date (“1835”) in the mural, a small interpretive panel or similar be installed to explain the significance of the date. This could also contain information about the artist and program under which this art was installed.

The Staff would also recommend the Applicant clarify how the maintenance of the public art will be accomplished, including frequency, responsible entity, and techniques.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm delivery of comments at the 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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of
Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1460 West Peachtree Street

APPLICATION: RC-20-320

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: NA

Other Zoning: NA

Date of Construction: 1931

Property Location: 1460 West Peachtree Street, near the intersection of Peachtree Street in Midtown Atlanta

Contributing (Y/N)?: Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Georgian Revival Garden Apartment

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: National Register nomination.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: None

Relevant Code Sections: NA

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None.

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

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043.

The National Register of Historic Places is the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preservation. Authorized by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Park Service's National Register of Historic Places is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America's historic and archeological resources.

The Winwood Apartments is a 2-story, 24-unit building located in Midtown Atlanta. Its U-shape and architectural composition is an excellent example of an early 20th-century garden style apartment.

The defining characteristics include its setback from the street, its symmetrical form, enclosed garden / courtyard, separate entrances for each living unit, a distinct front and back, as well as rear service entrances and rear parking area. Its lack of porches and use of brick further define it as a great example of this building type and style.

The property is significant for its architectural form (as noted above) and its architectural style – that of Georgian Revival. It is significant for community planning and development as a good example of the apartment development that proliferated in Atlanta in the 1920s and 1930s due to rising property values, better transportation options (streetcar and automobile), and an increasing white middle-class population that found apartment living more acceptable or in some cases a necessity.

The Staff strongly supports the nomination of the Winwood Apartments to the National Register of Historic Places.

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

cc: File