



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

JAMES SHELBY
Commissioner

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-016) for an addition and other renovations at **685 Grady Place**-Property is zoned R-4A/West End Historic District.

Applicant: Michael Edey
556 John Wesley Dobbs

Facts: According to the West End Historic district inventory this dwelling is considered contributing. In looking at the Fulton County tax records available online, this dwelling was built in 1920.

On November 12, 2008, the Commission approved an application for Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (HD-08-366) to allow re-siding and replacement of windows at 685 Grady Place, with the following conditions:

- 1) The replacement siding shall be wood with a 4”-6” reveal, per Section 16-20G.006(2)(d);
- 2) All windows shall be wood, true divided lite, have appropriate headers, trim, actual sills and no lower apron, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(c);
- 3) All windows visible from the public right-of way shall be 6 over 6, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(c);
- 4) The windows on the right side of the front façade shall be a large bank of 6 over 6 windows flanked by 4 over 4, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(c); and
- 5) Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 16-20G.005 of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

The following general regulations shall apply to the West End Historic District.

- (1) *Certificates of Appropriateness:* Certificates of appropriateness within this district shall be required as follows:
 - (a) *When required:*
 - (i) To change the exterior appearance of any portion of a structure within the district, when said change can be seen from the public right-of-way;
 - (b) *Type required:*
 - (i) Type I certificates of appropriateness for ordinary repairs and maintenance are not required in this district. This exemption in no way obviates the requirements for certificates of appropriateness for all

minor alterations (type II), major alterations (type III) and demolitions (type IV, except partial demolitions) as set forth in chapter 20 of this part 16.

(2) *The Compatibility Rule:* The compatibility rule is a method of requiring that alterations and new construction are sensitive and sympathetic to existing elements of design, scale and general character of the district with particular attention to the immediate environment constituting a particular block. In accordance with this purpose, the compatibility rule is as follows: "To the maximum extent possible, the element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall substantially match that which predominates on that block. When elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor height, they shall equal the statistical average of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

Sec. 16-20G.006. - Specific regulations.

In addition to the general regulations set forth in section 16-20G.005, and any other applicable regulations, the following regulations shall apply to all rehabilitations, new construction, alterations, and other changes:

(1) *Generally:* The following building elements and architectural features shall be considered when applying section 16-20.009 of this chapter to the West End Historic District: doors, windows, foundations, finished floor elevations, roofs, roof features, gutters, downspouts, cornices, siding, porches, steps, terraces, dormers, shutters, awnings, gateways, archways, louvres, walls, fences, and gates.

(2) *Building Façades:*

- (a) All new construction shall conform to the existing building orientation by having sidewalks, front yards, porches and front doors facing and parallel to the street, and if located on a corner, the main façade shall face the principal street whenever possible.
- (b) At a minimum, the front of all new construction, including any portion thereof, shall be placed at the distance from the street determined by the compatibility rule. This requirement shall also apply to those sides of corner lots which also face a street.
- (c) All building materials, which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, are subject to the compatibility rule.
- (d) Siding repair or replacement shall match the original in material, scale and direction. For new construction and additions, brick, wood or horizontal smooth cementitious siding is permitted.
- (e) Contemporary design of new construction, compatible with adjacent and surrounding structures, is permitted.
- (f) Height of the first floor of the front façade above grade shall be subject to the compatibility rule. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, the first floor of the principal structure shall be on foundations and shall be elevated above grade at the front façade a minimum of two entrance risers each of which shall be not less than seven inches in height. Slab-on-grade construction is not permitted.
- (g) No structure shall exceed that height established by the compatibility rule.

(3) *Windows and Doors:*

- (a) Architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trimwork, and framing, shall be retained.
- (b) Original window and door openings shall not be blocked or enclosed, in whole or in part.
- (c) Replacement windows and doors shall be permitted only when originals cannot be rehabilitated. Replacement windows and doors shall match the original in style, materials, shape and size, with no more than a one-inch width or height difference from the original size. The use of simulated divided lite windows is permitted.
- (d) If muntins and/or mullions are used, such muntins and/or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass.
- (e) The replacement and reconfiguration of windows on the side elevations to accommodate kitchens and bathrooms is permitted.
- (f) Dropped ceilings, when located below the head of a window, shall be sufficiently recessed from the window opening to maintain the original exterior appearance.

(g) New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.

(h) The ratio of openings to solid for all new construction (for example, windows to wall) shall be established by the compatibility rule.

(i) The scale, size, proportion, and location of all openings in new construction shall be established by the compatibility rule.

(j) New windows or doors added to existing structures shall be located façades that don't face a public street.

(k) New or replacement doors shall be made of wood and shall contain a rectangular light opening subject to the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion placement, and style to original doors within that block face.

(4) *Storm Doors, Storm Windows, Shutters and Awnings:*

(a) Shutters shall not be added to the building if they were not a part of the original building.

(b) Shutters shall be operable or appear operable, and shall fit the size of the window.

(c) Replacement shutters shall match the original shutters in design, materials and configuration.

(d) Storm doors, screen doors or storm windows shall be of compatible design and shall not cover, obscure or dominate significant architectural details.

(e) Fabric and metal awnings are permitted. All other types of canopies and awnings are prohibited.

(5) *Foundations:*

(a) Foundation materials, including infill materials, shall replicate the original materials in size, shape, color, texture and mortar, and shall be installed using construction techniques similar to the original.

(b) New foundations shall be of masonry or concrete construction. Other foundation materials are permitted provided they are appropriate to the building on which they are located and in scale, materials and style with adjacent and surrounding buildings.

(c) Slab on grade is not permitted.

(d) Lattice, painted concrete block, brick or stucco shall be used as infill between foundation masonry piers when infill is otherwise required.

(6) *Chimneys:*

(a) Chimneys shall match original materials, mortar, color and pattern whenever possible.

(b) New chimneys shall be faced with brick or stucco.

(c) Siding on chimneys is prohibited.

(d) When any portion of a chimney is visible from a public street as a façade element, the chimney shall originate at grade.

(7) *Roofs:*

(a) Replacement roofing materials shall be of the same size, texture and material as existing, exposed roofing materials when the existing, exposed roofing materials constitute a significant architectural feature of the structure.

(b) Cold-rolled roofing is permitted only on flat roofs. Corrugated metal and corrugated fiberglass roofs are not permitted.

(c) The use of synthetic roofing materials is permitted if not visibly distinguishable from the original as viewed from the public street.

(d) The shape and pitch of roofs for new construction shall be subject to the compatibility rule.

(9) *Porches:*

(a) Architecturally significant porches, including their component features, steps and stoops shall be retained.

(b) Replacement porches, steps and stoops shall match the original in size, style and materials. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.

(c) Porches may be enclosed with screen wire or glass provided that the main characteristics of a front porch are maintained.

(d) New or replacement porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other features consistent with the architectural style of the house or other original porches in that block. The height of the top rail shall be no more than 33 inches above the finish porch floor, except as required by the City's building code.

Façade Changes

In 2008 the owner at the time replaced the windows and siding without appropriate approval by the Commission and without a permit. In looking at pictures submitted by the Applicant, the conditions of the previous approval were never met and a permit was never obtained. As the regulations have been revised to allow the use of simulated divided lite, Staff recommends all previous conditions of approval be met with a revision to allow the use of simulated divided lite.

The proposed elevation indicates a larger gable window with a different shape. As there is no indication the existing gable window is beyond repair, Staff recommends the existing gable window is retained. The existing front door is not historic or appropriate. The proposed elevations indicate a new door, however the material details are not indicated. Staff recommends the front façade door meet the requirements.

Site

The lot in question fronts 50' on Grady Place and has a depth of 160'. Per underlying zoning, the side yard shall be no less than 7' and the rear yard shall be no less than 15'. Staff finds the proposed side and rear yard setbacks meet the setback requirement.

Per underlying zoning, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) allowed is .50. The Applicant did not provide documentation of the proposed FAR. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the FAR requirement has been met. Per underlying zoning, the lot coverage shall be no less than 55%. The Applicant did not provide calculations regarding the lot coverage. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the lot coverage requirement has been met.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing both an addition on the right side of the house and a second story addition. The proposed side addition will not project beyond the existing side façade of the house. The overall design and materials of the side addition meets the regulations. Staff does not have concerns regarding the side addition.

The proposed second story addition will be very visible from the street. Staff finds the height of the proposed addition has a negative impact on the existing historic house. Per regulations, the height of the addition has to meet the compatibility rule. The Applicant has not provided any documentation that the height of the addition meets the height requirement. All of the houses on the block face are single-story, therefore Staff finds it doubtful the proposed addition will meet the height requirement. Staff recommends the Applicant provide height information for the historic houses on the block face. Staff recommends the addition meet the height requirement.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

- a) The plans minimally meet the regulations, with the exceptions noted in the above analysis, per Section 16-20G.006.

Staff recommends approval of the Application for Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-016) for an addition and other renovations at **685 Grady Place**-Property is zoned R-4A/West End Historic District, with the following conditions:

- 1) The replacement siding shall be wood with a 4"-6" reveal, per Section 16-20G.006(2)(d);
- 2) All windows shall be wood, true divided lite or simulated divided lite, have appropriate headers, trim, actual sills and no lower apron, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(c);
- 3) All windows visible from the public right-of way shall be 6 over 6, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(c);
- 4) The windows on the right side of the front façade shall be a large bank of 6 over 6 windows flanked by 4 over 4, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(c);
- 5) The existing gable window shall be retained, per Section 16-20G.006;
- 6) The front façade door shall meet the requirements, per Section 16-20G.006
- 7) The Applicant shall provide documentation the FAR requirement has been met, per Section 16-06A.008(5);
- 8) The Applicant shall provide documentation the lot coverage requirement has been met, per Section 16-06A.008(6);
- 9) The Applicant shall provide height information for the historic houses on the block face, per Section 16-20G.006(2)(g);
- 10) The addition shall meet the height requirement, per Section 16-20G.006(3)(a); and
- 11) Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

JAMES SHELBY
Commissioner

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT

February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Review and Comment (RC-13-020) on the demolition of a City of Atlanta owned property at **1148 Lotus Avenue** - Property is zoned R-4A.

Applicant: Daphne Talley
55 Trinity Avenue

Facts: This City of Atlanta property is located in the Almond Park neighborhood in NPU G.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:
Per section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code, as amended:

(5) The commission shall review the proposed location and design of buildings, bridges, viaducts, elevated ways, streets, highways, gates, fences, railings, lamp standards, and other structures or fixtures to be erected or placed on land belonging to the city, or on any private or public property which extends over or upon any property or right-of-way owned or controlled by the city.

Per Section 16-20.009. Same; further standards.

In deciding individual applications for certificates of appropriateness, the commission shall be guided by the purposes set forth in section 16-20.001, by findings contained in ordinances designating buildings and sites for protection, by purposes and objectives which are contained within individual Landmark and Historic District regulations, and by findings contained in reports prepared in support of Landmark and Historic District regulations as are required in article D of chapter 4 of part 6. Furthermore, in considering whether to grant approval, conditional approval or denial of an application for a type II or type III certificate of appropriateness, the commission shall apply the following standards:

- (1) Every reasonable effort shall be made to adapt the property in a manner which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment.
- (2) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.
- (3) Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.
- (4) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, object or site shall be kept where possible.
- (5) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should reflect the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

- (6) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to buildings, structures or sites shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building, structure or site would be unimpaired.

The Applicant is proposing to demolish an existing City of Atlanta property. In looking at pictures submitted by the Applicant, it is clear the existing building is heavily damaged due to a fire and fallen trees. The building is so damaged it is not clear what the structure originally looked like. In looking at the Fulton County property records available online, this was a 2 bedroom, 1 bathroom Ranch style house built in 1952 with a siding exterior. This building would have been considered historic, however it has no integrity left.

The Applicant details all the repairs necessary to fix the problems with the house. The cost to repair the house is estimated to be \$69,435.09. According to the Fulton County records, the building is valued at \$19,900. Staff finds that the cost to repair the building is significantly higher than the building is worth. Further, when all repairs are done, it would be a new house. Given the current condition of the property, Staff has no concerns with the proposed demolition.

Staff recommends the Commission deliver comments at the meeting.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

JAMES SHELBY
Commissioner

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-022) for additions and other renovations at **2870 Fabin Street**- Property is R-4A/Whittier Mill Historic District.

Applicant: Sara E. Andrews
1020 Riverbend Club Drive, SE

Facts: According to the Whittier Mill inventory, this house was built in 1927 and is considered contributing.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Sec. 16-20J.005. General regulations.

The following regulations shall apply to all properties within the Whittier Mill Historic District:

- (1) *The Compatibility Rule:* The compatibility rule is a method of requiring that alterations and new construction are sensitive and sympathetic to existing elements of design, scale and general character of the district with particular attention to the immediate environment constituting a particular block. In accordance with this purpose, the compatibility rule is as follows: "To the maximum extent possible, the element in question, such as roof form or architectural trim, shall substantially match that which predominates on that block. When elements are quantifiable, such as building height or floor heights, they shall equal the statistical average of all like elements of all structures of like use in that block." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

In addition to the general regulations set forth in section 16-20J.005, and any other applicable regulations, the following regulations shall apply to all properties located within Residential Subarea I:

- (1) *Certificates of Appropriateness:* Certificates of appropriateness within this subarea shall be required as follows:
 - a. *When required:*
 1. To change the exterior appearance of the following elements of a structure within the subarea, when said changes can be seen from the public right-of-way: foundations, siding, chimneys and roofs;
 2. To change the exterior appearance of the following elements of the front facade of a structure: windows, doors, architectural details and porches. For the purpose of this chapter, front facade means the elevation of the building which faces the front yard as defined in code of ordinances section 16-28.007(3) and (4).
 3. To erect a new structure;
 - b. *Type required:*

1. Type I certificates of appropriateness for ordinary repairs and maintenance are not required in this subarea. This exemption in no way obviates the requirements for certificates of appropriateness for all minor alterations (Type II), major alterations (Type III) and demolitions (Type IV, except partial demolitions).
- (2) *Architectural Standards:*
- a. *Building facades:*
 1. All new construction shall conform to the existing building orientation by having porches and front doors facing the front yard.
 2. At a minimum, the front of all new construction, including any portion thereof, shall be placed at the distance from the street determined by the compatibility rule.
 3. There shall be two (2) side yards, one (1) on each side of the principal building, each having a width of not less than the width of the side yards for the block as established by the compatibility rule.
 4. There shall be a rear yard of not less than 10 feet.
 5. All building materials which upon completion are visible from the public right-of-way, shall be compatible with those which predominate in the subarea.
 6. Siding repair or replacement shall match the original materials in scale and direction. Wood clapboard, if original, is preferred; however, aluminum, masonite, vinyl or other horizontal siding is permitted if window trim, cornerboards, and fascia/bargeboards are left in place or replaced with new material to match the original.
 7. No new construction of additions shall exceed the height of the existing structure on the site or, for new construction, that of the tallest structure of like use on the block
 - b. *Windows and doors*
 1. New doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and design to existing windows and doors.
 2. The ratio of openings to solid for all new construction (for example, windows to wall) shall be established by the compatibility rule, with a permitted differential of ten (10) percent.
 3. New exterior doors shall be wood panel or fixed glass panel in wood frame. In the alternative, metal doors may be used if their design matches that of an original door.
 - c. *Foundations:*
 1. Foundations shall be of brick, painted concrete block or stuccoed.
 2. Foundations shall be of masonry pier or continuous wall construction closed with solid or screen infill wall.
 3. Lattice, painted concrete block, brick or stucco shall be used as infill between foundation masonry piers when infill is otherwise required.
 4. Slab on grade is not permitted.
 - d. *Roof:*
 1. Cold-rolled roofing is permitted only on flat roofs.
 2. Corrugated metal and corrugated fiberglass roofs are not permitted.
 3. The shape and pitch of roofs for new construction shall be subject to the compatibility rule.
 4. Dormers shall not be permitted on the roof over the front facade of any structure.
 5. Skylights, solar panels and communication equipment, when otherwise allowed by these or other regulations, are not permitted on the roof over the front facade of any structure.
- Walls and fences:*
1. Front yard closure walls are not permitted.
 2. Fences in the front yard of any structure shall be of wood picket type construction.
 3. Retaining walls which are located in the front yard shall have a finished masonry surface constructed of materials compatible with the exterior finish of the principal dwelling. Retaining walls shall be integrated into the landscape
- g. Porches:*
1. Architecturally significant front porches, steps and stoops shall be retained, whenever possible.

2. Replacement front porches, steps and stoops shall match the original in size, design and materials.
 3. Front porches may be enclosed with screenwire or glass if the main characteristics of a front porch are maintained.
 4. Front porches shall be required for the development of new homes and the compatibility rule shall apply or columns shall be six-inch by six-inch posts; the top and bottom rails of the balustrade shall be constructed of two-inch by four-inch lumber or the equivalent; the top rail shall not be higher than 36 inches above the porch floor; the bottom rail of the balustrade shall be three (3) to four (4) inches above the porch floor; and the individual balusters shall be constructed of two-inch by two-inch lumber and shall not be more than four (4) inches apart.
 5. Front porches shall contain balustrades, columns and other characteristics including floor dimension, height, roof pitch and overhang consistent with historic features for porches in that block, although standard lumber is permitted.
 6. New decks shall be permitted to the rear of the house.
- j. *Architectural details:*
1. Exterior architectural details, such as brackets, decorative trim, corner boards, windows moldings, railings, columns, steps and doors, which contribute to the character of the buildings and appear on the front façade, shall be retained, restored or replaced to match the original in dimension and design.

Site Plan

The lot in question fronts 129' on Fabian Street and has a depth of 79.5' on its longest side. The Applicant is proposing to add an additional porch on the front façade and an addition on the rear facade. Per regulations, the front yard setback shall be based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant has not provided information regarding the front yard setbacks on the block. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the new portion of the front porch meets the front yard setback requirements. Per regulations, the rear yard setback shall be no less than 10'. Staff finds the rear yard setback requirement has been met.

Per regulations, the side yard setbacks shall be based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing rear addition and keep the foundation. As the foundation will be retained, the re-built portions of the previous addition do not need to meet the setback requirements. The proposed rear screened porch is beyond the existing footprint and therefore must meet the side yard setback requirements. The Applicant did not provide compatibility information for the side yard setbacks. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the side yard setback requirements have been met.

Per underlying zoning, the maximum lot coverage allowed is 55%. The Applicant did not provide lot coverage calculations. In looking at the site plan, Staff finds it likely the lot coverage requirement has been met. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the lot coverage requirement has been met. Per underlying zoning, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) allowed is .50 of the net lot area. The Applicant has not provided calculations for the FAR. While Staff finds it likely the project meets the FAR requirement, Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the FAR requirement has been met.

Front Porch

In looking at the survey pictures and notations regarding the original structure, this house was originally a duplex with two separate porches. Before the districts designation, the roof, columns and railings on the west elevation porch were removed. The Applicant is proposing to add a new foundation, railings and columns at the center of the front elevation in order to create one full width

porch. The Applicant is also proposing to remove the stairs on left side of the front elevation and add a new set of stairs on the right of the front elevation. A new roof will be installed to create one cohesive roof for the proposed full width porch.

In looking at the survey book and pictures submitted by the Applicant, there are several examples of similar houses with similar porches. There are also other examples of similar houses with two separate porches. Per regulations, existing historic porches and its elements shall not be replaced. If replacement is warranted, the porch and its elements shall be replaced in-kind. While the proposed porch meets the regulations for new construction, Staff finds the proposed porch would significantly impact the overall character and interpretability of the existing historic structure. Staff finds as currently proposed, the front porch does not meet the regulations for historic structures. As such, Staff recommends the front porch is either revised to meet the regulations or the Applicant shall apply for a variance.

Rear Addition

The Applicant is proposing to demolish an existing rear addition in order to construct a new addition and screened porch. Per regulations, a Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness for a partial demolition is only required when the proposed demolition would result in the loss of significant architectural features or destroys the importance or interpretability of the front façade. In this case, Staff finds the proposed partial demolition does not require a Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness application. Staff does not have a concern regarding the demolition of the existing addition in order to re-build an existing addition and add a new rear screened porch.

The proposed addition has a design, massing, materials and architectural details that are consistent and compatible with the existing house. The height of the addition drops below the existing ridgeline and therefore the front façade of the house is not impacted. Overall, Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed addition.

Renovations

The Applicant is proposing to replace all of the existing windows. There are notations in the survey book that all of the existing windows were replaced before the district designation. As all of the windows are not original or historic, Staff has no concerns with their replacement. The Applicant is proposing to install 6 over 6, vinyl, simulated divided lite windows. Staff finds the overall design of the windows is appropriate and compatible with the windows on other historic houses on the block. Staff finds the material of the windows does not meet the regulations. The original windows were not vinyl, they would have been wood. As such, Staff recommends all new windows are wood.

The Applicant is proposing to replace two doors on the front façade. Staff finds the existing doors are not original or historic, therefore Staff has no concerns regarding the replacement of the doors. Staff recommends the new doors be either fixed glass in a wood frame or a wood panel door to meet the regulations.

Fence

The Applicant is proposing to remove an existing chain link fence in order to install a 6' wood privacy fence. Staff has no concerns regarding the removal of the existing chain link fence. Staff finds the overall height and materials of the fence meet the regulations. The locations of the existing and proposed fence are not indicated on the site plan. Staff recommends the site plan indicate the location and height of the proposed fence.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

- (a) The plans meet the regulations, with the exception of the notes above, per Section 16-20J.005 and 16-20J.006.

Staff recommends approval of Application for a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-022) for additions and other renovations at 2870 Fabian Street- Property is R-4A/Whittier Mill Historic District, with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide documentation the new portion of the porch meets the front yard setback requirements, per Section 16-20J.006(6)(a)(2);
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation the side yard setback requirements have been met, per Section 16-20J.006(6)(a)(2);
3. The Applicant shall provide documentation the lot coverage requirement has been met, per Section 16-06A.008(6);
4. The Applicant shall provide documentation the FAR requirement has been met, per Section 16-06A.008(5);
5. The front porch design shall either revised to meet the regulations or the Applicant shall apply for a variance, per Section 16-20J.006(g)(1) and (2);
6. Staff recommends all new windows are wood, per Section 16-20J.006(2)(b);
7. The front facade doors shall either fixed glass in a wood frame or a wood panel door to meet the regulations, per Section 16-20J.006(2)(b);
8. The site plan shall indicate the location and height of the proposed fence; and
9. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans.



KASIM REED
MAYOR

CITY OF ATLANTA
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
<http://www.atlantaga.gov/Government/Planning.aspx>

JAMES E. SHELBY
COMMISSIONER

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
DIRECTOR
Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT
February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Review and Comment (RC-13-027) for a variance (V-13-001) to reduce the transitional rear yard setback from 20' to 10' to allow for the installation of additional parking and a special exception (V-13-004) to reduce on-site parking from 40 spaces (required) to an undetermined number (possibly 14) at **135 Krog Street** – Property is zoned C-2/Beltline/ Inman Park Historic (Subarea 3).

Applicant: Eric Kronberg
1359 LaFrance Street

Facts: The property is located on the east side of Krog Street, at the northeast corner of West Ashland Avenue. Recently, the Commission approved the replat of this property (CA3-13-015) to separate it from a very large parcel shown on the City's plat map which extended from the end of Krog Street behind Lake Avenue and West Ashland Avenue. (For non-residentially zoned property in the City of Atlanta, the subdivision of land is accomplished by "replatting" the parcels to the desired configuration.)

The replatted property that is the subject of this application includes a one-story, metal warehouse / light commercial building and concrete loading / parking area. To the north and east of this building on the now separate piece of property is a contemporary residential development that was completed prior to the District's designation. To the south of the property, across West Ashland Avenue, are the back yards of single family houses. To the west, across Krog Street, are additional commercial and mixed-use buildings. None of the existing buildings on the property are considered contributing to the District.

At this time, the Commission is commenting on the variances / special exceptions (V-13-001 and V-13-004) that are before the Board of Zoning Adjustment related to the redesign of the existing building and property. The actual redesign of the existing building and property, including any variances or special exceptions from the Historic District regulations, will be before the Commission at a future date.

The Staff had discussions with the development team prior to the submission of their application both to discuss the project itself, as well as the coordination of the Beltline Overlay Zoning and District reviews.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code:

(e) Powers and Duties: The commission is the city agency responsible for developing and administering the city's historic preservation and urban design activities and shall have the following powers and duties:

(6) The commission shall review and make written recommendation to the zoning review board and to the board of zoning adjustment on any proposed action pending before said boards regarding any building, site or district which has been designated for historic protection pursuant to this article or by chapter 20 of part 16 of the Code of Ordinances.

The general regulations of the District, which apply to Subarea 3, address the overall, broad design criteria and characteristics of a proposed project. The Subarea 3 regulations (where the project site is located) have additional, more-detailed regulations that address allowed uses, density (and potential density bonuses), setbacks, transitional heights, the location and design of off-street parking, vehicle access, loading and servicing, and sidewalk and streetscape requirements.

The Staff finds the proposed variance and special exception would not affect the ability of the currently proposed project to meet the District regulations given that the variance and special exception would not require, but allow for: the existing parking to remain (special exception) and new “grasspave area” parking to be established on the property (variance).

The Subarea 3 regulations prohibit off-street parking between the building and the street. The variance to reduce the transitional yard would be for parking along the eastern property line that is not between the building and the street. The special exception to reduce the required parking provided on-site allows the parking area already established to remain on the property. The potential conflict arises for the “new grasspave area” to the east (left) of the established parking area in front of the east-west oriented portion of the building. If the “new grasspave area” were to be established as a parking lot, it would require a variance from the Subarea 3 regulations and it would be assessed using the standard City of Atlanta variance criteria. The variance and special exception could be approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the final design of the parking (both established area and “new grasspave area”) would still be subject to approval by the Commission per the Subarea 3 regulations.

Therefore, the variance and special exception would not supersede the requirement for the issuance of the pertinent certificate of appropriateness as required by the District regulations for any physical changes to the properties, including but not limited to parking, curb cuts, general site work, or building alterations.

Staff recommendation: A letter with comments be sent to the Applicant and the appropriate Staff of the Office of Planning regarding Review and Comment (RC-13-027) for a variance (V-13-001) to reduce the transitional rear yard setback from 20' to 10' to allow for the installation of additional parking and a special exception (V-13-004) to reduce on-site parking from 40 spaces (required) to an undetermined number (possibly 14) at **135 Krog Street**.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

JAMES SHELBY
Commissioner

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT

February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-028) for dormer additions at **215 Degrass Avenue** – Property is zoned R-5/Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1).

Applicant: Chad Hermanson
215 Degrass Avenue

Facts: According to the District inventory sheet, the house was built in 1907 and is considered contributing to the District. The one-story, hipped-roof cottage sits on a rectangular lot. The front portion of the lot sits even with the sidewalk grade, while the rear portion drops off.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 16-20L.005 of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:
The following general regulations shall apply to all properties located within the Inman Park Historic District.

1. General criteria.
 - a. Except as otherwise provided herein, the procedures for determining the appropriate type of certificate of appropriateness shall be those specified in section 16-20.008 of the Zoning Code.
 - b. In the Inman Park Historic District, the commission shall apply the standards referenced below only if the standards set forth elsewhere in this chapter 20L do not specifically address the application including multifamily residential, institutional, commercial, industrial and mixed use structures in Subarea 1:
 - i. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
 - ii. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 - iii. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes shall not be undertaken that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties.
 - iv. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
 - v. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques, or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property, shall be preserved.
 - vi. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, texture, and, where possible, materials.

- vii. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.
 - viii. Archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
 - ix. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
 - x. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- d. Compatibility rule:
- i. The intent of the mayor and council in establishing the regulations of the Inman Park Historic District is to ensure that alterations to existing structures, and new construction, in Subarea 1 and alterations to existing contributing structures in Subarea 2 and Subarea 3 are compatible with the historic design, scale, and general character of the entire district as it existed in 1945, of the contributing structures in each subarea, and of the contributing structures in the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block face; and further, to ensure that lot platting in Subarea 1 is compatible with the historic platting pattern of Subarea 1 and of a particular block face as it existed in 1945.
 - ii. To further that intent and simultaneously permit flexibility in design, the regulations provide a compatibility rule which is as follows:
 - (a) 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.
 - (b) Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) it shall be compatible with that which predominates in contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.
 - f. Building height shall be measured on the front elevation from the average point of grade on the front elevation to the highest point of the roof or façade, whichever is higher.
2. Certificates of appropriateness.
- a. Notwithstanding any other provision herein, no certificate of appropriateness shall be required unless, at a minimum, the work would otherwise require a building permit.
 - d. Type III certificates of appropriateness shall be reviewed by the commission and shall be required for:
 - ii. Additions that are visible from a public street or park, unless such additions are specifically exempted from a certificate of appropriateness in the subarea regulations.

Sec. 16-20L.006. - Specific regulations for Inman Park Core District, Subarea 1.

In the Inman Park Core District, Subarea 1, the commission shall apply the standards referenced in section 16-20L.005(1)(b) only if the standards set forth below in this chapter 20L do not specifically address the application:

- 1. Design standards and other criteria for construction of and for additions to one- and two-family residential structures.
 - f. The compatibility rule shall apply to the form and pitch of the primary roof of the principal structure.
 - g. The compatibility rule shall apply to the height, scale, and massing of the principal structure, except as noted below. In no case shall the height of a structure exceed 35 feet. (See section 16-28.022 for excluded portions of structure.)
 - i. The height of additions shall not be subject to the compatibility rule, but shall be no higher than the existing structure.
 - ii. Notwithstanding the compatibility rule, any new roof ridge line shall be no higher than the highest roof ridge line of the existing structure.
 - n. The compatibility rule shall apply to the following aspects of fenestration, if visible from a public street or park upon completion:
 - i. The style of the individual window.

- (1) Windows in the front façade shall be predominantly vertical in proportion.
- (2) If muntins and/or mullions are used, such muntins and/or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass.
- (3) Window and door casings widths and depths are subject to the compatibility rule.
 - ii. The size and shape of individual window openings.
 - iii. The overall pattern of fenestration as it relates to the building façade.
- o. Mechanical equipment shall be located to the side and rear of the principal structure and where possible in the location least visible from a public street or park. Screening with appropriate plant material or fencing is required if the equipment is visible from a public street or park.
- p. Wood lap siding, cementitious lap siding, brick, stone, external insulating finishing system ("EIFS"), and true stucco systems are permissible building materials for the façade of the principal structure. Corrugated metal, aluminum siding, and vinyl siding are not permitted.
- q. The compatibility rule shall apply to building materials and design elements, if visible from a public street or park upon completion, and in addition to all other applicable regulations, as follows:
 - i. The dimensions of the exposed face of lap siding and wood shingles.
 - vi. The materials and pattern of roofing.
- 2. *Setback requirements:*
 - b. *New additions to existing structures:* The following setback requirements and maximum floor area ratio shall apply to all permitted uses of new additions to existing structures: Rear setbacks shall be subject to the compatibility rule. The compatibility rule shall not apply to the front and side setbacks of any addition to an existing structure, however the front and side yard setbacks of the addition shall not be less than the respective setback, at its closest point, of the existing structure.
- 4. *Principal uses and structures:*
 - a. Properties that have an underlying zoning designation of R-5 shall be used only for the following principal purposes subject to the following provisions:
 - v. Floor area ratio shall not exceed 0.50.

Site Work

No site work is proposed as part of the project.

Setbacks and General Development Controls

The proposed side dormer and rear dormer addition met the District setback requirements as they are larger than the existing house's side and rear yard setbacks. The floor area ratio will be less than .50.

Side Dormer

The Staff does not have any concerns about the side dormer. Its materials, roofing pattern, window design, and trim will match that of the existing house and its ridge line is slightly lower than that of the main roof.

Rear Dormer Addition

Initially, it was thought that the rear dormer would not be visible from the public street. While the two adjacent houses are close to the subject property and the proposed addition is located on the rear roof plane, the Staff finds that given the size of the rear dormer addition, the side roof planes will be visible.

The rear dormer addition meets all of the setback requirements and massing requirements. The materials of the proposed addition that are visible from the public street (i.e. the roofing) meet the District regulations. The architectural components of the rear addition (i.e. roof form and

pitch) meet the District regulations. The roof pitch of the rear dormer addition (8.5: 12) is one of two roof pitches found on the existing house.

The ridge line and height of the rear dormer addition also meet the specific District regulations regarding such architectural elements. The height of the rear dormer addition is “no higher than the existing structure” and the rear dormer addition’s ridge line is “no higher than the highest roof ridge line of the existing structure.” The Staff would note that in many cases (particularly on more visible additions) the preferred historic preservation approach is to have any new roof lines be slightly lower in height than the main roof line to allow the main roof line to still be the dominate roof feature.

Existing House Renovations

Apart from the side dormer and rear dormer addition, no exterior renovations are proposed for the existing house.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

(a) The proposal meets the District regulations, per Section 16-20L.005 and Section 16-20L.006.

Staff recommends approval of an application for a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-028) for dormer additions at **215 Degress Avenue**, with the following condition:

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



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

JAMES SHELBY
Commissioner

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-13-029) on new signage over the right of way at **25 Andrew Young International Boulevard** - Property is zoned SPI-1.

Applicant: 3D Sign Services
3076 Vicksburg Drive, Lawrenceville

Facts: The proposed project consists of the rehabilitation and relocation of an existing commercial sign that is already over the Andrew Young International Boulevard right of way and the installation of parking signage over the right of way. Both signs would be attached to a 1970s / 1980s parking garage that faces Andrew Young International Boulevard the bottom floor of which occupied by a restaurant with a “residential façade” treatment. The sign relocation and installation are part of an overall renovation to the façade of the garage that would extent the “residential façade” treatment to the second floor of the parking garage. The restaurant signage would be relocated to this newly-renovated second floor façade.

Analysis: The following code section applies to this application.

Per Section 6-4043:

(5) The commission shall review the proposed location and design of buildings, bridges, viaducts, elevated ways, streets, highways, gates, fences, railings, lamp standards, and other structures or fixtures to be erected or placed on land belonging to the city, or on any private or public property which extends over or upon any property or right-of-way owned or controlled by the city.

(7) The commission shall review the alteration, demolition, movement or construction of any structures, site or building which involves the use of capital expenditures by the City of Atlanta or capital expenditures by other public agencies or authorities which are required to submit plans for review by the city.

The Staff finds that the material and design of the signs are compatible with the parking garage / “residential façade” treatment, this section of Andrew Young International Boulevard, and this portion of Downtown. The materials and design are similar to comparable commercial and “directional” signage found in the area.

In addition, the Staff would note that the relocation of the restaurant sign away from and above the way finding sign and lamp post (which has a banner attachment) will help eliminate an awkward visual relationship. Both the way finding signage and any banners attached to the lamp post as well as the relocated restaurant signage will all “read” better to the passing pedestrian and motorist.

The Staff would recommend that the “P” used for the projecting parking directional sign be the same as the “P” used for free standing parking lot signs in the rest of Downtown.

Staff Recommendation: Confirm that the Staff and Commission comments were delivered at the Commission meeting regarding the Review and Comment (RC-13-029) on new signage over the right of way at **25 Andrew Young International Boulevard**.



CITY OF ATLANTA

M. KASIM REED
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
55 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

JAMES SHELBY
Commissioner

CHARLETTA WILSON JACKS
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT February 27, 2013

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-13-030) for an addition and site work at 1246 and 1274 Ponce De Leon Avenue and 803 Briarcliff Road (Springdale Park Elementary School)- Property is zoned Druid Hills Landmark District.

Applicant: Perkins and Will
1315 Peachtree Street

Facts: Springdale Elementary School includes a historic Neel Reid house built in 1913 and a detached addition constructed in 2009.

On December 12, 2007 the Commission approved with conditions an application for a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (LD-07-372) to allow the new construction of an elementary school at 1246 and 1274 Ponce de Leon Avenue.

On October 13, 2010, the Commission reviewed and commented on (RC-10-194) on the demolition of two existing buildings and the construction of a parking lot and open space area for Springdale Park Elementary.

On January 12, 2011 the Commission reviewed and commented on (RC-10-260) on the modifications to the playground at Springdale Park Elementary School.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code:

- (7) The commission shall review the alteration, demolition, movement or construction of any structure, site or building which involves the use of capital expenditures by the City of Atlanta or capital expenditures by other public agencies or authorities which are required to submit plans for review by the city.

The existing Springdale Park Elementary School campus has frontage on both Ponce De Leon Avenue and Briarcliff Road. The existing historic building faces Ponce De Leon with an addition directly behind it. On the Briarcliff Road elevation is a large parking lot for the school.

The Applicant is proposing a new addition to accommodate new classrooms, a gym, support services and storage. The new addition will be located behind the 2009 addition and in front of the rear parking lot that faces Briarcliff Road. As part of the proposal, the existing parking lot at the rear of the existing addition will be removed and replaced with green space. Staff has no concerns regarding the removal of the existing parking lot and the installation of green space.

In looking at the proposed elevations, Staff finds the overall design and materials are appropriate. Given the significant change in the topography, Staff finds the overall height, massing and orientation of the proposed addition are appropriate. Staff finds the proposed fenestration and signage on the rear elevation will help give the school more presence from Briarcliff Road. Staff finds the new addition will not have a negative impact on the existing historic building and will be consistent and compatible with the 2009 addition.

Staff has concerns regarding handicap accessibility from the parking lot to the 2009 addition. In looking at the site plans and elevations, it appears the proposed addition has direct access from the parking lot through a set of doors into the gym and another set of doors directly into the building. To access the 2009 addition without going through the building, someone would have to go around the corner and down a flight of stairs. Staff has concerns with this configuration as there might be parents and children who require handicap accessibility that are trying to get to the 2009 addition. Staff finds a more appropriate solution is to make sure there is handicap accessibility from the parking lot to the 2009 addition without going through the proposed addition.

Staff has concerns regarding the lack of an enclosed connection between the proposed addition and the 2009 addition. It appears that the only access between the buildings is through unenclosed stairs. Given the age of the population, Staff finds it would be more appropriate to have an enclosed corridor as access between buildings. Staff has concerns regarding the lack of fenestration on the west elevation. Staff suggests the Applicant clarify why there is no fenestration on the west elevation.

In general, Staff is in support of the proposed addition and site plans. At the same time, Staff has concerns regarding handicap accessibility, connections between the two buildings and the lack of fenestration on the west elevation.

Staff recommends the Commission deliver comments at the meeting.