



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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-070) for renovation and an addition at **827 Oakdale Rd**– Property is zoned Druid Hills Historic District.

Applicant: James and Christy Grauley
827 Oakdale Road

Facts: According to the architectural survey in 2002, this dwelling built in 1915 is contributing.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 16-20.007 of the Atlanta Land Development Code:

(a) When Required, Generally: In addition to other permits which are required pursuant to any city ordinance, and in addition to any certificate of appropriateness which may be required pursuant to any other landmark or historic building, site or district regulation contained in part 16 of the Codes of Ordinances, certificates of appropriateness shall, unless provided otherwise in the detailed regulations governing Landmark or Historic Districts contained within a designation ordinance as provided in section 16-20.006 of the Code of Ordinances, be required for any of the following actions within each of the following categories:

(3) Landmark buildings and sites:

(b) To change the exterior appearance of any structure within any Landmark District;

Per Section 16-20B.003 of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

The following general regulations shall apply to the entire district which includes both (1) the Ponce de Leon Corridor; (2) Fairview Road; and (3) Springdale/Oakdale/Lullwater.. Any proposed development shall require a certificate of appropriateness from the urban design commission and shall conform to the following regulations:

(5) *Minimum architectural controls:* Any construction in the Druid Hills District shall maintain the general architectural scale and character reflected in the original development of Druid Hills in order to preserve the historic character of the district.

Exterior architectural changes shall follow the standards set forth by the secretary of the interior. The secretary of the interior's standards for historic preservation projects are designed to assist individual property owners formulate plans for the development and continued use of historic properties. Separate guidelines are given for each of seven (7) treatments. (Refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards of Historic Preservation Projects.)

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, 1995, Standards for Rehabilitation

REHABILITATION IS DEFINED AS the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

1. A property will 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.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Sec. 16-20B.006. Springdale/Oakdale/Lullwater

The following regulations shall apply to any proposed development on any property located on Springdale Road, Oakdale Road, Lullwater Road or Lullwater Parkway:

(1) *Permitted principal uses and structures:*

- a. Single-family dwellings.
- b. Parks, playgrounds and community buildings owned and operated by a governmental agency.

(3) *Minimum lot requirements:*

- a. *Lot width:* Each lot shall have a minimum lot width of 100 feet.
- b. *Lot area:* Each lot shall contain a minimum lot area of 38,000 square feet.

(4) *Lot coverage:* Lot coverage for all structures, parking and driveways shall not exceed 35 percent of the lot area.

(5) *Minimum yard requirements:*

- a. *Setbacks:*
 1. West side of Springdale Road, Ponce de Leon Avenue to city limit:
Front yard: 120 feet.
Side yards: 25 feet.
Rear yard: 50 feet.

The Commission reviews alterations to any structure within the district, whether or not said alterations can be seen from the public right-of-way

Site

The Applicant did not provide a site plan, therefore Staff cannot determine if the project meets the setback and lot coverage requirements. Staff recommends the Applicant submit an appropriately scaled site plan and documentation that the setback and lot coverage requirements have been met.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing to replace the front entry columns. In looking at the pictures submitted by the Applicant, it is not clear why the front entry columns cannot be repaired and retained. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the existing entry columns cannot be repaired and retained.

The Applicant is proposing to unenclose an existing side porch and restore it to its original condition. Staff finds the proposed alterations to the existing enclosed side porch are highly appropriate. On the right elevation, the Applicant is proposing a new window to match the existing windows. Staff has no concerns regarding the addition of a new window on the right elevation.

Additions

The Applicant did not provide as-built drawings. As such, Staff compared the pictures submitted, to the proposed elevations. On the right elevation, it appears the Applicant is removing the existing area where the flue is located in order to construct a two-story addition in its place. In looking at the floor plans, the new side addition will accommodate a kitchen expansion and part of a second floor expansion. Staff finds the overall design, materials and massing of the proposed addition is appropriate. As the side addition is located towards the rear of the house, Staff finds any negative impact on the streetscape will be minimal.

The Applicant is proposing a two-story rear addition. It is not clear from the submittal what the rear demolition plan is. In looking at pictures of the rear façade, it is clear there are currently non-historic additions. Staff has no concerns regarding a partial demolition of non-historic additions to accommodate the new addition. The Applicant is proposing to add a new chimney to replace a previously existing chimney. Staff has no concerns regarding the addition of the new chimney. As the addition will be a different material, Staff finds the addition will be easily differentiated from the existing historic house. Overall, Staff finds the location, massing, materials and design of the new addition is appropriate and compatible with the existing historic house.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

- a) The plans 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 (CA3-13-070) for renovation and an addition at **827 Oakdale Rd**– Property is zoned Druid Hills Historic District, with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit an appropriately scaled site plan and documentation that the setback and lot coverage requirements have been met, per Section 16-20B.006(4);
2. The Applicant shall provide documentation the existing entry columns cannot be repaired and retained, per 16-20B.004(5); and
3. 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 JACKSON
Director, Office of Planning

STAFF REPORT

April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-13-071) for renovations, additions, and site work at Mary Lin Elementary School at 586 Candler Park Drive – Property is zoned R-4 / SPI-7 / SA1 (Candler Park Special Public Interest District / Subarea 1).

Applicant: Andrew Powell
409 John Wesley Dobbs Avenue

Facts: The school campus currently includes the original school building oriented towards Candler Park Drive with a large, contemporary addition projecting west from its southern corner, a playground area behind the original building, a drop-off and main parking area to the south of the original building, and a secondary parking area to the north of the original school building. The property is immediately adjacent to Freedom Park to the north. To the east, across Candler Park Drive, is Candler Park Golf Course.

The proposed work includes demolishing and rebuilding the front portion of the contemporary addition, redesigning the drop-off and main parking area south of the original building and in front of the rebuilt portion of the contemporary addition, adding an addition behind and at the northern end of the original building, and reconfiguring and adding to the parking area north of the original school building. In addition, the school's signage, retaining walls, site stairs, and other existing site features will be reconfigured, rebuilt, and/or redesigned.

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.

Site Design and Site Work

The most significant characteristic of the proposed site plan is the revision to the vehicle access and parking on the property. The large circular drop off area on the south is replaced with a "bulb-in" in front of the rebuilt portion of the contemporary addition. To the south of the "bulb

in”, the southern parking lot will now have a separate entrance and be simplified in design. The northern parking lot will also be configured, with a large circular drop-off lane added behind it and an entirely new parking lot added behind that. These new drop-off, parking, and hardscape areas will be immediately adjacent to Freedom Park.

The Staff does have operational and design concerns about the vehicle circulation, drop off, and parking. First, the Staff is concerned about the provision of more off-street parking, given what appears to a supply of on-street parking on the blocks surrounding the school. Given that Atlanta Public School properties are often smaller than what would be considered an optimum size, the use of what limited amount of property there is for parking (vs. green space and/or play areas) is a concern. Further, in this case, the additional parking will be located on land originally included within Freedom Park, even though the property has been used by Atlanta Public Schools for many years.

Second, the Staff is concerned about the proper functioning of the drop off-area on Candler Park Drive. Given that there is an on-street parking lane in front of the school, a drop off-area could be established within the on-street parking lane using signage instead of reconfiguring the sidewalk and changing the pedestrian environment.

In addition, the Staff would recommend the following specific design treatments / approaches:

- Any new driveways should not be more than 24 ft. wide, use concrete driveway aprons, and maintain the existing grade of the sidewalk across the driveway.
- The surrounding cross walks, including on Candler Park Drive, should be re-stripped using the City-standard “piano-style” markings.
- All signage should be upgraded to meet the 2009 *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*.

Apart from its concerns regarding the vehicle circulation and drop off noted above, the Staff would recommend that the landscape treatment associated with the new drop-off , parking and hardscape areas in the northern portion of the school property be substantially based on the materials and aesthetics of Freedom Parkway. Further, given that this portion of the school property essentially acts as a trail head to one of the Freedom Park trails, the Staff would recommend following treatments / approaches:

- The parking lot should be porous pavement to fit within the new City of Atlanta Stormwater Ordinance that was recently approved by the City of Atlanta.
- The retaining walls should be clad in real granite and match the style of granite walls elsewhere in Freedom Park.
- Parking lot trees should be native, drought tolerant species.
- The landscape improvements along the slope down to Freedom Park (which is equal to about 1/2 to 3/4 of an acre) should be grass and wildflower meadow type plantings to minimize maintenance and soften the transition to Freedom Park.
- The actual trailhead (the area providing the transition from the park trail to the school driveway) should include benches and/or seat walls.
- The trailhead area should include park signage, standard trash/recycling receptacle(s), and transitional pavement with proper warning materials and bollards to alert users to the change in their location / “environment”.

- The trailhead area should include bicycle racks so that bicycles don't have to be walked to the front of the school.
- Any perimeter or security fence in this portion of the school property should be located on the south side of the parking area and drive aisles.

Regarding the other site improvements on the property, the Staff would have the following recommendations:

- All retaining walls should be clad in real granite.
- The hardscape (walk ways, waiting areas, site stair, etc.) should only use a few basic materials that are simple and easy to maintain. The proposed site plan appears to show one paving material for the streetscape, one for the main entrance walkway and the rest of the site, and a third for the rest of the drop-off area.

Renovations and Additions

The existing, original school features a stucco façade with grouped, double hung windows. The contemporary addition also features a stucco material, with metal roofing and accents features. Other portions of the building have a brick exterior with grouped, awning style, more modern windows.

The Staff finds that the location (behind and/or to the side of the original building), massing (rectilinear in shape and with heights less than the original building), and proportions of the additions are appropriate for the site and generally compatible with the original building. Further, it finds that the use of a small amount of glass curtain wall immediately adjacent to the original building (at the front of the rebuilt contemporary addition) will help differentiate between the original and contemporary portions of the building and at the same time accentuate the original building's prominence on the site.

However, the Staff has significant concerns about the other exterior materials and window types used in the additions. The proposed design includes architectural concrete masonry units, ground face block, linear terra cotta panels, and on the Freedom Park side of the addition, vertically-connected and grouped ("stacked") windows. While the Staff acknowledges that the proposed work does not have to mimic the existing school building and the previous addition introduced new materials when it was built, the Staff finds that currently proposed materials will unnecessarily reinforce or introduce still more materials that it considers too contemporary for the original building on the property. The Staff would recommend a simplified palette of materials and window types that are more closely related to the original building on the property.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission shall deliver its comments at the meeting regarding Review and Comment (RC-13-071) for renovations, additions, and site work at Mary Lin Elementary School at 586 Candler Park Drive – Property is zoned R-4 / SPI-7 / SA1 (Candler Park Special Public Interest District / Subarea 1).



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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-073) for renovations at 976 Mathews St.-Property is zoned R-4A/West End Historic District.

Applicant: Stan Sugarman
PO Box 1831

Facts: According to the West End Historic district inventory this dwelling built between 1923 and 1924 is considered contributing.

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.

(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.

The Applicant is proposing to convert an existing duplex into a single family dwelling. In looking at the 1932 Sanborn Map, the existing house was a duplex at that time. It is worth noting that all of the houses on this particular block face were all duplexes. The Applicant is proposing to remove one of the door openings on the front façade so that the house appears to be a single family dwelling. While Staff has no concerns regarding the interior conversion of the house into a single-family home, Staff finds the exterior appearance should remain. Specifically, the regulations require that all historic door openings be retained. As such, Staff recommends the plans indicate the retention of the existing door openings on the front façade.

In looking at the narrative submitted by the Applicant, no window changes are proposed for the side elevations. In looking at the plans, it appears two windows will be replaced and one window will be

eliminated on the left elevation. On the right elevation, it appears that one window opening will be changed and one window will be replaced. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether there are any proposed window changes on the side elevations. Staff recommends all original window openings on the side elevations are retained. Staff recommends all historic windows on the side elevations are retained. If window replacement is warranted, Staff recommends all new windows meet the regulations.

The Applicant is proposing alterations on the rear façade. As the rear façade is not visible from a public street, Staff has no comments regarding the design of the proposed alterations. Staff finds the setbacks of the proposed deck meet the requirements. While Staff finds the project likely meets the lot coverage requirements, Staff recommends the site plan indicate the lot coverage calculations. In general, Staff finds the full scope of work for this project is not clear. There are discrepancies between the narrative and the plans. Staff recommends the Applicant submit plans that are detailed in regards to all proposed work.

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 II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-073) for renovations at **976 Mathews St.**-Property is zoned R-4A/West End Historic District, with the following conditions:

1. The plans shall indicate the retention of the existing door openings on the front façade, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
2. The Applicant shall clarify whether there are any proposed window changes on the side elevations, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
3. All original window openings on the side elevations shall be retained, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
4. All historic windows on the side elevations shall be retained, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
5. If window replacement is warranted, all new windows shall meet the regulations, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
6. The site plan shall indicate the lot coverage calculations, per Section 16-06A.008(6);
7. The Applicant shall submit plans that are detailed in regards to all proposed work; and
8. 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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type III Certificates of Appropriateness (CA2-13-076) for renovations and additions at **1143 St. Charles Place** – Property is zoned R-4/Atkins Park Historic District.

Applicant: Paul R. Burks
1143 St. Charles Place

Facts: According to the Atkins Park Historic District Survey, this single family dwelling built in 1920 is considered contributing.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:
Per Section 16-200.006 of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:
The following general regulations shall apply to all properties located within the Atkins Park Historic District.

Sec. 16-200.006. General Regulations.

The following general regulations shall apply to all properties located within the Atkins Park Historic District.

- (1) Certificates of Appropriateness.
 - (A) Type III certificates of appropriateness shall be required for:
 - (i) All new principal structures.
 - (ii) All major alterations and additions to existing structures.
 - (iii) Subdivisions or aggregations of lots, and planned developments.
- (7) Compatibility Rule.
 - (A) In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. Synthetic materials may be used if visually indistinguishable from the original materials. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front facade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face."
 - (B) Those elements to which the rule applies are noted in the regulations by a reference to the "compatibility rule."

Sec. 16-200.007. Specific Regulations.

The following regulations shall apply to all properties located within the Atkins Park Historic District.

- (1) *Development Controls for Principal Structures.*
 - (A) *Front Yards:* The front yard setback of principal structures shall meet the compatibility rule.
 - (B) *Side yards:* The side yard setbacks of principal structures shall meet the compatibility rule. All new construction and additions shall maintain a minimum of three (3) feet for side yards setbacks where the compatibility rule would permit otherwise.
 - (C) *Rear yard:* The rear yard setback of principal structures shall be a minimum of fifteen (15) feet.
- (2) *Architectural Standards for Principal Structures.*

Architectural standards for principal structures shall apply to front facades, side facades, and half-depth front facades visible from core residential streets only.

 - (A) All new construction shall be one of the house styles of a contributing building that appears on the block face of the street on which the new construction shall occur.
 - (B) *Building Height and Width:* The compatibility rule shall apply to the height and width of the principal structure. In no case shall the height of a structure exceed 35 feet from grade.
 - (C) *Foundation:*
 - (i) The maximum height of the first floor above grade shall meet the compatibility rule. The foundation shall be a maximum of four feet above the surface of the ground adjacent to the front façade, measured at the front facade.
 - (ii) Slab on grade is not permitted.
 - (iii) When masonry, brick or stucco is used as the primary façade material, the foundation material shall be the same. Otherwise the foundation shall be brick or stucco.
 - (D) *Siding:* Siding shall be substantially consistent with siding materials found in contributing buildings on the block face and shall be consistent with the architectural style. Brick, brick veneer, stucco, shingles, or horizontal lapped wood or cementitious plank siding are permissible building materials for the facades.
 - (E) *Roofs:*
 - (i) The shape and pitch of roofs, as well as ridge, overhang, and soffit construction shall meet the compatibility rule and be consistent with the architectural style.
 - (ii) Clay tile, slate, composition asphalt shingles, and fiberglass shingles are permissible roofing materials.
 - (iii) Membrane or cold-rolled roofing is permitted only on flat roofs.
 - (iv) Corrugated roofing materials are not permitted.
 - (g) *Skylights and solar panels:* Skylights and solar panels are permitted on roofs of buildings provided they are not visible from any core residential street.
 - (I) *Windows and Doors.* Fenestration, if visible from a core residential street upon completion, shall meet the following requirements:
 - (i) The compatibility rule shall apply to the style, size, shape and overall pattern of fenestration.
 - (ii) Windows on the front façade shall be predominantly vertical.
 - (iii) Exterior doors and door transoms shall be appropriate to the house style, regarding design, size, dimension, and location on the building.
- (3) *Maximum Floor Area Ratio:* The floor area ratio shall not exceed 50 percent of the total lot area.
- (4) *Maximum Lot Coverage:* Lot coverage shall not exceed 50 percent of total lot area.

Sec. 16-200.009. Design Criteria for Alterations and Additions to Contributing Structures.

Alterations and additions to contributing structures requiring a Certificate of Appropriateness shall comply with one of the following provided that the mere increase in floor area otherwise authorized in the district shall not constitute a standard for review:

- (A) Alterations and additions shall be consistent with and reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure and shall comply with the applicable regulations for *Architectural Standards for Principal Structures* set forth in subsection 16-200.007(2) above; or
- (B) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work may differentiate from the old. To protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, any new work will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, materials, and architectural features of the property and environment.

Site Plan

The lot in question fronts 54' on St. Charles and has a depth of 131.6' on its longest side. The project includes the demolition of an existing deck and the construction of a new patio and deck. Per regulations, the rear yard setback shall be no less than 15'. The proposed rear yard setback is more than 15' and therefore meets the rear yard setback requirements. Per regulations, the side yard setbacks are based on the compatibility rule. As this is a contributing structure and the addition is no wider than the existing house, Staff finds the side yard setback requirements have been met.

Per regulations, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) allowed is .50. The proposed FAR is .35 and therefore meets the requirements. Per regulations, the maximum lot coverage allowed is 50%. The existing lot coverage is 64.9% and therefore exceeds the maximum lot coverage allowed. The proposed project will reduce the lot coverage to 62.8%. Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed lot coverage.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing to add four dormers to the existing house to allow for additional living space. In general, Staff finds the design, materials and massing of the proposed dormers are appropriate. The ridge of the side elevation dormers are appropriately located below the existing ridgeline of the house. Staff finds the rear dormer, deck and patio are not visible from a public street, therefore Staff has no comments regarding the design. Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed dormer on the right elevation.

Staff has concerns regarding the dormers on the left elevation. Staff finds that having two separate dormers on one elevation is not appropriate or compatible with the existing historic house. Further, Staff finds that any proposed dormer should be located behind the existing chimney to help minimize its visibility. Staff recommends one dormer on the left elevation is eliminated from the plans. Staff recommends any dormer on the left elevation be located behind the existing chimney. There is a skylight located on the left elevation. As skylights are only allowed if they are not visible from the street, Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the skylight on the left elevation will not be visible from a public street.

Staff Recommendations: Based upon the following:

The plans, with the exceptions noted above, meet the regulations per Section 16-200.007;

Staff recommends approval of the application for a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-076) for renovations and additions at **1143 St. Charles Place** – Property is zoned R-4/Atkins Park Historic District, with the following conditions:

1. One dormer on the left elevation shall be eliminated from the plans, per Section 16-200.009(A) and (B);
2. Any dormer on the left elevation shall be located behind the existing chimney, per Section 16-200.009(A) and (B);
3. The Applicant shall provide documentation the skylight on the left elevation will not be visible from a public street, per Section 16-200.007(2)(g); and
4. 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
April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Review and comment (RC-13-079) on ordinance U-13-007 for the Transfer of Development Rights from the **Georgian Terrace Hotel at 659 Peachtree Street** - Property is zoned SPI-16 – Midtown Commercial District (Subarea 1) / Landmark Building or Site.

At the Request of: Sharon Gay
303 Peachtree Street, Suite 3500

Facts: The Georgia Terrace Hotel was rezoned as a Landmark Building or Site (LBS) by the City of Atlanta in June, 1990. As is the case with all other LBS rezonings, the underlying zoning remained for the property, including all of the associated development rights. Several years ago, the underlying Special Public Interest (SPI) zoning classification was substantially revised to implement the “Blueprint Midtown” planning process.

The LBS zoning category include one property which includes the original, historic hotel building and the contemporary, attached addition to its east.

According to the special use permit filing, the proposed TDR would transfer approximately 226,147 sq. ft. of development rights.

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 TDR will not result in any physical alteration to the Landmark Building or the site and will decrease the development pressure on the site by removing potential development rights beyond those already “used” by the existing buildings. The Staff would add that another benefit of the TDR to the “sending site” (i.e. Georgian Terrace Hotel) is that development rights that would otherwise likely go unused

(given the criteria regarding incompatible additions and alterations to a Landmark Building / Site property) will likely be sold to another party thus generating additional income for the owner of the development rights and thus likely the sending site as well. Both of these results would indirectly help retain the designated property and thus reinforce the historic and cultural values that it represents to the City.

The Staff does not find any concerns about the proposed transfer.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that a letter of support with the Staff's and the Commission's comments be sent to the Office of Planning and other concerned parties.



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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-080) for renovations, additions and site work at **878 White Street**-Property is zoned R-4A/West End Historic District.

Applicant: Innocent Nwachukwu
2550 Sandy Plains Road, Marietta

Facts: According to the West End Historic district inventory this dwelling built between 1905 and 1906 is considered contributing.

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.

Site

The lot in question fronts 50' on White Street and has a depth of 125'. 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 proposed project has an FAR of .39 and therefore meets the requirements. The maximum lot coverage allowed is 55%. The proposed lot coverage is 39.2% and therefore meets the requirements.

Alterations

In looking at survey pictures of the existing house, the front porch was enclosed with glass and siding before the districts designation. The Applicant is proposing to alter the front façade by unenclosing a portion of the porch, fully enclosing the other portion of the porch and replacing the front facing gable with a new steeper pitched gable. Staff has no concerns with unenclosing the porch, however Staff finds the proposed alterations do not meet the regulations and are not consistent and compatible with the existing historic house. Staff recommends any alterations to the porch and front facing gable meet the regulations.

As the Applicant did not provide as-built elevations or pictures of all the elevations, Staff compared the survey pictures to the proposed elevations. Staff recommends the Applicant provide as-built drawings. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide pictures of all the elevations of the existing house. It appears the Applicant is proposing to change the overall height and pitch of the existing roof. Staff finds that changing the height or pitch of the roof is not appropriate. Staff recommends the existing roof, pitch and height be retained. In looking at the elevations, a new gable is being added. Given Staff's previous comments regarding the roof, pitch and height, Staff recommends the gable on the right elevation is eliminated from the plans.

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition and rear deck. Staff finds the rear addition and deck are appropriately located. As the rear elevation is not visible from a public street, Staff has no comments regarding the design.

Windows and Siding

The current condition of the existing windows is not clear. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information regarding the condition of all existing windows and openings. It is not clear from the elevations whether new windows and openings are proposed. Staff recommends the elevations are detailed in regards to existing and proposed conditions. Staff recommends all historic window openings are retained. Staff recommends all historic windows are retained. If replacement of windows is warranted, Staff recommends all new windows meet the regulations.

It is not clear from the elevations whether new siding is proposed. In looking at a picture submitted by the Applicant, it appears the original siding is beneath the existing siding. Staff recommends the original wood siding is repaired and retained.

In general, Staff has concerns regarding the proposed alterations to the existing historic structure. Staff finds the alterations as currently proposed would destroy historic fabric and alter the overall architectural design of the existing historic structure. Staff has concerns regarding the lack of information in regards to the existing conditions. Given the concern regarding the design and the lack of information regarding the existing conditions, Staff finds a deferral is appropriate.

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 deferral of the Application for Type III Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-080) for renovations, additions and site work at **878 White Street**-Property is zoned R-4A/West End Historic District, to allow the Applicant time to address the following concerns of Staff:

1. Any alterations to the porch and front facing gable shall meet the regulations, per Section 16-20G.006(9);

2. The applicant shall provide as-built drawings;
3. The Applicant shall provide pictures of all the elevations of the existing house;
4. The existing roof, pitch and height shall be retained, per Section 16-20.009;
5. The gable on the right elevation shall be eliminated from the plans, per Section 16-20.009;
6. The Applicant shall provide information regarding the condition of all existing windows and openings, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
7. The elevations shall be detailed in regards to existing and proposed conditions;
8. All historic window openings shall be retained, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
9. All historic windows shall be retained, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
10. If replacement of windows is warranted, all new windows shall meet the regulations, per Section 16-20G.006(3);
11. The original wood siding shall be repaired and retained, per Section 16-20.009; and
12. All updated plans and materials shall be submitted to Staff no later than eight days before the meeting to which the application is deferred.



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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA3-13-081) for the installation of a mural at 209 Edgewood Avenue – M. L. King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 5).

Applicant: Eddie Granderson
233 Peachtree Street

Facts: The subject building is City of Atlanta Municipal Market, also known as the Curb Market. It has recently undergone extensive renovation, all of which has been previously reviewed by the Commission.

The Applicant, which is the City of Atlanta's Office of Cultural Affairs, is proposing the permanent installation of a stone mural above the Jesse Hill Jr. Drive entrance to the market, which is the west façade of the building. The mural will consist of 3 in. to 6 in. depth panels depicting a generic market-related scene.

The proposed mural / art work is the resulting product of the City's "one percent for the arts" requirement for the use of City capitol funds. In this case, the installation of the mural / art work is an outgrowth of the funds already spent on the overall renovation of the Municipal Market.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:

Per Section 16-20.007:

- (a) When Required, Generally: In addition to other permits which are required pursuant to any city ordinance, and in addition to any certificate of appropriateness which may be required pursuant to any other landmark or historic building, site or district regulation contained in part 16 of the Code of Ordinances, certificates of appropriateness shall, unless provided otherwise in the detailed regulations governing Landmark or Historic Districts contained within a designation ordinance as provided in section 16-20.006 of the Code of Ordinances, be required for any of the following actions within each of the following categories:
 - (3) Landmark Districts:
 - a. To change the exterior appearance of any structure within any Landmark District.

Per Section 16-20.009:

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:

- (6) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.

Location

The Staff finds that the location of the proposed mural / art work is compatible with the building and the District regulations. The Staff finds that having a physical graphic and/or bas relief architectural element above an entrance to a building on or near the parapet wall is in keeping with the historic practice of having engraved building names, building owner names, construction dates, or carved ornamentation in similar locations on higher style buildings in the District.

Materials, Design, and Compatibility to the District

The materials and design of the mural also meet the District regulations and are compatible with the building's architecture and materials. Natural and cast stone elements, both painted and unpainted, are a common architectural component to higher-style buildings in the District. The use of the gray stone as the "canvas" for the mural will be compatible with the gray cast stone elements found throughout the building.

However, the Staff would recommend that when feasible the mural's mounting brackets and hardware be secured to the mortar of the building, not the bricks themselves. Mounting the mural in this manner will eliminate damage to the bricks themselves, which is much more permanent and difficult to remedy than holes in masonry mortar.

The Staff would also suggest that a small interpretive panel be installed below the mural at pedestrian level that would identify the mural (name, date of installation, artist, etc.), note that it is a product of the City's "one percent for the arts" program, and briefly describe the "one percent for the arts" program.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

- 1) With the exceptions noted above, the plans meet regulations per Section 16-20.009(6).

Staff recommends approval of the application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-081) to allow the installation of a mural at 209 Edgewood Avenue – M. L. King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 5) with the following conditions:

- 1) When feasible, the mural's mounting brackets/hardware shall be secured to the mortar of the building, not the bricks themselves, per Section 16-20.009(6); and
- 2) The Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final construction details and specifications.



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

April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-082) for renovations and site work at 2974 Hardman Court – Property is zoned R-LC-C.

Applicant: Luxe Properties
2974 Hardman Court

Facts: This property was rezoned with 11 other properties in 1987 (Z-87-12) to Residential-Limited-Commercial. As part of that rezoning, four conditions were placed on the properties, including the following:

“Any additional construction shall be of the same architectural character as the existing structures as determined by the Urban Design Commission.”

Analysis: Based on the requirement that “additional construction shall be of the same architectural character as the existing structures”, the Staff finds that the following code sections shall be applied to this application

Sec. 16-20.009. Some; further 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) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.

(7) 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.

Windows and Doors

The Applicant is proposing to replace all of the windows on the existing building. In looking at the pictures submitted, the existing windows do not appear to be beyond repair. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the existing windows are either non-historic or are beyond repair. If replacement of windows is warranted, Staff recommends the new windows match the historic windows in size, material and design. Staff recommends all original window openings are maintained.

The Applicant is proposing to replace the front and rear doors. It is not clear from the pictures submitted the existing doors are beyond repair. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation then front and rear door are either non-historic or beyond repair.

The Applicant is proposing to convert an existing rear door into a window. In looking at the floor plan, the door will be eliminated in the kitchen area. Given the location and function of the space, Staff finds converting the door into window is appropriate. The Applicant is proposing to eliminate a double window on the left elevation. Staff finds this leaves the appearance of a blank wall. Staff recommends the left elevation window is retained.

Attic

The Applicant is proposing to create exterior access to the attic with the installation of stairs and conversion on an existing window into a door. The plans indicate a narrow stair, however Staff has received pictures that indicate that indicate the stair and landing has already been installed. The site plan does not indicate the proposed stairs and landing, therefore Staff cannot determine whether the existing stair and landing meet the setback requirements. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether the existing exterior stair is the same as the stair shown in the elevations. Staff recommends the Applicant submit a site plan that indicates all proposed conditions. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation the right elevation stair meets the setback requirements.

Given the pictures we have received of the exterior stairs, Staff has concerns that much of the proposed work has already been done. Staff recommends the Applicant provide recent pictures of all elevations. The Applicant is proposing to convert an existing attic window into a door. As the existing attic is indicated as a storage area with a pull down stair, it is not clear why and exterior door and stair is needed. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the full scope of work for the attic area.

Awnings and Front Walkway

The Applicant is proposing to add awnings to the front and rear of the house. In looking at pictures submitted by the Applicant, there is an existing awning on the rear elevation. Staff does not have a concern with the replacement of the rear awning. Staff finds that having a small entry roof on a house like this would not atypical. As this structure is supposed to retain its residential appearance, Staff has concerns with how the awning will look. The materials and design of the proposed awning are not clear. Staff recommends the Applicant provide details regarding the design and materials of the proposed front elevation awning.

The Applicant is proposing a new walkway on the front elevation. It is not clear whether this is a replacement walkway or an entirely new walkway. If the proposed project is for the replacement of an existing walkway, Staff recommends the replacement is done in-kind. If the proposed project is for an

entirely new walkway, Staff recommends the walkway be configured to end at the sidewalk as is typical of a residential walkway.

Rear Deck

The Applicant is proposing to reconfigure the rear deck with new railings, stairs and steps. In comparing the proposed elevations to existing pictures, it appears that sections of the stairs and foundation will be removed. While Staff finds the design of the new deck area is appropriate, Staff recommends the Applicant clarify whether any demolition of the foundation or stairs is proposed. Staff recommends any proposed demolition be indicated on the site plan.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

- 1) The plans minimally meet the regulations, per Section 16-20.009; and

Staff recommends deferral of the application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-082) for renovations and site work at 2974 Hardman Court – Property is zoned R-LC-C, to allow the Applicant time to address the following concerns of Staff:

1. The Applicant shall provide documentation the existing windows are either non-historic or are beyond repair, per Section 16-20.009(1) and (5);
2. If replacement of windows is warranted, the new windows shall match the historic windows in size, material and design, per Section 16-20.009(1) and (5);
3. All original window openings shall be maintained, per Section 16-20.009(1) and (5);
4. The Applicant shall provide documentation the front and rear doors are either non-historic or beyond repair, per Section 16-20.009(1) and (5);
5. The left elevation window shall be retained, per Section 16-20.009 (1) and (5);
6. The Applicant shall clarify whether the existing exterior stair is the same as the stair shown in the elevations;
7. The Applicant shall submit a site plan that indicates all proposed conditions;
8. The Applicant shall provide documentation the right elevation stair meets the setback requirements, per Section 16-09.009;
9. The Applicant shall provide recent pictures of all elevations;
10. The Applicant shall clarify the full scope of work for the attic area;
11. The Applicant shall provide details regarding the design and materials of the proposed front elevation awning, per Section 16-20.009(6);
12. If the proposed project is for the replacement of an existing walkway, the replacement shall be done in-kind, per Section 16-20.009(5);
13. If the proposed project is for an entirely new walkway, the walkway shall be configured to end at the sidewalk, per Section 16-20.009 (1) and (6);
14. The Applicant shall clarify whether any demolition of the foundation or stairs is proposed;
15. Any proposed demolition shall be indicated on the site plan; and
16. All updated plans and information shall be submitted to Staff no less than 8 days before the deferred 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

April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-083) for fences, walls and site work at **770 Lexington Avenue** - Property is zoned R4-A/Adair Park Historic District.

Applicant: Kebin Friel
770 Lexington Avenue

Facts: According to the Adair Park Inventory the original historic house built in 1923 was demolished. The existing single family dwelling was reviewed by the Commission in 2002.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:
Per Section 16-20L.005 of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

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

The following regulations shall apply to all properties within the Adair Park 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."

Sec. 16-20I.006. Specific regulations--Residential Subarea I.

In addition to the general regulations set forth in section 16-20I.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 any portion of a structure within the subarea, when said change can be seen from the public right-of-way;
 2. To erect a new structure or to make an addition to any structure within the subarea, when said new structure or addition can be seen from the public right-of-way; and
 3. To demolish or move any contributing structure, in whole or in part, within the subarea.
 - (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. Except with regard to Type I certificates, the procedures for determining the appropriate type of certificate required under subsection 16-20I.006(1)a. above shall be those specified in section 16-20.008 of the zoning code, provided, however, that a partial demolition shall require a Type IV certificate of appropriateness only when said partial demolition will result in the loss of significant architectural features which destroys the structure's historic interpretability or importance.
2. *Lot Size:* In addition to the requirements of the subdivision and zoning ordinances, the compatibility rule specified in this chapter 20I shall apply to all subdivisions and aggregations of lots with regard to lot size, dimensions and configurations.
4. *Architectural Standards:*
 - (i) Fences: Fences shall be fabricated of brick, cast iron, wrought iron, stone and wood pickets. Fence lines shall follow the property line. Fences shall not obscure the front facade of the building. Chain link type of fencing shall be located to the rear of the lot and shall not extend beyond the front facade of the main structure into the front yard.
 - (j) Walls: Concrete block may be used in retaining walls, but stone or brick facing material is required.

Fences, Gates and Walls

In looking at pictures submitted by the Applicant, a 6' tall privacy wall with planter boxes is being installed. Staff wants to ensure that the maximum height of the fence will be 6', including the planter boxes on top. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a properly scaled elevation of the fence that includes the planter boxes. Staff recommends the proposed privacy fence be no taller than 6', including the planter boxes. Per regulations, wood fences shall have a picket design. The Applicant is proposing to install horizontal members as opposed to vertical. Staff finds the fence as currently designed does not meet the regulations. Staff recommends the proposed privacy fence have a vertical picket design.

The Applicant is proposing a 6' driveway gate and a 6' side gate. The design of the proposed gates is not indicated. Staff recommends the Applicant provide an elevation of the proposed gates. As the proposed gates are located outside of the front yard setback, Staff finds the proposed heights are appropriate.

The Applicant is proposing to install a stacked stone retaining wall on the front façade. Staff has concerns regarding proposed design of the wall. Per regulations, retaining walls shall be faced or constructed with brick or stone, Staff finds that stacked stone does not meet this requirement. In looking at the numerous retaining walls on Lexington, the closest design to the proposed wall is the adjacent property. Staff recommends the proposed retaining wall is constructed or faced with brick or stone.

The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing chain link fence. Staff has no concerns regarding the removal of the existing chain link fence. The Applicant is proposing a 4' fence on the front of the property. Staff finds the height, design and materials are appropriate. It is not clear whether the proposed fence will be located on top of or behind the proposed retaining wall. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify the location of the proposed 4' fence.

Deck and Paving

In looking at the existing site plan, the site currently exceeds the allowable lot coverage. There are notes from the Applicant that indicate the removal of some of the paving and removal of the deck. Staff has no concerns regarding the removal of the deck as it is not an historic feature. Staff has no concerns regarding the removal of paving. Staff recommends the Applicant submit a site plan that shows all proposed work and an updated lot coverage calculation.

Staff Recommendation: Based upon the following:

- (a) Except as noted above, the plans minimally meet the regulations per Section 16-20I.005 and 16-20I.006;

Staff recommends approval of the Application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-083) for fences, walls and site work at **770 Lexington Avenue** - Property is zoned R4-A/Adair Park Historic District, with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide a properly scaled elevation of the fence that includes the planter boxes;
2. The proposed privacy fence shall be no taller than 6', including the planter boxes, per Section 16-28.008;
3. The proposed privacy fence shall have a vertical picket design, per Section 16-20I.006(4)(i);
4. The Applicant shall provide an elevation of the proposed gates;
5. The proposed retaining wall shall be constructed or faced with brick or stone, per Section 16-20I.006(4)(j);
6. The Applicant shall clarify the location of the proposed 4' fence;
7. The Applicant shall submit a site plan that shows all proposed work and an updated lot coverage calculation; and
8. 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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-084) for renovations at **100 Bradley Street**- Property is zoned Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 2)/Beltline.

Applicant: Historic District Development Corporation
522 Auburn Avenue

Facts: According to the neighborhood inventory, this single family dwelling was built in 1910 and is considered contributing.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:
Per Section 16-20.007 of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

(a) When Required, Generally: In addition to other permits which are required pursuant to any city ordinance, and in addition to any certificate of appropriateness which may be required pursuant to any other landmark or historic building, site or district regulation contained in part 16 of the Codes of Ordinances, certificates of appropriateness shall, unless provided otherwise in the detailed regulations governing Landmark or Historic Districts contained within a designation ordinance as provided in section 16-20.006 of the Code of Ordinances, be required for any of the following actions within each of the following categories:

(3) Landmark Districts:

b. To erect any new structure or to make an addition to any structure within a Landmark District.

Per Section 16-20C.003:

The following regulations shall apply to the entire Landmark District inclusive of all subareas. All rehabilitation, restoration or new construction shall require a certificate of appropriateness from the Atlanta Urban Design Commission (AUDC). All proposed development shall conform to the following regulations:

(1) Regulations shall be minimum standards which must be followed and shall be applied by the AUDC.

(2) The AUDC shall further adopt and maintain guidelines that shall extend the intent of these regulations, further define elements of architectural style, and shall further ensure the compatibility of future developments within this HC district.

(3) The power to hear, grant or deny variances and special exceptions from these regulations shall rest with the AUDC.

(4) Procedure for variance: Upon a determination by the AUDC that an application for renovation or new construction is in conflict with these regulations and/or the guidelines, the AUDC shall institute

procedures for public notification and public hearing as are specified similarly for the board of zoning adjustment (section 16-26.001). Notification shall include any government or nonprofit institution which has legitimate interest in the historic integrity of this Landmark District.

(5) The compatibility rule: In general the intent of the regulations and guidelines structures and new construction are compatible with the design, scale and general character of the entire district, of each subarea, and of the immediately adjacent environment of a particular block. To further that intent and simultaneously retain flexibility, the regulations provide a "compatibility rule" which is: The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, building setback, etc.) shall match that which predominates on that block; or where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback etc.), the average of all structures of like use in that block shall be adhered to. The rule shall apply as it is noted in these regulations and guidelines by reference to the "compatibility rule."

Per Section 16-20C.005 – Residential District Sub-area 2:

In addition to the general regulations required in section 16-20C.003, the following regulations shall apply to any new development, rehabilitation or the conversion of any existing structures to permitted uses within the residential district subarea.

These regulations are intended to preserve the character and scale of the residential environment as it existed during the historic period of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District. These regulations are intended to ensure that permitted uses will maintain the historic integrity of the subarea and the district as a whole.

(1) *Permitted principal uses:*

a. Single-family dwellings.

(3) Development controls:

a. All front, side and rear yard setbacks shall be established through utilization of the compatibility rule on block-by-block basis. A variance of five percent (5%) may be allowed. All new construction shall maintain a minimum of seven (7) feet for side yard setback and 10 feet for rear yard setbacks where the compatibility rule would permit otherwise.

Per Section 16-20.009. 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:

(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.

(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) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.

(7) 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.

Rear Addition

The Applicant is proposing to add a rear screened porch to the existing house. As Staff originally thought an existing rear porch was simply being screened, this application was not properly advertised as a Type III Certificate of Appropriateness application for a rear addition. Staff recommends the porch addition review be deferred to the May 8th meeting to allow for proper advertisement.

Siding

The Applicant is proposing to replace all of the existing siding with new 5" cementitious siding. While pictures submitted indicate some of the siding is damaged, it is not clear that the majority of the siding is beyond repair and must be replaced. Staff recommends the Applicant provide additional documentation regarding the condition of the siding. If replacement is warranted, Staff recommends the replacement siding is wood to match the dimension and direction of the existing siding.

Windows

The narrative indicates that the windows will be repaired or replaced. In looking at the plans, the front windows and one side window will be repaired. Staff has no concerns regarding the repair and retention of existing windows. The plans indicate that all other side elevation windows will be replaced and one side window will be filled in. It is not clear what the condition of the existing windows is. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation regarding the condition of the existing windows. If window replacement is warranted, Staff recommends the new windows match the original windows in material and design. It appears that one of the side elevation window openings is being eliminated to accommodate a kitchen. Staff recommends an appropriate smaller double hung window is put in its place to eliminate the appearance of a blank wall.

Repairs

The Applicant is proposing to replace the existing roof. It is not clear whether the Applicant is proposing to replace the shingles or replace the structure of the roof. Staff recommends the Applicant provide details regarding the proposed roof work. The Applicant is proposing to repair/replace the columns, decking and railing on the front porch. It is not clear what items will be replaced and what items will be repaired. Staff recommends the Applicant provide details regarding the repairs and replacement of porch elements. Staff recommends the front porch columns, decking and railings be repaired and retained. If replacement of any front porch elements is warranted, all such elements shall be replaced in-kind.

The Applicant is proposing to repair the foundation and front stairs with in-kind materials. Staff has no concerns regarding the foundation and front stair repairs. It appears the Applicant is proposing to replace all of the trim around the windows and doors. Based on the pictures submitted, it is not clear that all of the trim around the windows and doors must be replaced. Staff recommends the Applicant provide documentation regarding the existing window and door trim. If replacement of the trim is warranted, Staff recommends all window and door trim be replaced in-kind.

Staff Recommendations: Based upon the following:

- 1) The plans meet the regulations, per Section 16-20.009;

Staff recommends approval of the Application for a Type II Certificate of Appropriateness (CA2-13-084) for renovations at **100 Bradley Street**- Property is zoned Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 2)/Beltline, with the following conditions:

1. The porch addition review shall be deferred to the May 8th meeting;

2. The Applicant shall provide additional documentation regarding the condition of the existing siding, per Section 16-20.009(5);
3. If siding replacement is warranted, the replacement siding shall be wood to match the dimension and direction of the existing siding, per Section 16-20.009(5);
4. The Applicant shall provide documentation regarding the condition of the existing windows, per Section 16-20.009(5);
5. If window replacement is warranted, the replacement windows shall match the original windows in material and design, per Section 16-20.009(5);
6. An appropriate smaller double hung window shall replace the rear side window proposed to be in-filled, per Section 16-20.009(5);
7. The Applicant shall provide details regarding the proposed roof work, per Section 16-20.009(5);
8. The Applicant shall provide details regarding the repairs and replacement of porch elements, per Section 16-20.009(5);
9. The front porch columns, decking and railings shall be repaired and retained, per Section 16-20.009(5);
10. If replacement of any front porch elements is warranted, all such elements shall be replaced in-kind, per Section 16-20.009(5);
11. The Applicant shall provide documentation regarding the existing window and door trim, per Section 16-20.009(5);
12. If replacement of the trim is warranted, all window and door trim shall be replaced in-kind, per Section 16-20.009(5); and
13. 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

April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Review and Comment (RC-13-087) for demolition and new construction at **1461 Sylvan Road (Sylvan Hills Middle School)**-Property is zoned R-4.

Applicant: Atlanta Public Schools
130 Trinity Avenue

Facts: Sylvan Hills Middle School is located in the Sylvan Hills neighborhood in NPU X. Sylvan Hills Middle School was constructed in 1949, with additions in 1954 and 1993. The school is currently open and in use.

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.

Demolition

The Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing school. The Applicant provided detailed report regarding the current condition of the school. The following is a summary of the current conditions and issues:

- Overall, the structure of the school is in good condition, however there are issues with water damage, cracks and concerns that the building does not meet the current building code requirements.
- The plumbing, electrical and mechanical systems are in good to fair condition, however service, repairs, relocation and replacements are needed.
- The HVAC system requires replacement.
- The existing school does not meet ADA requirements.
- There are concerns regarding circulation and signage.
- There are concerns about the lack of parking.

The existing school was built in 1949, with additions in 1954 and 1993. Staff has no concerns regarding the demolition of the additions built in 1993. Staff finds the original school building and the 1954 addition are historic and therefore should not be demolished unless the buildings are beyond repair. In looking at the concerns and recommendations in the existing conditions report, Staff finds there are several issues with the existing building. Like most schools built more than 50 years ago, the building does not meet the current code or ADA requirements. The existing building has damage that requires repairs and some replacements. The various systems require repair or replacement. There is also a general need for expansion to accommodate a larger population and new programs.

It is clear that the existing school requires upgrades. With all that said, Staff does not find that the entire school warrants demolition. Staff finds there are opportunities for partial demolition and additions that would accommodate all that is needed at the school. Staff finds that many of the repairs and upgrades to the various systems (mechanical, electrical, HVAC, plumbing etc.) could be done without demolition of the existing school. Staff finds that there are likely solutions to the parking and circulation concerns without demolition of the historic buildings.

Given the information we have at this time, Staff cannot support the demolition of the existing school. Staff suggests the Applicant provide a cost analysis and alternatives to full demolition. Staff suggests the cost analysis for alternatives include the following: renovations, additions and partial demolition and a separate analysis for renovations and additions. Staff suggests the Applicant also provide a cost analysis of the proposed full demolition and new construction.

New Construction

Notwithstanding our concerns regarding the proposed demolition, Staff has separate comments regarding the proposed new construction.

General Site Plan Comments

The existing 12.86 acre lot fronts 940.88 on Sylvan Road and has a depth of 600' on Arden Avenue. In looking at the City of Cadastral map, there is a discrepancy between the City records and the lot dimensions submitted by the Applicant. Staff suggests the Applicant contact the Office of Buildings to

confirm whether a permit will be issued given the lot discrepancy. If a permit will not be issued, Staff suggests the Applicant contact the subdivision staff in the Office of Planning in regards to resolution of the lot discrepancy.

The new site layout includes a new building in the same location as the existing building. There will be a parking lot in between the school and the sidewalk, as well as a rear parking lot with access from Arden Avenue. There is a proposed soccer/football field towards the front of the site and a softball/baseball field towards the rear of the site. Staff would note that there is also a fenced water retention area in between the school and the football field.

While Staff finds the general layout of the building, athletic fields and rear parking is appropriate, Staff suggests the parking at the front of the building is minimized. Staff finds the way to have a true building presence on the street, is to eliminate most of the parking in the front. Staff has no concerns with providing handicap accessible parking at the front, however the rest of the parking could be minimized, reconfigured or moved.

The site plan indicates that the front of the building will serve as a secondary entrance. In looking at the floor plan, the main office is located at the rear of the building. As the building fronts Sylvan Road, Staff finds that main entrance should be on the Sylvan façade and the interior layout should reflect appropriate offices towards the front of the building as opposed to the rear as currently proposed.

There is discussion in the narrative regarding circulation. In looking at the submittal, there is currently no signage for the building or site proposed. Staff suggests the Applicant provide information regarding signage for the building and the site. As the front of the building is currently proposed as a secondary entrance, it may be confusing for visitors trying to drop off children or find the main office.

The site plans indicate new sidewalks. Staff finds new sidewalks are highly appropriate and allow safe pedestrian access to the school. In looking at the site plan, there appears to be no designated area for bike racks. Staff suggests the site plan include bike racks to encourage and accommodate those students who may ride bikes to school.

It is not clear what is planned for the water detention area. Is there a way to have water detention and make the space a useable asset for the school? The Old Fourth Ward Park is an example of a large scale water detention project that also benefits the community. Staff suggests there be some creative solutions for that area on a smaller scale is possible.

In looking at the site plan, Staff finds the site will be appropriately landscaped at property lines and in the rear parking area. The narrative indicates the installation of retaining walls to accommodate the re-grading of portions of the property. Staff has no general concerns regarding re-grading and installation of retaining walls. Staff suggests the location, height and material of the proposed retaining walls are indicated on the plans.

Elevations

The proposed school features several facades with varying building heights, roof shapes and pitches, building materials and fenestration patterns. While Staff finds the materials and massing of the proposed building is appropriate, Staff finds the various roof pitches, roof shapes and building heights make the project appear to be several buildings that are joined together as opposed to one cohesive building. Staff suggests the building design reflect a more cohesive looking building.

Staff has concerns regarding the configuration of the building. As previously mentioned, Staff finds much of the parking could be eliminated on the front façade. This would allow the building to move closer to the street and additional parking could be added to the rear of the property. As the building is proposed for demolition and much of the lot is being re-graded, Staff suggests the Applicant clarify whether there was the possibility of the proposed building addressing more of the street on the Sylvan elevation.

In looking at the fenestration, Staff has concerns regarding the strips of windows for the auditorium and the lack of windows for the gym on the front façade. Staff finds that the portions of the building that faces the main street should have larger windows. Staff finds that moving the auditorium and the gym to the rear of the building would not only be appropriate because of access to the parking lot, but would also allow for larger windows on the front façade of the building.

Staff has concerns regarding the fenestration on the south elevation. Staff finds the south façade windows on the main building make the building appear bleak and uninviting. In looking at the floor plans, these are classrooms and therefore larger windows would be appropriate. Given Staff's concerns regarding the front façade, the fenestration and the lack of a cohesive appearance, Staff suggests the Applicant consider exploring other design solutions that address these concerns.

Staff recommends the Commission deliver its 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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Review and Comment (RC-13-097) for construction of a retaining wall and rebuilding of stairs, walkway and front porch at **185 Huntington Road**- Property is zoned R-4/Brookwood Hills Conservation District.

Applicant: William and Rebecca Holliday
185 Huntington Road

Facts: According to the Brookwood Hills Inventory, this house was constructed in 1921 and is considered contributing.

In 2011, the Commission review and commented on (RC-11-126) for an addition, renovations and landscape improvements.

Analysis: The following code sections apply to this application:
Per Section 16-20.007(b) of the Atlanta Land Development Code, as amended:

Conservation Districts Exempted: Certificates of appropriateness are not required for Conservation Districts. However, no person shall construct, alter, demolish or move, in whole or in part, any building, structure or site located within a Conservation District until the Commission shall have reviewed the proposed action(s) and made written recommendations regarding any such action to the owner(s) of the property.

Sec. 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.

In looking at a picture submitted by the Applicant, there are currently no retaining walls on the front of the property. The Applicant is proposing to construct a low stucco retaining wall with a fieldstone cap. In looking at the retaining walls on Huntington, the materials and heights of the retaining walls vary. Staff has no concerns regarding the height, material or design of the proposed retaining wall. The Applicant is proposing to install new stairs at the sidewalk. In looking at the picture submitted, it appears there are currently no stairs at the sidewalk. As such, Staff has no concerns regarding the installation of stairs at the sidewalk.

The Applicant is proposing to replace the existing landing and stairs at the front entry and replace the existing walkway. It is not clear why the existing landing, stairs and walkway require replacement. Staff suggests the Applicant clarify the current condition of the existing landing, stairs and walkway. As Staff has a concern regarding the destruction of historic materials, Staff suggests the existing landing, stairs and walkway are repaired and retained. If replacement is warranted, Staff suggests all replacements be done in-kind.

The Applicant is proposing a series of landscape changes on the front of the property including the addition of numerous boxwoods and camellia sasanqua. The Applicant is also proposing an ornamental bench on the right side of the property and stepping stones on the left side that will create two separate lawn areas. Staff finds the overall layout of the plantings and landscape features is appropriate.

Staff recommends a letter with the comments of Staff and the Commission be sent to the Applicant.



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 April 24, 2013

Agenda Item: Application for a Review and Comment (RC-13-108) for encroachment into the right-of-way for the construction of a Ferris wheel at **168 Luckie Street**. Property is zoned SPI-1.

Applicant: Atlanta Partners, LLC / Al Mers
10845 Olive Boulevard, Suite 306, St. Louis, Missouri

Facts: The proposed project consists of the installation of a 180 ft. tall Ferris wheel on private property located across the street from Centennial Olympic Park. The site is currently a surface parking lot. The Ferris wheel will be temporarily installed for one year, with the potential for it to be a permanent attraction at this location. If the project is successful, after one year the first Ferris wheel on the site will be removed and a permanent Ferris wheel put in its place. The proposed project is being reviewed by the Office of Planning for compliance with the SPI-1 zoning regulations (Special Public Interest, Subarea 1) through the SAP (Special Administrative Permit) process.

While the proposed Ferris wheel will be entirely installed on the private property on 168 Luckie Street, the wheel itself will extend over both the Luckie Street and Nassau Street right-of-ways.

The Ferris wheel will be a “family friendly attraction which appeals to all ages...”

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 proposed site plan and project narrative describe basic improvements to the property (new paving, trash cans, and landscape planters), as well as the installation of a concessions trailer, portable restrooms, and “hospitality tents”. The proposed site plan and Ferris wheel orientation take into account the proposed acquisition of a northern portion of the property for the Atlanta Streetcar. The Ferris wheel itself will be contemporary in design with simple, metal components. The Ferris wheel will have changeable lighting.

The proposed encroachment over the Luckie Street right-of-way will be about 126 sq. ft. and over the Nassau Street right-of-way about 87 sq. ft. At the points of encroachment, the Ferris wheel will be in excess of 30 ft. above the sidewalk and travel lanes, including the Atlanta streetcar track way.

The Staff finds that the encroachments themselves will have very little if any impact on the pedestrian, vehicle, or Atlanta Streetcar environment. Given the height of the wheel at the point of encroachment and the wheel’s open metal framing system, there will be no blockage of light or excessive shadows to diminish the pedestrian experience below.

The Staff has no concerns about the design of the wheel itself.

However, even though the current proposal is for a “temporary installation”, the Staff finds that one year is a significant amount of time. As such, the Staff would recommend that the currently proposed at-grade improvements (paving, street furniture, potentially lighting, etc.) reasonably reflect the requirements of SPI-1. The Staff would further recommend that the currently proposed structures to be placed on the site and detailed to reasonably reflect the requirements of SPI-1.

Lastly, and most importantly though, the Staff would recommend that if after one year the Ferris wheel is made permanent, all of the at-grade improvements and any new buildings on the property adhere to all of the pertinent SPI-1 requirements.

Staff Recommendation: Confirm that the Staff and Commission comments were delivered at the Commission meeting regarding the Application for a Review and Comment (RC-13-108) for encroachment into the right of way for the construction of a Ferris wheel at **168 Luckie Street**.