SUBJECT: Appeal of Decision of the Historic Preservation Commission Concerning Property Located at 1176 Lullwater Road by Katharine Butler and George Beazley

ATTACHMENTS (61 PAGES)

- 1. Attachment list (page 1)
- 2. Appeal (pages 2- 6)
- 3. Response to Appeal (pages 7-9)
- 4. Denial Form and Decision Form (pages 10-12)

(All information below this line was provided to the preservation commission for

their consideration in making their decision.)

- 5. Staff report (pages 13-17)
- 6. Application and supporting documents (pages 18-42)
- 7. Letters supporting the application (pages 43-51)
- 8. Opposition to the application (pages 52-61)

Link to the recording of the September 18, 2023, Historic Preservation Commission meeting:

https://dekalbcountyga.zoom.us/rec/share/DsybLNcUYJN1qLwUaWTmHv_tv8zL1e P4k-2sjcwFnOZRzhxirmzX7aO9l47glgfP.hbaDkO1YNmolSAt5

Passcode: tF59%c9S



Interim Director

Cedric Hudson

Chief Executive Officer DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY Michael Thurmond

Application to Appeal a Decision of the DeKalb County Historic Preservation Commission

All appeals must comply with the procedures set forth herein.

An application to appeal a decision of the Historic Preservation Commission on a certificate of appropriateness application must be filed within fifteen (15) calendar days after the issuance or denial of the certificate of appropriateness.

To be completed by County:

Date Received: _____

To be completed by appellant:

 Name:
 Katharine Butler and George Beazley

Address of appellant:

1165 Lullwater Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30307

Address of Property: 1176 Lullwater Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30307

This appeal is a review of the record of the proceedings before the preservation commission by the governing authority of DeKalb County, Georgia. The governing authority is looking for an abuse of discretion as revealed by the record. An abuse of discretion exists where the record presented to the governing authority shows that the preservation commission: (a) exceeded the limits of its authority; (b) that the preservation commission was not based on factors set forth in the section 13.5-8(3) or the guidelines adopted by the preservation commission pursuant to section 13.5-6 or; (c) that the preservation commission's decision was otherwise arbitrary and capricious.

If the governing authority finds no abuse of discretion, then it may affirm the decision of the preservation commission. If the governing authority finds that the preservation commission abused its discretion in reaching a decision, then it may; (a) reverse the preservation commission's decision, or; (b) it may adverse the preservation commission's decision with direction.

Date(s) of hearing, if any:	September 18, 2023
	September 19, 2023

Date of Historic Preservation Commission decision:

.

Historic Preservation Commission Appeal Form Page 2 of 2

In the space provided below the Appellant must describe how the preservation commission's decision constitutes an abuse of discretion. Specifically, the appellant must, citing to the preservation commission's written decision, show at least one of the following: that the preservation commission exceeded the limits of its authority, or that the preservation commission's decision was not based on factors set forth in the section 13.5-8(3) of the DeKalb County Code or on the guidelines adopted by the preservation commission pursuant to section 13.5-6 of said code or that the preservation commission's decision was otherwise arbitrary and capricious.

Grounds for appeal:

Abuse of Discretion by Issuing a COA on an Incomplete Application Without a Valid Site Plan. It was an abuse of discretion for the Historic Preservation Commission (the "HPC") to conduct the HPC meeting on September 18, 2023, and to issue a decision when the site plan submitted with the Application was no longer viable. On September 13, 2023, the Applicant's request for a stream buffer variance was denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The site plan included as part of the Application assumed that the variance would be granted, and the proposed structure as shown on the Application encroached into the stream buffer protected area. Since no valid site plan was before the HPC at the September 18th hearing the Application was incomplete, and it was an abuse of discretion for the HPC to render any decision at all other than to defer the hearing to a future date at such time as a revised site plan had been submitted.

2. Abuse of Discretion for Failure to Comply with the Design Guidelines. Although the form Decision issued by the HPC recites that the HPC "has considered the historical and architectural value and significance, architectural style, scale, height, setback, landscaping, general design, arrangement, texture and materials of the architectural features involved and the relationship . . . [to] other pertinent features of other properties in the immediate neighborhood", there is no evidence in the record to support this assertion. The Supplementary Explanation provides more detail concerning the failure of the HPC to consider the majority of prominent neighborhood characteristics which are dramatically different in the 1176 Lullwater design, nor is there evidence that it considered the impact that

construction of a new building would have on the drainage, water run-off, flood control, soil erosion and other ecological features of the lot. These failures are in direct conflict with the Design Guidelines and were an abuse of discretion; as a result, the HPC approval of a COA should be reversed.

The appellant may submit a written supplementary explanation in support of the appeal. The supplementary explanation shall be submitted with the appeal. The supplementary explanation may not exceed three pages and must be typewritten and double-spaced using a twelve-point font with a one-inch margin on all four sides. The governing authority will not consider text in excess of the page limit set forth herein.

10 Date:	//03/23 Signature:	Katharine Butler and George Beazley

Instructions: The appellant shall also deliver copies of this appeal to the planning department and the county attorney. The appellant and any person who has filed a statement in opposition to, or in support of the appeal may attend the meeting at which the appeal is considered and may be called upon by any member of the governing authority to provide information or answer questions. There shall be no other public participation in the appeal.

Supplemental Explanation in Support of Appeal

Applicant seeks reversal of the HPC decision on September 18, 2023, which granted a modified approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness ("COA") for a new construction at 1176 Lullwater Road. The HPC abused its discretion in granting the COA for the following reasons:

1. Abuse of Discretion - Failure to Comply with Goals and Objectives of Designation of the Druid Hills Local Historic District (the "District") and Adoption of the Design Guidelines. This Board's adoption of the Ordinance and the Design Guidelines was "primarily intended to recognize and preserve the unique character and integrity of these areas and properties . . ." (Design Guidelines §1.1). Section 1.3 further states that "[T]he primary goal for new development is to accommodate stylistic change while maintaining visual integrity. In this approach designs for new buildings reflect the basic neighborhood characteristics of siting, setback . . . and contain features that are similar to those of historic structures." (Emphasis supplied). The 1176 Lullwater design fails to reflect the basic neighborhood characteristics as set forth below; accordingly, it was an abuse of discretion for the HPC to grant the COA for 1176 Lullwater.

2. Abuse of Discretion - Failure to Recognize the Basic Neighborhood Characteristics. The HPC abused its discretion by failing to recognize the "predominant physical and developmental characteristics" (Design Guideline 7.2) of the homes in the immediate vicinity in reaching its decision Below is a comparison of design characteristics of existing homes in the area of influence versus the same characteristics in the 1176 Lullwater design:

Existing Homes in the	Proposed 1176 New Construction
Area of Influence	
Every home is roughly centered on the lot	Crowded up to 7.65 ft from the adjacent
	property line with 1166 Lullwater
Every home is approximately 100 ft set back	Set back 72 ft from Lullwater Road
from Lullwater Road	
Every home has a driveway which leads to	The driveway sweeps across the front yard
the back of the house	and leads to a turnaround in the middle of
	the front yard, then to the front-facing garage
Every home has its garage behind the house	Garage is built into front of the house
None of the homes have a concrete	Concrete turnaround is prominently situated
turnaround in the middle of the front yard	in the middle of the front yard

The features of the existing homes are significant and highly visible design elements which "define the predominant physical and developmental characteristics of the area. *These patterns must be identified and respected in the design of . . . new construction.*" (Design Guideline 7.2) (Emphasis supplied). As shown above, the 1176 Lullwater design departs significantly from the features found in existing properties. Design Guideline 7.2.1 further provides that "The orientation of a new building and its site placement should appear to be *consistent with dominant patterns within the area of influence . . . "* (Emphasis supplied). The site placement of 1176, which crowds the adjacent property line with 1166 Lullwater and sits 29 feet in front of it, is not consistent with the dominant patterns established in the area of influence. With the exception of the side and Lullwater Road setbacks, the record contains no evidence that the HPC considered any of the other predominant design features found in properties in the near vicinity, and failed to identify the numerous and significant differences between those features and the ones found in the 1176 Lullwater design. There was a clear abuse of discretion by the HPC in failing to consider neighborhood characteristics and the failure of 1176 Lullwater to preserve visual integrity with those features.

3. Abuse of Discretion - Failure to Respect the Olmsted Plan and Its Goal to Protect the Natural Elements. The Olmsted Plan protected the Peavine and Lullwater Creek Watershed (see Design Guidelines §4.1.2) and the Design Guidelines continue this focus. Design Guideline

8.3 provides that *"[A]II construction within the . . . District should follow a 25' setback requirement from the top of bank of creek corridors and drainage ways, as delineated on the official "Historic District Map."* (Emphasis supplied). There is no evidence in the record that the HPC considered the resulting alteration of the natural drainage ways in reaching its decision. New construction, with bulldozers, construction crews, dump trucks and drilling will produce soil erosion and alter the water run-off near and into Peavine Creek and the surrounding areas, all in violation of the Olmsted Plan and the Design Guidelines.

4. Summary. For the above reasons, the HPC determination that grant of a COA to Applicant will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historic, or architectural significance and value of the historic district was in error, was a substantial abuse of its discretion, and its decision to approve a COA should be reversed.

RESPONSE TO APPEAL OF KATHARINE BUTLER AND GEORGE BEAZLEY

The plans approved by the HPC are consistent with the purpose and intent of the

Guidelines. The appellants argue that because the setbacks proposed by applicants are not identical to those of some homes on Lullwater and because front screened porches and driveways are allegedly not found on Lullwater, the HPC approval fails to maintain the integrity of the area and reflect neighborhood characteristics. In support of this assertion, appellants cite to Section 1 of the Guidelines, which summarize thepurpose and intent but ignore the conceptual framework of flexibility within that Section. As noted therein, "the guidelines are not rigid restrictions but rather should be viewed as standards which, if followed, will result in sound preservation practices." The Guidelines are "primarily intended to recognize and preserve the unique character and integrity of these areas and properties while also allowing for their active use." Section 1.3. The HPC is required to interpret the Guidelines with the purpose and intent in mind and as noted by the Chairperson on September 18, the Guidelines do not provide "hard and fast rules". The HPC's job is to interpret to the best of its ability when dealing with unique applications. The HPC has interpretive leeway. Recording of Proceedings before the HPC on September 18, 2023 (Recording) at 39:48. The discussion below and the evidence in the record make it clear that the HPC exercised interpretive leeway to approve plans allowing for active use of the Subject Property while maintaining the unique characteristics of this end of Lullwater. Speculation regarding storm water impacts during construction is not a valid reason to reverse the HPC approval of the COA. Appellants, citing to Guideline 4.1.2, assert without any evidence that "new construction, with bulldozers, construction crews, dump trucks and drilling will produce soil erosion and alter the water run-off near and into Peavine Creek and the surrounding areas, all in violation of the Olmsted Plan and the Design Guidelines. "The evidence in the record is that there will be little or no grading on the lot-see page 3 of application narrative: "There is also no grading in the buildable area of the lot except some leveling at the driveway". Guideline 4.1.2 is merely a summary of Olmsted's original plans and contains no mandates to the HPC concerning erosion or run off. That is because oversight of the HPC is limited to "the historical and architectural value and significance; architectural style; scale; height; setback; landscaping; general design; arrangement; texture and materials of the architectural features involved and the relationship thereof to the exterior architectural style; and pertinent features of other properties in the immediate neighborhood. "Section 13.5-8(3). It has no purview over matters relating to storm water and erosion. That is within the purview of other arms of the DeKalb County government at the permitting stage of new construction.

The HPC properly interpreted the Guidelines in the context of the extreme development challenges on the Subject Property. The Subject Property was split off from the original lot (to the north) in 1993 or 1994. It has never been developed and is heavily wooded. It is much smaller than other lots in the area. Moreover, there are many topographical problems with this property limiting the buildable area. A small stream runs across the rear of the property and diagonally away from the property on the north side. The grade on the left side of the lot is the same as that of the adjacent house, but then drops off to the right and drops off steeply to the rear. Section 13.5-11 provides that, "Where by reason of unusual circumstances, the strict application of any provision of this chapter would result in exceptional practical difficulty or undue hardship upon any owner of any specific property, the preservation commission in passing upon applications shall have power to vary or modify strict adherence to said provisions or to interpret the meaning of said provisions so as to relieve such difficulty or hardship; provided such variance, modifications, or interpretation shall remain in harmony

with the general purpose and intent of said provisions so that the architectural or historical integrity or character of the property shall be conserved and substantial justice done. In granting variations, the preservation commission may impose such reasonable and additional stipulations and conditions as will, in its judgment, best fulfill the purpose of this chapter. An undue hardship shall be a situation beyond the control of the applicant, which is a problem unique to a specific property or to comply with this chapter, the person will violate another ordinance of DeKalb County." While not specifically mentioned by the HPC or staff, this section is clearly designed for situations such as the one presented by the applicants and the HPC was clearly aware of it in their discussions concerning the COA application. The applicants are faced with a "regulatory hardship" -they need to comply with the stream buffer regulations while at the same time complying with the historic guidelines. See Recording at 21:40. These regulations create compliance tension. The stream buffer regulations greatly reduce the buildable area to the applicants for construction on this "buildable lot" while trying to adhere to the requirements of the HPO and its guidelines, particularly setbacks and use of yard spaces. There are also development challenges posed by the small size of the lot, the existence of flood plain and the topography. See DeKalb GIS map in application materials at p.25. These conditions were not created by the applicants and are unique to the Subject Property. If the HPC is seen to have varied the requirements of the HPO in approving the applicants' application (which the applicants submit the HPC did not), it would have been justified in doing so per the provisions of Section 13.5-11.

Conclusion. For all the foregoing reasons the applicants submit that there is absolutely no legal or factual basis for the appeals filed nor for reversal of the HPC's decision. They therefore request that the BOC affirm the HPC decision in its entirety.

3

Dekalb County Historic Preservation Commission
220 Dense De Leen Avenue, Suite 200

330 Ponce De Leon Avenue, Suite 300 Decatur, GA 30030 (404) 371-2155 or (404) 371-2813 (Fax)

Michael L. Thurmond Chief Executive Officer

×

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

September 20, 2023

Site Address:	1176 LULLWATER RD
	ATLANTA, GA 30307-

Parcel ID: 18-054-06-001

Applicant:Elizabeth Finnerty c/o Battle Law, P.C.Mailing Address:3562 Habersham at Northlake
Tucker, GA 30324

THIS IS TO ADVISE YOU THAT THE DEKALB COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION, AT ITS REGULARLY SCHEDULED PUBLIC MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2023, REACHED THE FOLLOWING DECISION ON THIS APPLICATION:

ACTION: Modified Approval

Build a house as shown in the architectural drawings with the modifications that the granite shown on the front and left side of the house will be replaced with brick and the small window on the right side of the front elevation will be replaced by a larger window matching the others on the façade.

Decision of the DeKalb County Historic Preservation Commission

Name of Applican	t: Elizabeth Finnerty c/o Battle Law, P.C	
Address of Prope	ty :1176 Lullwater Rd	
Date(s) of hearing	if any :September 18, 2023	
Case Number:	1246598	
Approved	Denied Deferred	

Approval: The Historic Preservation Commission, having considered the submissions made on behalf of the applicant and all other matters presented to the Preservation Commission finds that the proposed change(s) will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historic, or architectural significance and value of the historic district and hereby approves the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness.

Any conditions or modifications are shown below.

Pursuant to Code of DeKalb County, § 13.5-8(3), the Preservation Commission has considered

the historical and architectural value and significance; architectural style; scale; height; setback; landscaping; general design; arrangement; texture and materials of the architectural features involved and the relationship of such texture and materials to the exterior architectural style; pertinent features of other properties in the immediate neighborhood, as prescribed generally by county code and specifically by the district design guidelines.

☐ This application relates to an existing building, pursuant to the authority granted to the Preservation Commission by Code of DeKalb County, § 13.5-8(3), the Preservation Commission has also used the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guideline for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings therein as guidelines. The Preservation Commission finds that all relevant guidelines have been met.

Additional pertinent factors:

Build a house as shown in the architectural drawings with the modifications that the granite shown on the front and left side of the house will be replaced with brick.

Application is approved with conditions or modifications earrow/without conditions or modifications \Box

Conditions or modifications (if applicable):

The granite on the foundation level will be replaced with brick.

Denial: The Preservation Commission has determined that the proposed material changes in appearance would have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historic or architectural significance and value of the historic property or the historic district \Box / or, the applicant has not provided sufficient information for the Preservation Commission to approve the application . Specifically, the Preservation Commission finds as follows:

Deferral: The Preservation Commission has deferred action on this application for the following reasons:

The application will be re-heard by the Historic Preservation Commission at its meeting on

Date: <u>9/19/2023</u>

Signature:

Chair, DeKalb County **Historic Preservation Commission**

DeKalb County Historic Preservation Commission

Monday, September 18, 2023- 6:00 P.M.

Staff Report

New Construction Agenda

M. 1176 Lullwater Road, Elizabeth Finnerty c/o Battle Law, P.C. Build a house. 1246598

(18 054 06 001)

This property is in the Druid Hills National Register Historic District and Character Area 1.

7-18 1176 Lullwater Road (DH), John Carpentier. Comment only on a proposed house location. 1235073 For comment only

- 7-21 1176 Lullwater Road, Price Residential Design. Build a new house on a wooded lot. 1245085 Approved
- 11-21 1176 Lullwater Road, Dave Price, Price Residential Design. Modify previously approved COA reduce the footprint of the house and to decrease the overall size. 1245291 **Denied**

7-23 1176 Lullwater Road, Elizabeth Finnerty c/o Battle Law, P.C. Build a house Denied

NOTE: The applicant has applied to the county for a stream buffer variance. Regardless of the HPC decision, the house will not be able to be constructed without that variance. Staff recommends the commission accept the county's determination on the stream buffer variance and not require the 75' setback set out in the Design Manual.

Summary

Applicant proposes building a new house on a previously undeveloped lot.

Staff visited the property with the designer, Dave Price. Mr. Price's letter provides a good summary of the proposal. Based on the site visit, the distances from the neighboring house and the right-of-way cited in the letter appear to be accurate.

Summary August 2023

The front façade is the similar to that which was approved in July 2021. It is 3.5 narrower and the height 1.25' shorter. The location is 7.65' from the property line as opposed to 5' in the previous application. The applicant says the nearest part of the house to the right-of-way house is 68', 7' closer than the previously approved house. The survey shows the neighboring house set back 97.1' from the ROW, resulting in the façade of the new house being 29.1 closer to the street than that of the neighboring house.

A major difference is the reduction of the left side to pull it back from the stream. A brick section runs straight back 32.5' from the front facade, then turns 45 degrees and changes material to HardiePlank. The applicant states the 45-degree wall will not be visible from the right-of-way. The left side of the house and the narrow rear walls are now brick. The roof pitch is steeper, 10:12 rather than 8:12. The windows will be wood with simulated divided lights.

The tree survey is more complete than the one submitted in 2021. Tree removal is similar as approved in in the previous application with only one additional healthy tree being removed. The tree preservation note says no new trees are to be planted but the site plan shows two beech trees, which were included in the 2021 plan.

Excerpts from the 2018 and 2021 staff reports are below.

Partial Summary July 2018

This lot was split off from the original lot (to the north) in 1993 or 1994. It has never been developed and is heavily wooded. It is much smaller than other lots in the area. There are many topographical problems with this property limiting the buildable area. The adjacent house, 1166 Lullwater, is set back about 93' from the right-of-way. The setbacks of nearby houses on Lullwater are all more than 93', with those across the street all over 100'. The next house on the north side faces North Decatur Road and its rear is about 130' from the proposed building site.

A small stream runs across the rear of the property and diagonally away from the property on the north side. The grade on the south (left) side of the lot is the same as that of the adjacent house, but then drops off to the right and drops off steeply to the rear. A portion of the property is in the floodplain. While this limits development, it does not prohibit it. Staff recommends the commission accept the county's determination on the stream buffer variance and not require the 75' setback set out in the Design Manual.

The grade drops about 7' from the left front corner of the unbuildable area to the right front corner.

Partial Summary July 2021

- The applicant states the proposed location would minimize grading and tree loss. The location would maximize the use of the topography, as there are few flat areas on the lot. The applicant has submitted a state water determination form that states no buffer is required, due to the concrete/brick wall along the stream. The site is 75 feet from the sidewalk in front of the lot, 5 feet from the south side property line, and more than 40 feet from the rear property line. It adheres closely to the south side property line to make the best of the topography.
- 2. The house would be a two-story Colonial Revival house with an attic and basement. The house would have a side gabled roof, clad in fiberglass shingles and a chimney on the exterior of the north elevation. There would be a hipped-roof dormer set into the center of the surface of the front elevation of the roof. A cornice with decorative dentils would extend from the front elevation to both side elevations. The house would be clad in brick in a running bond pattern. Granite would clad the front porch/terrace and front half of the foundation of the house. Windows would be equally spaced across the front elevation and they would have a 6/6 pattern. Those on the first floor would have decorative cast stone lintels. The window above the front entrance would be paired, six-light casement windows. The front entrance would have a hipped roof, with a dentil cornice and tapered columns.

The rear elevation has a rear projecting gabled wing, clad in cement fiber siding. The core, sidegabled portion of the house would be clad in brick in a running bond pattern. The would be a rear porch on the first floor and a screen porch extending from the basement. The majority of windows would be six-over-six, but the rear elevation also includes two-light fixed windows and four-overfour double hung windows. The left side elevation has cement fiber siding and paired casement windows above the cornice line. It is clad in brick veneer with a soldier course at the terrace/porch height and is inset with mixture of 6/6 and 4/4 double hung windows. Above the cornice line, the right-side elevation has cement fiber siding and a 9-light casement windows. The windows are paired around the chimney, transitioning from pairs of 4/4 double hung windows on the second floor, to 6/6 double hung windows on the first floor, and 6-light fixed windows on the basement level. The front portion of the house has a mixture of double hung windows.

- 3. The garage projects from the basement level on the front elevation. There would be a screened front porch on top, with a flat roof. The large, screened panels would have decorative cast stone lintels. The garage would be clad with granite and the porch in brick veneer. The concrete driveway would enter the parcel at the high point of the lot, in the south east corner. It would extend to the basement level garage and include a turn around. The applicant proposes a 1.5' high wall next to the driveway due to the topographic change from the street level.
- 4. The materials proposed for the new construction are fiber glass shingles, cement fiber board, granite, and brick.
- 5. The tree plan shows 28 existing trees on the site including 8 specimen-sized trees. The applicant proposes to remove 9 trees (1,10,11,12,13,14,15,22,23) three of which are specimen trees (1,12,13). Two of the specimen trees (1 and 12) are damaged, based on the submitted documentation. Applicant also proposes to maintain an existing hedge at the sidewalk to partially buffer the house.

Recommendation

Approve. The proposed changes will not conflict with the guidelines and will not have substantial adverse effect on the property or district.

Relevant Guidelines

- 5.0 Design Review Objective (p45) When making a material change to a structure that is in view from a public right-ofway, a higher standard is required to ensure that design changes are compatible with the architectural style of the structure and retain character-defining features. When a proposed material change to a structure is not in view from the public-right-way, the Preservation Commission may review the project with a less strict standard so as to allow the owner more flexibility. Such changes, however, shall not have a substantial adverse effect on the overall architectural character of the structure.
- 7.1 Defining the Area of Influence (p64) <u>Guideline</u> In considering the appropriateness of a design for a new building or addition in a historic district, it is important to determine the area of influence. This area should be that which will be visually influenced by the building, i.e. the area in which visual relationships will occur between historic and new construction.
- *7.2 Recognizing the Prevailing Character of Existing Development* (p65) <u>Guideline</u> When looking at a series of historic buildings in the area of influence, patterns of similarities may emerge that help define the predominant physical and developmental characteristics of the area. These patterns must be identified and respected in the design of additions and new construction.
- 7.2.2 Directional Emphasis (p67) Guideline A new building's directional emphasis should be consistent with dominant patterns of directional emphasis within the area of influence, if such patterns are present.
- *7.2.3 Shape: Roof Pitch* (p68) <u>Guideline</u> The roof pitch of a new building should be consistent with those of existing buildings within the area of influence, if dominant patterns are present.

- *7.2.3 Shape: Building Elements* (p68) <u>Guideline</u> The principal elements and shapes used on the front facade of a new building should be compatible with those of existing buildings in the area of influence, if dominant patterns are present.
- *7.2.3 Shape: Porch Form* (p68) <u>Guideline</u> The shape and size of a new porch should be consistent with those of existing historic buildings within the area of influence, if dominant patterns are present.
- *7.2.4 Massing* (p69) <u>Guideline</u> The massing of a new building should be consistent with dominant massing patterns of existing buildings in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.
- *7.2.5 Proportion* (p70) <u>Guideline</u> The proportions of a new building should be consistent with dominant patterns of proportion of existing buildings in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.
- 7.2.6 Rhythm (p71) Guideline New construction in a historic area should respect and not disrupt existing rhythmic patterns in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.
- 7.2.7 Scale/Height (p72) Guideline New construction in historic areas should be consistent with dominant patterns of scale within the area of influence, if such patterns are present. Additions to historic buildings should not appear to overwhelm the existing building.
- *7.2.7 Scale/Height* (p72) <u>Guideline</u> A proposed new building should appear to conform to the floor-to-floor heights of existing structures if there is a dominant pattern within the established area of influence. Dominant patterns of cornice lines, string courses, and water tables can be referenced to help create a consistent appearance.
- *7.2.8 Individual Architectural Elements* (p73) <u>Guideline</u> New construction and additions should be compatible and not conflict with the predominant site and architectural elements—and their design relationships—of existing properties in the area of influence.
- 7.3.2 New Construction and Subdivision Development (p75) <u>Guideline</u> To be compatible with its environment, new construction should follow established design patterns of its historic neighbors, including building orientation, setback, height, scale, and massing.
- *7.3.2 New Construction and Subdivision Development* (p75) <u>Guideline</u> New construction should respect the historic character that makes the area distinctive, but it should not be a mere imitation of historic design.
- 7.3.3 Demolition and Relocation (p75) Guideline Historic buildings and structures should not be demolished unless they are so unsound that rehabilitation is not possible. Historic buildings should not be moved off the property or relocated on the site, nor should other buildings be moved onto the site.
- 8.2 Trees (p78) <u>Recommendation</u> The mature hardwood forest within the Druid Hills Local Historic District should be perpetuated through a district-wide replanting program. Trees should be replaced when mature trees are lost to age or damage or are removed for safety reasons. Replacement trees should be of identical or similar varieties to the original trees. A diversity of tree types is recommended to perpetuate the existing character of most tree groupings. Replacement trees of adequate size (1.5" caliper minimum) are recommended. Existing ordinances that provide for the protection and replacement of the district's tree resources should be applied to development activities within Druid Hills.
- 8.3 Protection of the Historic Watershed Design and Design Concept (p79) <u>Guideline</u> All construction within the Druid Hills Local Historic District should follow a 75' setback requirement from the top of bank of creek corridors and drainage ways, as delineated on the official "Historic District Map."
- 9.4 Enclosures and Walls (p90) <u>Guideline</u> Fences and walls should not be built in front yard spaces and are strongly discouraged from corner lot side yard spaces. Retaining walls should only be used in situations where topography requires their use.

- *9.4 Enclosures and Walls* (p90) <u>Recommendation</u> Fences are appropriate in rear yard spaces. Rear yard fences should be coordinated with existing county codes. Suggested materials include wood and chain link. Vinyl- covered chain link fencing, typically in bronze, brown, or black, assist in making fences less obtrusive. Vines are suggested to "soften" the appearance of metal chain link fencing. If wood fencing is used, the paint color and design should be compatible with the architecture of the adjacent residence. Fence heights can range from 4' to 6' depending on the reason for the enclosure.
- *9.5 Parking* (p90) <u>Guideline</u> Parking should be addressed in a manner that does not distract from the overall character of the district. Parking to serve private residential lots should be accommodated on-site, when at all possible, using the pathway of original drives and parking. Front yard parking should not be allowed unless it is a public safety issue. When front yard parking is necessary, it should be added in a manner that does not destroy the unbroken landscaped character of the front yard spaces in Druid Hills. Rear yard spaces should be considered for expansion of parking areas.
- *9.5 Parking* (p90) <u>Guideline</u> Curb cuts should not be added or expanded in order to protect the character of the district's streets.
- *9.7 Residential Landscape Design* (p91) <u>Recommendation</u> For residential yards, created without the assistance of landscape designers, historic landscape plans for other residential lots within the district should be used for guidance. These plans can be interpreted to create a new landscape plan that is based on historic traditions. Care should be taken to select designs for yards of similar size containing houses of similar style and scale.



Chief Executive Officer Michael Thurmond DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY

Interim Director Cedric Hudson

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Date Received: Appl	ication No.:
Address of Subject Property:1176 Lullwater Roa	ad
Applicant: Elizabeth Finnerty c/o Battle La	
Applicant Mailing Address: 3562 Habersham at	Northlake, Tucker, GA. 30324
Applicant Phone: 404-601-7616 ext. 6	Fax:
Applicant's relationship to the owner: Owner 🖬 Archite	ect: Contractor/Builder Other
Owner(s): Elizabeth Finnerty	Email: bfinnerty@skylandtrail.org
Owner(s): David Martin	Email: david@basismedical.com
Owner(s) Mailing Address:	
Owner(s) Telephone Number: 404-308-0071	
Approximate age or date of construction of the primary st	ructure on the property and any secondary structures affected by this project:
Nature of work (check all that apply):	
New construction Demolition Addition changes New accessory building Landscaping changes Sign installation or replacement Other	
Description of Work: The applicant seeks to construct one single-family de	tached home 72 feet from the front property line.
samples, photographs, etc. All documents should be in	ompanied by supporting documents, such as plans, list of materials, color PDF format, except for photographs, which may be in JPEG format. <u>plansustain@dekalbcountyga.gov</u> and <u>rlbragg@dekalbcountyga.gov</u>

)M

Signature of Applicant: _



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY

Authorization of a Second Party to Apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness

This form is required if the individual making the request is **not** the owner of the property.

I/We: Elizabeth Finnerty and David Martin

being owner(s) of the property at: <u>1176 Lullwater Road</u>

hereby delegate authority to: Battle Law, P.C.

to file an application for a certificate of appropriateness in my/our behalf.

Signature of Owner(s): <u>Elizabeth Hinry Marty</u> Date: 7/28/2023

Please review the following information

Approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness does not release the recipient from compliance with all other pertinent county, state, and federal regulations.

Before making any changes to your approved plans, contact the preservation planner (404/371- 2155). Some changes may fall within the scope of the existing approval, but others will require review by the preservation commission. If work is performed which is not in accordance with your certificate, a Stop Work Order may be issued.

If your project requires that the county issue a Certificate of Occupancy at the end of construction, an inspection may be made to verify that the work has been completed in accord with the Certificate of Appropriateness. If the work as completed is not the same as that approved in the Certificate of Appropriateness you will not receive a Certificate of Occupancy. You may also be subject to other penalties including fines and/or required demolition of the non-conforming work.

If you do not commence construction within twelve months of the date of approval, your Certificate of Appropriateness will become void and you will need to apply for a new certificate if you still intend to do the work.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR 1176 LULLWATER ROAD 7-28-2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1-2 Table of Contents / Background
- 3- Application for COA
- 4- Owners' Authorization
- 5- Expired COA approved July 19, 2021
- 6- Current Site Sketch
- 7- Old Site Sketch from 2021 approval
- 8- Streetscape
- 9- Survey
- 10- Front Elevation Comparison (current versus July 2021 approval)
- 11-14 House Plans
- 15-18 Site Plans (will require modification due to smaller current footprint)
- 19-20 Photos
- 21-24 Tree Inventory
- GIS map

BACKGROUND

At the July 2021 HPC meeting, a version of the proposed home was approved for a Certificate of Appropriateness that was 690 square feet larger, 30" wider, and 30" taller to the ridge. That approval was supported by a current state water determination letter confirming again that no stream buffer was required for this project. There is a small stream for which the owners had regularly requested state water determinations from DeKalb County and, for many years, it was determined that no buffer was required for the work zone. Although the letter itself is valid for a year, the site visit must have occurred within six months of the application for a building permit. If we had started a little earlier with our HPC process, we would have been within that time limit and the house would now have been built but instead we had to request an updated site visit. We were surprised and are still bewildered that DeKalb County reversed the letter and imposed a stream buffer in September 2021. Long months of attempting to fix that problem yielded no result so we began to work towards a stream buffer variance based on the originally approved design and location and made possible because this is a conforming vacant lot that had existed and was owned by the same owners prior to the current stream buffer ordinance, which went into effect in early 2009. After two hearings before the ZBOA this year, we were given clear direction that they were uncomfortable with the original location encroaching into the central 25' zone of the 75' stream buffer. In the revised design in front of you, the house is located between the 50' and 75' buffer area which only requires an administrative variance. Again, the relief being requested will place the house more than 50' from the line of wrested vegetation.

Also, during the ZBOA hearing we had sought a variance to reduce the side yard setback adjacent to 1166 Lullwater from 8.5 ft to 5ft to match the approved site plan. Unfortunately for us, the Planning Staff recommended denial and the adjacent property owner opposed the request. Therefore, we withdrew that variance request and then were approved for an administrative variance to reduce the side yard setback 10% to 7.65ft; a good bit further from the neighbor at 1166 Lullwater.

These changes resulted in the buildable area squeezing in from the north and south and bulging forward to the east. To have a house of an appropriate width within the buildable area, the front edge of the house is now 3' closer to Lullwater Road; originally approved at 75', it is now 72' away.

One advantage of moving to this location is that neighborhood concerns about the effect on the stream should be allayed because there is no work happening within the flood zone; even the driveway is not within the flood zone. There is also no grading in the buildable area of the lot except some leveling at the driveway and many existing trees will remain in the buildable area along with two new beech trees. All the healthy trees will remain in that large portion of the lot that is below the flood elevation of 870.7'. Please note that this flood elevation was not on a FEMA map, that map shows this lot as a Type X flood zone, not a "special hazard flood zone" which typically begin with the letter A and are provided with 100-year flood elevations on the FEMA map. Directly across Lullwater Road is an AE flood zone next to Peavine Creek with FEMA providing a 100-year flood elevation at 867.0. At some point, DeKalb County established our flood elevation at 870.7 on their GIS map. This number is almost 4' above the adjacent flood elevation and the flood water would be more than 8' deep above the normal creek elevation. It is difficult to imagine a flood like that is possible, but we do not dispute that number because it is wise to be conservative when dealing with flooding. I bring it up to show that the owners had no reason to believe this lot would be a difficult lot: they had a history of receiving County determinations that no buffer was required and no initial concern about flood zones since this lot is Type X per the FEMA map and not even a concern after a 100-year flood elevation appeared, because a house would still fit (and was approved in 2021 by HPC).

If there is any project which deserves a small front setback exception to 72' from what was the otherwise appropriate and previously approved 75' setback, it is this project based on 13.5-11. The sudden appearance of a stream buffer was entirely out of the control of the owners and is specific to this property. Through an exceptionally long and difficult process, we have cut and tailored the footprint to match the requirements of most levels of DeKalb ordinance outside the Historic Preservation ordinance and we believe this design is in harmony with the general purpose of the Historic District and ask that you reinstate the previous approval from July 2021 on a house that appears the same as that approval (albeit slightly smaller) from the right of way at Lullwater Road.



Dekalb County Historic Preservation Commission 330 Ponce De Leon Avenue, Suite 300 Decatur, GA 30030 (404) 371-2155 or (404) 371-2813 (Fax)



CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Michael L. Thurmond Chief Executive Officer

July 20, 2021

Site Address: 1176 LULLWATER RD ATLANTA, GA30307-

Parcel ID: 18-054-06-001

Application Date:

Applicant:Dave PriceMailing Address:1595 Nottingham Way
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

THIS IS TO ADVISE YOU THAT THE DEKALB COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION, AT ITS REGULARLY SCHEDULED PUBLIC MEETING ON July 19, 2021, REACHED THE FOLLOWING DECISION ON THIS APPLICATION:

ACTION: Approval

- 1. Builda new house on a wooded lot. The house will be a two-story ColonialRevival-style house with an attic and basement. The basement will be aboveground at the rear and right side. Thehouse will be clad with brick, except for the granite front terrace andbasement level, and cement-fiber lap siding in the gables, on the dormers andon the rear wing. The roof will be sidegabled with three gabled dormers on the front roof slope. The roof will be clad with fiberglassshingles. The front entry portion of theterrace will have a hipped roof supported by tapered columns. An arched opening on the front of thebasement level will lead to a one-car garage door set back more than 8' behindthe front façade. A wooden deck andscreened porch will be at the rear of the house. All windows will be wood with simulateddivided lights.
- 2. A10'3" wide concrete driveway will enter at the southeast corner of the lot and curveacross to the basement level garage. Aturnaround will be installed at the curve in the driveway. The distance between the end of theturnaround and the opposite side of the driveway will be 23'. A 1.5' high boulder wall will be installedalong a portion of the driveway near the house. A 4' wide walkway will run from the driveway to the frontterrace.
- 3. Tentrees will be removed. Two3"-5"American beech trees will be planted in the front yard. Naturalistic plantingsof native shrubs will be installed beside the sidewalk and flanking thedriveway near the house.
- 4. Thesouth side setback of 5' will require a zoning variance from the required8.5'. The commission notes that othercounty departments may require further study of the floodplain and streambuffer.





SITE PLAN HIGHLIGHTS:

SSMH

RIP RAP / CULVERT

33.01 ASPHALT

50,

ROAD

LULLWA;

СВ

TOP=881.89

DIRT/DEBRIS)

(FULL OF

PAVING

(BC-BC)

HUGE MATURE NETHE BUFFER

/ NAIL

TOP=873.83

INV=859.91

1. BASE FLOOD ELEVATION PER DEKALB GIS MAP IS 870.7 SO LOWEST FLOOR MUST BE 3' ABOVE @ 873.7' (GARAGE). 7.8' HIGH CEILING WILL ALLOW OVERHEAD GARAGE DOOR.

2. AVERAGE NATURAL GRADE AT 35' FRONT SETBACK IS 874.2', WHICH IS THE MAXIMUM ELEVATION (ABOVE SEA LEVEL) OF FRONT DOOR THRESHOLD IF THERE IS NO VARIANCE. WITH A 7.7' CEILING HEIGHT IN BASEMENT ENTRY (FROM GARAGE), OUR LOWEST POSSIBLE MAIN FLOOR FFE IS 883.1'.

3. VARIANCE WILL BE SOUGHT TO RAISE FRONT DOOR THRESHOLD FROM 874.2' TO 883.1' ELEVATION (BETWEEN EX. SOUTHERN NEIGHBOR @ 885.8'+/- & EXISTING SIDEWALK AT FUTURE DRIVEWAY @ 881.5'+/-) AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE HAS BEEN GRANTED TO REDUCE SIDE YARD SETBACK FROM 8.5' TO 7.65' DUE TO FLOOD ZONE AND TO PRESERVE EXISTING TREES THEREIN WITH AS LARGE A FRONT SETBACK AS POSSIBLE (72') PER HPC GUIDELINE 7.2.1 4. VERY LITTLE GRADING EXCEPT TO SMOOTH OUT DRIVEWAY PATH AND A 1.5' HIGH BOULDER WALL WILL BE REQUIRED WHERE DRIVEWAY MEETS THE FRONT PORCH. NO WORK IN AREAS BELOW 100-YEAR BFE PER DEKALB GIS MAP. THERE IS NO SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA ON FEMA F.I.R.M. PANEL No. 13089C0062K, DATED AUGUST 15, 2019, SHOWN ON THIS LOT, ONLY ZONE X (500-YEAR FLOOD AREA).

5. 12' WIDE SINGLE FRONT-FACING DOOR WILL BE RECESSED OVER 6' BEHIND PORCH EDGE IN FULL SHADOW SO THAT, COMPARED TO A MORE TYPICAL SIDE-ENTRY GARAGE AND DRIVEWAY, WORK WILL NOT ENCROACH FLOOD ZONE, MAINTAINS LOW LOT COVERAGE (21.2%, WELL UNDER 35% MAXIMUM PER CODE), AND MINIMAL LOSS OF EXISTING TREES. ONLY ONE TREE IN FLOOD ZONE WILL BE REMOVED, DUE TO ACTIVE TERMITE INFESTATION. 6. REMOVAL OF TREES FROM FLOOD ZONE IS PROHIBITED BY DEKALB COUNTY ORDINANCE EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF ACTIVE INSECT INFESTATION SO A FRONT-FACING GARAGE IS THE SOLE MEANS OF AVOIDING A VIOLATION OF THE TREE ORDINANCE IN THIS UNIQUE CASE.

7. EXISTING MASSIVE HEDGE (MOSTLY ON NEIGHBOR'S LOT) BUFFERS VIEW OF GARAGE DOOR FROM NORTHEAST, EXISTING TREES AND NEW NATURALISTIC SHRUBBERY (A) NEXT TO SIDEWALK BUFFERS VIEW FROM FRONT, AND SHRUBBERY (B) FLANKING DRIVEWAY AT UNDER-PORCH ENTRY BUFFERS VIEW FROM THE SOUTH. NATIVE SHRUBBERY CHOSEN FROM DRUID HILLS RECOMMENDED PLANT MATERIALS LIST - 4-6' MATURE HEIGHT. RAINWATER DIRECTED TO RAIN GARDEN (C).

8. IT IS A VACANT LOT OF RECORD IN GOOD STANDING THAT IS FULLY WOODED. OF 32 EXTANT NON-DDH TREES, 10 WILL BE REMOVED, 22 REMAIN. OF THOSE 32, 6 EXTANT NON-DDH TREES ARE OF SPECIMEN SIZE AND 5 WILL REMAIN. THE LARGEST SPECIMEN (53" YELLOW-POPLAR) WILL REMAIN AND EXISTING TREES ARE EVENLY DISTRIBUTED AROUND LOT SO EXISTING CANOPY WILL REMAIN AS UNBROKEN AS POSSIBLE. MANY TREES WILL REQUIRE ARBORIST PRESCRIPTIONS, WHICH WE WILL PROVIDE. THIS PLAN HAS BEEN MODIFIED TO SHOW DIAMETERS PER ARBORIST REPORT.

9. TWO NEW 3-5" REPLACEMENT AMERICAN BEECH TREES (SIZE DETERMINED BY AVAILABILITY) ARE PROPOSED IN FRONT YARD TO REPLACE THE ONE HEALTHY SPECIMEN (41" AMERICAN BEECH) THAT WE UNFORTUNATELY MUST REMOVE.

10. SEVERAL YEARS OF PREVIOUS STATE WATERS DETERMINATION CERTIFICATES INDICATING NO STREAM BUFFER WAS REQUIRED WERE REVERSED IN 2021 AFTER THE JULY 2021 PREVIOUS HPC APPROVAL AND A STREAM BUFFER WAS DETERMINED TO EXIST ON SITE. THE STREAM BUFFER WAS THEREAFTER REDUCED TO 50'. HPC GUIDELINE 8.3 STATES CONSTRUCTION SHOULD ONLY OCCUR OUTSIDE 25' STATE BUFFER SETBACK AND THIS PLAN COMPLIES WITH THAT GUIDELINE.

11. PER SEC. 13.5-11, HPC HAS THE POWER TO ALLOW AN UNCOMMON FRONT-FACING GARAGE IN THIS PECULIAR SITUATION AND SETBACK DUE TO THE CONFLICTING HISTORIC PRESERVATION. TREE PRESERVATION, AND STREAM BUFFER ORDINANCES CREATING A HARDSHIP. WE HAVE PROVIDED A SOLUTION WHICH ALLOWS THE MAXIMUM SETBACK AND HAVE GONE TO GREAT LENGTHS TO CONCEAL OR VISUALLY BUFFER THE VIEW OF THE GARAGE DOOR. THIS DESIGN WILL REMAIN IN HARMONY WITH THE GENERAL PURPOSE AND INTENT OF HPC GUIDELINES WHILE ALSO PRESERVING THE LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS OF THE OWNERS OF THIS LONG-STANDING LEGAL LOT.

1176 LULLWATER ROAD SITE SKETCH 1"=20' 7-28-23 PROVIDED BY PRICE RESIDENTIAL DESIGN BASED ON SURVEY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY GA LAND SURVEYOR, LAST UPDATED 1-30-23



APPROXIMATE LIMITS OF FUTURE 100 YEAR FLOOD HAZARD AREA PER DEKALB COUNTY GIS MAPS. ELEVATION = 870.7

ENEW 3-5" REPLACEMENT AMERICAN BEECH TREES (SIZE
 DETERMINED BY AVAILABILITY). TWO PROPOSED IN FRONT YARD.

SITE PLAN HIGHLIGHTS:

SSMH

TOP=873.83

INV=859.91

1. BASE FLOOD ELEVATION IS 870.7 SO LOWEST FLOOR MUST BE 3' ABOVE @ 873.7' (GARAGE). 7.8' HIGH CEILING WILL ALLOW OVERHEAD GARAGE DOOR.

2. AVERAGE NATURAL GRADE AT 35' FRONT SETBACK IS 874.2', WHICH IS THE MAXIMUM ELEVATION (ABOVE SEA LEVEL) OF FRONT DOOR THRESHOLD IF THERE IS NO VARIANCE. WITH A 7.7' CEILING HEIGHT IN BASEMENT ENTRY (FROM GARAGE), OUR LOWEST POSSIBLE MAIN FLOOR FFE IS 883.1'.

3. VARIANCES WILL BE SOUGHT TO RAISE FRONT DOOR THRESHOLD FROM 874.2' TO 883.1' ELEVATION (BETWEEN EX. SOUTHERN NEIGHBOR @ 885.8' & EXISTING SIDEWALK AT FUTURE DRIVEWAY @ 881.5') AND TO REDUCE SIDE YARD SETBACK FROM 8.5' TO 5' DUE TO FLOOD ZONE AND TO PRESERVE EXISTING TREES THEREIN WHILE MAINTAINING BUILDING ORIENTATION AND AS LARGE A FRONT SETBACK AS POSSIBLE (75') PER HPC GUIDELINE 7.2.1.

4. VERY LITTLE GRADING EXCEPT APPROX. 1 FOOT OF FILL AROUND CORNERS WHICH PROTRUDE INTO EXISTING FLOOD ZONE TO MOVE LINE OUTSIDE OF HOUSE FOOTPRINT (FLOOD CAPACITY WILL BE BALANCED ELSEWHERE). SOME GRADING AND A 1.5' HIGH BOULDER WALL WILL BE REQUIRED NEXT TO DRIVEWAY. 5. 12' WIDE SINGLE FRONT-FACING DOOR WILL BE RECESSED OVER 8' BEHIND PORCH EDGE IN FULL SHADOW SO THAT, COMPARED TO A MORE TYPICAL SIDE-ENTRY GARAGE AND DRIVEWAY, WORK WILL MINIMALLY ENCROACH FLOOD ZONE, MAINTAINS LOW LOT COVERAGE (23.3%, WELL UNDER 35% MAXIMUM PER CODE), AND MINIMAL LOSS OF EXISTING TREES. ONLY ONE TREE IN FLOOD ZONE WILL BE REMOVED, DUE TO ACTIVE TERMITE INFESTATION.

6. REMOVAL OF TREES FROM FLOOD ZONE IS PROHIBITED BY DEKALB COUNTY ORDINANCE EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF ACTIVE INSECT INFESTATION SO A FRONT-FACING GARAGE IS THE SOLE MEANS OF AVOIDING A VIOLATION OF THE TREE ORDINANCE IN THIS UNIQUE CASE.

7. EXISTING MASSIVE HEDGE (MOSTLY ON NEIGHBOR'S LOT) BUFFERS VIEW OF GARAGE DOOR FROM NORTHEAST, EXISTING TREES AND NEW NATURALISTIC SHRUBBERY (A) NEXT TO SIDEWALK BUFFERS VIEW FROM FRONT, AND SHRUBBERY (B) FLANKING DRIVEWAY AT UNDER-PORCH ENTRY BUFFERS VIEW FROM THE SOUTH. NATIVE SHRUBBERY CHOSEN FROM DRUID HILLS RECOMMENDED PLANT MATERIALS LIST - 4-6' MATURE HEIGHT.

8. IT IS A VACANT LOT OF RECORD IN GOOD STANDING THAT IS FULLY WOODED. OF 28 EXTANT TREES, 10 WILL BE REMOVED, 18 REMAIN. OF THOSE 28, 8 EXTANT TREES ARE OF SPECIMEN SIZE AND 5 WILL REMAIN (TWO OF THREE BEING REMOVED ARE UNHEALTHY, MARKED AS DDH ON THIS PLAN). THE LARGEST SPECIMEN (53" YELLOW-POPLAR) WILL REMAIN AND EXISTING TREES ARE EVENLY DISTRIBUTED AROUND LOT SO EXISTING CANOPY WILL REMAIN AS UNBROKEN AS POSSIBLE. MANY TREES WILL REQUIRE ARBORIST PRESCRIPTIONS, WHICH WE WILL PROVIDE. THIS PLAN HAS BEEN MODIFIED TO SHOW DIAMETERS PER ARBORIST REPORT.

9. TWO NEW 3-5" REPLACEMENT AMERICAN BEECH TREES (SIZE DETERMINED BY AVAILABILITY) ARE PROPOSED IN FRONT YARD TO REPLACE THE ONE HEALTHY SPECIMEN (41" AMERICAN BEECH) THAT WE UNFORTUNATELY MUST REMOVE.

10. PER STATE WATER DETERMINATION FORM DATED 10/2/2020 AND VALID FOR ONE YEAR FROM DEKALB COUNTY, THERE IS NO BUFFER REQUIRED.

11. HPC HAS THE POWER TO ALLOW AN UNCOMMON FRONT-FACING GARAGE IN THIS PECULIAR SITUATION DUE TO THE CONFLICTING TREE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE CREATING A HARDSHIP. WE HAVE PROVIDED A SOLUTION WHICH SAVES THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF TREE CANOPY AND HAVE GONE TO GREAT LENGTHS TO CONCEAL OR VISUALLY BUFFER THE VIEW OF THE GARAGE DOOR. THIS DESIGN WILL REMAIN IN HARMONY WITH THE GENERAL PURPOSE AND INTENT OF HPC GUIDELINES.

1176 LULLWATER ROAD SITE SKETCH 1"=20' 6-27-21 REVISED 7-9-21 PROVIDED BY PRICE RESIDENTIAL DESIGN BASED ON SURVEY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY GA LAND SURVEYOR, LAST UPDATED 6-23-21

APPROVED JULY 2021

CB TOP=881.89 (FULL OF DIRT/DEBRIS)

LULLWATER ROAD -











3. BASKET-WEAVE BRICK COURSE AT MAIN FLOOR LEVEL

GRADING AND A 1.5' HIGH BOULDER WALL WILL BE REQUIRED NEXT TO DRIVEWAY. A 12' WIDE SINGLE FRONT-FACING DOOR WILL BE RECESSED OVER 6' BEHIND PORCH EDGE IN FULL REMOVED, DUE TO ACTIVE TERMITE INFEGTATION.





GARAGE FLOOR IS AT THE LOWEST ELEVATION ALLOWED (3' ABOVE THIS 100-YR BASE FLOOD ELEVATION) AND HAS MINIMUM CEILING HEIGHT FOR OVERHEAD GARAGE DOOR (1'-10" FIN CEILING)

2. SEGMENTED ARCHES LIKE I AM PROPOSING TO THE VOID UNDER THE SIDE PORCH 4. SMALL FRONT ENTRY PORCH ON LARGE FRONT TERRACE INCLUDING FRONT STAIRS WITH CHEEKWALLS.









SIMPLE BLACK IRON 36' HIGH GUARDRAIL / HANDRAIL W/ MODEST FLOURISH AT NEWELS. NO FLOURISH ON INDIVIDUAL SPINDLES FOR US ALTHOUGH THAT IS SHOWN IN THIS EXAMPLE.







TYPICAL DIMENSION EITHER TO ROUGH FRAMING OR ROUGH FOUNDATION WALL



ROOF PLAN SCALE: ¼" = 1'-0" SOME CONDITIONED SPACE (OFFICE, STORAGE) IN ATTIC - UNPLANNED





DATE: MAY 30, 2023		ISSUE	
SCALE: 1" = 30'	NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
ACREAGE: 0.4165			
LAND LOT(S): 2			
DISTRICT: 18th			
CITY:			
COUNTY: DEKALB STATE: GEORGIA			
SURVEYED: MAF DRAWN: MWR			
CHECKED: WGH APPROVED: CAM			
PROJECT #: 16-257			



© Copyright - 2021 | Ga Land Surveyor, llc | All Rights Reserved

SUWANEE, GA 30024



LAND LOT 2, 18th DISTRICT, DEKALB COUNTY, GEORGIA TAX PARCEL No. 18 054 06 001

SURVEYED: MAF

CHECKED: WGH

PROJECT #: 16-257

DRAWN: MWR

APPROVED: CAM

A. MCGAUGY GSWCC LEVEL II #0000064742

~~~`~`





| DATE: AUGUST 5, 2021          |     | ISSUE                |            |  |
|-------------------------------|-----|----------------------|------------|--|
| SCALE: 1" = 30'               | NO. | DESCRIPTION          | DATE       |  |
| ACREAGE: 0.4165               | 1   | ADDED STREAM BUFFERS | 02/01/2023 |  |
| LAND LOT(S): 2                | 2   | UPDATED HOUSE PLAN   | 05/30/2023 |  |
| DISTRICT: 18th                |     |                      |            |  |
| CITY:                         |     |                      |            |  |
| COUNTY: DEKALB STATE: GEORGIA |     |                      |            |  |
| SURVEYED: MAF DRAWN: MWR      |     |                      |            |  |
| CHECKED: WGH APPROVED: CAM    |     |                      |            |  |
| PROJECT #: 16-257             |     |                      |            |  |

TAX PARCEL No. 18 054 06 001

3355 ANNANDALE LANE, STE 1

SUWANEE, GA 30024

GSWCC LEVEL II #0000064742

© Copyright - 2021 | Ga Land Surveyor, llc | All Rights Reserved

# Price Residential Design 1176 Lullwater Road photo documentation



Both adjacent houses (this is the rear of the house on North Decatur that faces the project) have two full floors with large attics and basement below because of the extreme topography.


This massive mature (camelia?) hedge will be retained for a visual buffer, though it will be pruned back.



This is one of many examples of Colonial Revival houses along this side of Lullwater Road with dormers on the roof. None of the Colonials nearby the project have a dormer, as we propose, but dormers are nonetheless common. There are only Colonial Revivals in the area of influence so we will continue that style in order to retain the directional emphasis, shape, massing, proportion, rhythm, scale/height, and the architectural features that are prevalent nearby.

#### **Tree Evaluation Report**

## 1176 Lullwater Road, DeKalb County July 6, 2021

#### **Description of property:**

This is a vacant undeveloped lot with proposed new construction. Twenty-eight trees exist on the site with three boundary trees noted. There are eight specimen-sized trees on the property and one off site.

**Observations**: All observations were visual and made from the ground. No invasive tests, underground or aerial inspections were performed. The site visit was conducted on July 1, 2021. Diameters were measured at breast height, 4½ feet above the ground (DBH) and current conditions noted.



## PAGE 2 1176 Lullwater Road, DeKalb County

| 1       2       3       4       5       6 | Water Oak<br>Water Oak<br>Ash<br>Ash<br>Yellow-poplar<br>Yellow-poplar | 37"<br>24"<br>24"<br>18" | Bifurcated upper trunk, Covered in vines<br>Covered in vines<br>Covered in vines | Specimen<br>Y<br>N | N | N | N | Target |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|--------|
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6                          | Ash<br>Ash<br>Yellow-poplar                                            | 24"<br>18"               |                                                                                  | N                  |   |   | N | Y      |
| 4<br>5<br>6                               | Ash<br>Yellow-poplar                                                   | 18"                      | Covered in vines                                                                 |                    | N | N | N | Y      |
| 5<br>6                                    | Yellow-poplar                                                          |                          |                                                                                  | N                  | Ν | N | N | Y      |
| 6                                         |                                                                        | 4.01                     | Covered in vines                                                                 | N                  | Ν | N | N | Y      |
| -                                         | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 18"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | Ν | N | N | Y      |
|                                           |                                                                        | 25"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | N | Ν      |
| 7                                         | Sweetgum                                                               | 15"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | N | Ν      |
| 8                                         | Ash                                                                    | 19"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | Ν | Y | N | Ν      |
| 9                                         | Loblolly Pine                                                          | 30"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | Y                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 10                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 25"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | N | Ν      |
| 11                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 12"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | Ν | N | N | Ν      |
| 12                                        | Loblolly Pine                                                          | 33"                      | Termites at the base, <20% LCR                                                   | Y                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 13                                        | Beech                                                                  | 41"                      | 1 broken limb, Appears Healthy                                                   | Y                  | N | N | N | Y      |
| 14                                        | Hardwood                                                               | 12"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | N | Ν      |
| 15                                        | Hardwood                                                               | 15"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | N | N      |
| 16                                        | Loblolly Pine                                                          | 33"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | Y                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 17                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 13"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | Y | N | Ν      |
| 18                                        | Hardwood                                                               | 12"                      | Lean >20 degrees, decay in main trunk                                            | N                  | Ν | Y | N | Ν      |
| 19                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 31"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | Y                  | N | N | N | N      |
| 20                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 28"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | N | N      |
| 21                                        | Tupelo                                                                 | 24"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 22                                        | Loblolly Pine                                                          | 28"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | Ν | N | N | Y      |
| 23                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 15"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | Ν | N | N | Y      |
| 24                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 53"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | Y                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 25                                        | Pecan                                                                  | 8"                       | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 26                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 24"                      | Roots starting to become eroded, Appears<br>Healthy                              | N                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 27                                        | Yellow-poplar                                                          | 30"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | Y                  | N | Y | N | Y      |
| 28                                        | Hardwood                                                               | 10"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | Y | N | N      |
| 29                                        | Sweetgum                                                               | ~18"                     | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | Y | Y | Y      |
| 30                                        | Hardwood                                                               | 12"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | Ν | N | Y | Y      |
| 31                                        | Post Oak                                                               | 27"                      | Appears Healthy                                                                  | N                  | N | N | Y | Y      |

Highlighted trees are of specimen size for DeKalb County

| 32 | Yellow-poplar | 9"  | Appears Healthy, Outcompeted                          | N | Ν | Ν | N | N |
|----|---------------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33 | Sweetgum      | 9"  | Appears Healthy, Outcompeted                          | N | Ν | Ν | Ν | N |
| 34 | Sweetgum      | 8"  | Appears Healthy, Outcompeted                          | N | Ν | Ν | N | N |
| 35 | Yellow-poplar | 9"  | Appears Healthy, Outcompeted                          | N | Ν | Ν | N | N |
| 36 | Water Oak     | 11" | Significant lean over street, unbalanced crown weight | N | N | N | N | Y |

Trees (#32-36) not on original site plan

PAGE 3 1176 Lullwater Road, DeKalb County

Pictures (not in good condition):



Tree 12



Tree 18





Tree 26



#### PAGE 4 1176 Lullwater Road, DeKalb County

Tree 36 leaning over street



#### **Final Notes:**

Consult with the International Society of Arboriculture for specific guidelines on tree removal, pruning and planting, <u>www.isa-arbor.com</u>.

This letter serves as an assessment of the specified trees. I certify that all the statements in this letter are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that they are made in good faith. All trees will fail. No arborist can state exactly when, where, or how a tree will fail. Live trees that appear healthy may fall as an "act of God" or with significant weather or environmental conditions that cannot be controlled. All recommendations made in this letter are the sole responsibility of the homeowner to address, thus assuming any risk associated with not performing such recommendations.

This information was generated by Heidi Rieckermann Harrington, Certified Arborist (ISA #NY-1074A), Certified Forester (SAF #2756), HRH Trees, LLC.



#### RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration,

Louis Edwards Name 1156 Indhuafer Rd Allanta, Get 30307

17 Aug 2023

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- Thursday, August 17, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

#### RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration, Lull Water Road 3

Address

8/17/23

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- Thursday, August 17, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

## RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and smail to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

| Thank you for your consideration, |            |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Jonathan Wegman                   | 08/17/2023 |
| Name                              | Date       |
| 1146 Lullwater Rd<br>Address      |            |
| Address                           |            |

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- **Thursday, August 17, 2023** at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting – **Monday, August 21** at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

## RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration Address

7.23

Date

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- **Thursday, August 17, 2023** at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

#### RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration,

Address

17/2023

Date

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- **Thursday, August 17, 2023** at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

#### RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration,

Matthew ? Brittany Hartnett Name 1125 Millnater Rd

| 9 | 115 | 123 |
|---|-----|-----|
| - |     |     |

Date

Atanta, 6A 30307

Address

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- Thursday, August 17, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

#### RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration,

Andrea Schklor + Macairang Wan

8/19/23

Date

1114 Lullwater Rd. NE

Atlanta, GA 30307 Address

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- Thursday, August 17, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

#### RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

Thank you for your consideration,

Name

8 18 2023

Date

1124 LULLWATER ROAD

TLAMA, GA 30307

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- Thursday, August 17, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

## RE: 1176 Lullwater Road -

1. Request to reinstate expired Certificate of Appropriateness granted in July 2021 by DeKalb Co Historic Preservation Commission. The original design is modified to be 30" shorter, 30" narrower, and at a 72' setback from Lullwater Road rather than 75' as originally approved.

2. Request for Variance from DeKalb Co Zoning Code Ordinance to raise the elevation of the new home's front door threshold from 874.2' (average natural grade at 35' front setback) to 883.1' elevation. For reference, the manhole on a catch basin next to the sidewalk on the southeastern corner of the lot is at elevation 881.52', so the main floor elevation is 19 inches above that manhole.

Dear Zoning Board and Historic Preservation Commission members and staff:

We, as neighbors of 1176 Lullwater Road, have reviewed the plans and exterior elevations of this project and believe it is appropriate to the neighborhood. We ask that you support the approvals requested.

This page can be returned to the owner's mailbox at 1136 Lullwater Road on or before August 17, or you may take a photo with your phone and text it to Dave Price of Price Residential Design at 404-245-4244, or scan and email to me at dave@priceresidentialdesign.com

LullwATER Rd. Atl. GA 30307

Thank you for your consideration,

ame Jwin J. Schklar

8-19-2023

Address

Please feel free to join us at the upcoming meetings:

1. Neighbor Information Meeting -- Thursday, August 17, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 1136 Lullwater Road (home of the owners, Beth Finnerty and Daivd Martin)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting - Monday, August 21 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

## September 18, 2023 HPC Agenda Meeting

## **Opposition to New Construction at 1176 Lullwater Road**

Submitted by Virginia Tate, owner of 1166 Lullwater Road (property adjacent to 1176 on the south side). September 15, 2023

Attachments: 1166 Lullwater Survey

Picture of Side Room at 1166 Lullwater

Druid Hills Historic Landmark Doc

Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness ("COA") for a new home. The request is inappropriate at this time given the County has denied Applicant's request for a stream buffer variance and the site plan before the HPC is based on the assumption that the variance would be granted. Further, the proposed new home would have a substantial adverse effect on the District and contravenes Guidelines from the Design Manual for Druid Hills Local Historic District. The application should be denied for these following reasons.

- 1) Applicant applied for an administrative variance for the stream buffer. However, ZBOA Board Member Dan Wright pointed out at the ZBOA hearing on September 13, 2023 that the County denied the request earlier this week, and he stated the current site plan isn't viable.
- 2) The HPC just heard and denied this same application at its July 17, 2023 hearing and denied the application.
- 3) The building is inconsistent with the neighborhood and does not conform to the Druid Hills Design Manual.
- 4) The lot should not be developed as it is not part of the original Olmstead plan.
- 5) The HPC addressed the same property at its November 2021 meeting and denied the applicant's request, in part, based on the side distance between 1166 and 1176 Lullwater.
- 6) The July 2021 HPC grant of a COA was based on a completely different application. The dimensions were different and there was no clear stream buffer requirement. Additionally, it was based on erroneous information.
- 7) Given the watershed and flooding issues that would be caused by a new construction on the lot, the HPC should deny the request.
- 8) There is no undue hardship on the applicant, so an exception to Section 13.5-11 should not be granted.

## 1) The current site plan before the HPC is not viable.

As stated, the County just this week denied Applicant's application for a stream buffer variance. (To date, I have been unable to obtain a copy.) The site plan before the HPC is based on the assumption that a stream buffer variance would be granted. Until this matter is resolved, it would not be prudent for the HPC to make a ruling.

## 2) The HPC already denied this application last month.

The HPC heard this same request for a COA in July and denied it based on the Guidelines from the Design Manual for Druid Hills Local Historic District. The minutes from that meeting state:

Modification or reason for denial or deferral: The commission determined that the construction of the house would not be in compliance with Guideline 7.2.6 and would have a substantial adverse effect on the historic district.

Section 7.2.6 of the Guidelines provides: Rhythm (p71) Guidelines - New construction in a historic area should respect and not disrupt existing rhythmic patterns in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.

There is nothing new in the current application. The only slight change seems to be that the house would be 72 feet from the street instead of 68 feet. Given that this is virtually the same application as the one in July, the HPC should again deny the application.

# 3) The Proposed Building is not consistent with the rhythm and cadence of the street and would have a negative impact on the District.

#### Side Distance to 1166 Lullwater

The building would be less than half the distance to 1166 Lullwater than most homes on Lullwater and at least 25 feet in front of 1166 Lullwater.

The new building would be about 23 feet (side setback) from 1166 Lullwater, if applicant continues to pursue and is approved for a side setback to 5 feet. The boundary line is 18.5 feet from the side of 1166 Lullwater.\* With a 5 foot set back they have been requesting from ZBOA, the distance between the homes would be 23.5 feet. Even if the applicant relies on the Setback Variance just granted by Administrative Decision, the distance would be about 26 feet. The neighbor on the other side of 1166 Lullwater is nearly 55 feet away, so the proposed house at 1176 Lullwater would be less than half the distance. Most houses are about 40 to 55 feet apart.

\*(1166 Lullwater survey attached shows it 30.5 feet from the two story portion of house to the property line. Taking into account the 12 foot sunporch of 1166 Lullwater, picture attached, the distance from 1166 to the property line is 18.5 feet).

## Front Setback

Applicant's application states that the house would be 72 feet from the street, not including the porch/stone terrace which protrudes another 9 feet, as opposed to the typical 100 feet from the street on that section of Lullwater. Further, my house is on average about 100 feet from the street (see 1166 survey), so this new construction would not only be about 25 feet from my house but a good 25 to 28

feet in front of it. This is a drastic difference from the dominant pattern of the District. One of the unique features of the Druid Hills District is the privacy of the houses due to the consistent spacing with houses being situated in the center of the lot. This new construction would be right up against the side of my house and significantlyin front of it (25 to 28 feet). Not only would this have an substantial adverse effect on the neighborhood, but it would also impact the value of my property as no one would want the house in Druid Hills that has a new construction so close and in front.

#### **Street Facing Garage and Basement**

This new construction shows a street facing garage and daylight basement. Virtually none of the houses in the District have that.

#### Screened Porch Facing the Street

There are no houses on Lullwater and probably not in the entire Druid Hills neighborhood with a screened porch on the front of the house.

#### Large Driveway in Front of the House

The new construction shows a huge and sweeping concrete driveway and turn around sitting right in front of the house. This is completely out of character with all neighboring homes which have a side driveway going to the back of the house.

#### The Elevation

The applicant is seeking approval of an increase in elevation from 874.2 to 883.1 feet. The National Map App USGS shows that the sidewalk at 1176 is about 875 feet. Thus, the proposed house would be at least 8 feet above the sidewalk. Again, this is completely inconsistent with the surrounding homes.

#### **Building Elements**

The new construction would have granite veneer at the front of the building combined with brick. Such building elements are not a common element of neighboring homes.

#### House Proportions Are Not Compatible.

The new construction places a large house on a very small lot which is not in keeping with the dominant pattern of the neighborhood.

#### House Shape

The house is shaped like a triangle which there are no such shaped homes in the District.

In summary, the new construction has numerous characteristics that are drastically inconsistent with the dominant patterns of influence on the street and would greatly disrupt the rhythmic patterns and cadence of the neighborhood.

#### 4) The lot should not be developed as it has always been a non-buildable lot.

This lot by itself was never part of the original Olmstead plan. See Druid Hills Historic Landmark document attached. In fact, it was originally part of 1495 N Decatur Road and at some point was subdivided from that property in the early 1990's. The applicant wants to build on what used to be the backyard of 1495 N Decatur that would require multiple variances. This lot was never part of the historical plan and to allow a new construction on it would have a negative impact on the District.

## 5) The HPC Denied the Applicant's COA Request in November 2021

The HPC denial of applicant's request in November 2021 addressed the side distance between 1176 and 1166. (The front set back was adjusted in that application due to the stream buffer requirement.) The HPC adopted the staff recommendation which stated, in part, that the distance was not in keeping with the nearby houses.

The distance between the proposed house and the house is next door is substantially less than the distance between the other four houses. The distance between the house next door (1166) and its neighbor is almost twice that of the proposed house and 1166. Distance between houses (based on numbers taken from the applicant's illustration):

Between 1136 and 1146 – 41'

Between 1146 and 1156 – 40'8"

Between 1156 and 1166 – 53' to 54'

Between 1166 and 1176 – 27'

(Staff rec. p. 31)

# 6) The HPC COA from July 2021 was a different application and was based on inaccurate information.

The applicant appears to rely on the HPC COA granted in July 2021. That COA in July 2021 was a completely different application. The dimensions of the building were significantly different and there was not a stream buffer requirement at the time. Furthermore, there were inaccuracies upon which the HPC relied. The staff report for that meeting states:

The applicant states the proposed location will minimize grading and tree loss. The location will maximize the use of the topography, as there are few flat areas on the lot. The applicant has submitted a state water determination form that states no buffer is required, due to the concrete/brick wall along the stream. The house will be set back 75 feet from the right-of-way and 13' closer to the street than the adjacent house. The house will be set 5' from the property line on that side. It adheres closely to the south side property line to make the best of the topography. 29 R. 1176 Lullwater Road, Price Residential Design Page 2 The side setback will require a variance from the 8.5' required by the zoning code. The side of the house will be just over 37' from the side of the neighbor's house. The first floor (FFE) will be 2' lower than that of the neighbor.

The distances are inaccurate:

- The distance between the homes would not be just over 37 feet, but rather just over 23 feet to 26 feet, depending on what variance is obtained;
- The applicant's house would not be just 13 feet in front of 1166 Lullwater, but rather about 28 feet in front (the original COA application from then had the building 75 feet from the road, but that has changed in the current application.)

## 7) Building on the lot will have an adverse effect on the watershed design.

The removal of 13 trees, elevating the lot 8 feet and building a large house with the front yard being a concrete driveway will significantly adversely affect the watershed design and the adjacent neighbors. Given so much hard surface on a lot that is in a flood zone is going to lead to more flooding and runoff impinging on the already fragile condition of Peavine Creek. The water that naturally flows through the property would have to go into the neighboring yards. Additionally, excessive water would end up back in the stream. The heavier volume of runoff and overflow will cause erosion and a build up of sediment and have damaging effects on Peavine Creek. Section 8.3 of the Guidelines provides that the watershed design of the District should be considered.

# 8) There is no undue hardship on the applicant, so an exception to Section 13.5-11 should not be granted.

The Applicants purchased the lot in 2006 for \$120,000 when they lived in the property adjacent at 1495 N Decatur Road, such that the lot became part of their backyard. Applicants later sold the 1495 N Decatur home but not the lot. Any reasonable person would not have only paid \$120,000 for a lot on Lullwater and expect it to be buildable. It's never been buildable and is in a floodplain. As ZBOA member Mark Goldman pointed out in one of the recent ZBOA hearings on this issue, we all make bad financial decisions but that is not undue hardship.

The Applicants are making the argument that they did everything that they possibly could, received multiple assurances from DeKalb County representatives that the lot was buildable, and now are "bewildered" that the County's previous position has been reversed. They're using this reversal to portray themselves as having been done wrong by the County. This was a business deal, and business deals carry inherent risks. The fact that DeKalb County eventually did decide a stream buffer is required is neither surprising, unusual, and certainly not bewildering. Government entities at all levels modify and reverse regulations and previous positions that they've taken all the time. Efforts to protect the environment, in particular, have become of increasing importance over the last years, so the County's position on the stream buffer cannot be a surprise to anyone.

It is apparent that Applicants are trying to make a significant profit off of the lot that was a bad business decision but to do so, it must be deemed "buildable." There is no undue hardship on the Applicants in this case simply because they are unable to make a profit. Further, applicants cannot buy an unbuildable lot and then argue that it should be buildable because they didn't create the conditions.

For the foregoing reasons, I urge the HPC to deny the applicant's request for a COA on 1176 Lullwater.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Tate 1166 Lullwater Road

#### Some relevant Guidelines from the Design Manual for Druid Hills Local Historic District are as follows:

7.1 Defining the Area of Influence (p64) Guideline - In considering the appropriateness of a design for a new building or addition in a historic district, it is important to determine the area of influence. This area should be that which will be visually influenced by the building, i.e. the area in which visual relationships will occur between historic and new construction.

7.2 Recognizing the Prevailing Character of Existing Development (p65) Guideline - When looking at a series of historic buildings in the area of influence, patterns of similarities may emerge that help define the predominant physical and developmental characteristics of the area. These patterns must be identified and respected in the design of additions and new construction.

7.2.1 Building Orientation and Setback (p66) Guideline - The orientation of a new building and its site placement should appear to be consistent with dominant patterns within the area of influence, if such patterns are present.

7.4 Massing (p69) Guideline - The massing of a new building should be consistent with dominant massing patterns of existing buildings in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.

7.2.5 Proportion (p70) Guideline - The proportions of a new building should be consistent with dominant patterns of proportion of existing buildings in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.

7.2.6 Rhythm (p71) Guideline - New construction in a historic area should respect and not disrupt existing rhythmic patterns in the area of influence, if such patterns are present.

7.3.2 New Construction and Subdivision Development (p75) Guideline - To be compatible with its environment, new construction should follow established design patterns of its historic neighbors, including building orientation, setback, height, scale, and massing





| AS PER STORM MAP DEKALB CO<br>INFRASTRUCTURE MAP.                                  | DUNTY,                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                        |  |  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| PROPERTY ADDRESS:<br>1166 LULLWATER ROAD, NE<br>ATLANTA, GA 30307                  | plat prepared for:<br>VIRGINIA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | TATE                                                           | GEORG<br>GEGISTERED V                                                                                                                                                  |  |  |
| LAND AREA:                                                                         | SUBDIVISIONDRUID HILLSULAND LOT 218THDISTRIDEKALB COUNTY, GEORGIA1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <pre>&lt; "13" INIT ICT SECTION NTED/SIGNED MAR 09, 2015</pre> | * No. 3197<br>PROFESSIONAL *<br>TE STORESSIONAL *<br>TE STORESSIONAL *<br>A. STEP                                                                                      |  |  |
| 0.979 AC                                                                           | PLAT BOOK 18 ,PAGE 99<br>DEED BOOK 23745 ,PAGE 439                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | ALL MATTERS PERTAINING<br>TO TITLE ARE EXCEPTED                | IN MY OPINION, THIS PLAT IS A CORRECT REPRESENTATION<br>OF THE LAND PLATTED AND HAS BEEN PREPARED IN CONFORMITY<br>WITH THE MINIMUM STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS OF LAW. |  |  |
|                                                                                    | THE FIELD DATA UPON WHICH THIS PLAT IS BASED HAS A CLOSURE OF 1 FOOT IN 30,000+ FEET, AN ANGULAR ERROR OF 05 SECONDS PER ANGLE POINT AND WAS ADJUSTED USING THE LEAST SQUARES METHOD. THIS PLAT HAS BEEN CALCULATED FOR CLOSURE AND FOUND TO BE ACCURATE TO 1 FOOT IN 100,000+ FEET. AN ELECTRONIC TOTAL STATION AND A 100' CHAIN WERE USED TO GATHER THE INFORMATION USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS PLAT. NO STATE PLANE COORDINATE MONUMENT FOUND WITHIN 500' OF THIS PROPERTY. |                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                        |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 40 \\ \hline \hline \\ SCALE & 1'' = & 40' \\ \end{array}$ | COORD # 20150299 SU<br>DWG_# 20150299                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | URVEY LAND EXPF<br>land surveying ser                          | FAX 404-601-0941                                                                                                                                                       |  |  |

PAPER FORMAT 11"x17"



## September 18, 2023 HPC Agenda Meeting

Re: **Opposition to New Construction at 1176 Lullwater Road** Submitted By: 1169 **Owner Of:** 

Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness ("COA") for a new home that w substantial adverse effect on the District and contravenes Guidelines from the Design Manual for Druid Hills Local Historic District. The application should be denied for the following reasons.

- 1) The HPC just heard and denied this same application at its July 17, 2023 hearing.
- The building is inconsistent with the neighborhood and does not conform to the Druid Hills Design Manual.
- 3) The lot should not be developed as it is not part of the original Olmstead plan.
- 4) The HPC addressed the same property at its November 2021 meeting and denied the applicant's request, in part, based on the side distance between 1166 and 1176 Lullwater.
- 5) The July 2021 HPC grant of a COA was based on a completely different application. The dimensions were different and there was no clear stream buffer requirement. Additionally, it was based on erroneous information.
- 6) Given the watershed and flooding issues that would be caused by a new construction on the lot, the HPC should deny the request.
- 7) There is no undue hardship on the applicant, so an exception to Section 13.5-11 should not be granted.

I have reviewed Ms. Tate's submission to the HPC on this matter and fully support her opposition. For these reasons, I urge the HPC to again deny applicant's request for a COA. Please make this Opposition a part of the official record for this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature

**Printed Name** 

Date: