



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 200 Walker Street
APPLICATION: CA2-19-629
MEETING DATE: January 22, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

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

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20N

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approvall with Conditions

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

ALTERATIONS

The Applicant proposes to replace in-kind six steel windows on the first floor of the existing building with double hung windows to match the existing windows on the bottom section of building.

While the photos provided by the Applicant, illustrates the six steel windows to be in good condition, Staff does recognize that the proposed window will be in accordance with the lower Store front windows on the building. The Applicant has not provided the rationale for the replacement. The District regulations states that “the removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided” These windows are distinctive material that were design not to be store front windows. replacing them will be problematic. Staff recommends the six steel windows not to be replaced but instead be repaired in-kind to retention the historical values and to abide by the District regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The six steel windows shall not be replaced but instead be repaired in-kind to retention the historical value of the building and to abide by the District regulations, per Sec. 19-20N.007(1)(b) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 788 Tift Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-20-017
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: unknown

Property Location: Corner of Hugh Street and Tift Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations: Windows and Fence constructions

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

ALTERATIONS

On the non-contributing principal structure, the Applicant proposes windows and replacement and shutters addition.

WINDOWS

The Applicant proposes window replacements for 11 windows on the principle structure but has not provided photos of 11 windows but instead provided one photo of a non-original window. Staff does agree the shown window can be replaced and after doing further researching, Staff also has determined that windows on the right side of the structure are non-original and too can be replaced. On the left side, Staff cannot fully discern the windows and recommends the Applicant provided photographic evidence of all the windows that will be replaced including at the rear of the house, since this house sits on a corner lot and will be visible from the public right-away. District regulations states that architecturally significant windows and doors, including details, trim work, and framing, shall be retained.

The Applicant proposes to replace the windows with vinyl one-over-one windows with simulated wood trim. The Applicant has also stated that three windows will not be replaced the master bedroom, the bathroom and kitchen. However, has not provided photos of those windows. District regulations states that new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence of the remaining windows so that Staff can determine if the proposed windows is abiding by the District regulations regarding replacements.

FENCE

The Applicant has purported there is an existing wood picket fence on the side and rear of the principle structure. As well, there is a chain linked gate on the side interior of the property. The Applicant proposes to remove all the fencing and replace it with a PVC 6ft privacy fence and gates. The District regulations states that fences shall be fabricated of brick, cast iron, wrought iron, stone and wood pickets. Staff recommends the Applicant use one of the stated materials listed for reinstalling the fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence of all windows that will be replaced including the rear of the property per, Sec.16-20M.006(4)(b)(1);
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence of the remaining windows so that Staff can determine if the proposed windows are abiding by the District regulations regarding replacement, Sec.16-20M.006(4)(b)(5)
3. The fence shall either be brick, cast iron, wrought iron, stone or wood picket, per Sec.16-20M.006(4)(i) and
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 838 Brookline Street

APPLICATION: CA2-20-019

MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: East of Allene Avenue and West of Elbert Street

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CA2-20-019 for 838 Brookline Street

February 12, 2020

pg. 2

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

ALTERATIONS

On a contributing principal structure, the Applicant proposes new rear deck and modification of rear parking pad.

DECK

The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing rear deck and steps and build a new covered deck not exceeding the rear setback. Since the Applicant is not exceeding the rear setback or side setbacks, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

PARKING PAD

The Applicant proposes to modify the existing parking pad that is permitted in the rear of the principle structure. From plans submitted by the Applicant, the parking pad will still be concrete expanding out from the original parking pad but using the footprint established. The extension is due to the expanded deck. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 676 Shelton Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-19-528
MEETING DATE: November 13, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1906

Property Location: East of Tift Avenue and West of Metropolitan Parkway

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

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

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to add an additional 500 sf for a second story addition that will allow for living space. This will increase the height of the principle structure from 18 feet 6 inches to 20 feet and 9 and half inches, still an acceptable height allowed in the District. Staff is not concern about the added space.

Roof form

The plans illustrate the Applicant plans to continue the hip formation, which is fine, although the massing of the house on plans appear to be huge and really transform the house. The added roof will also tuck under the existing roof which is not a concern to Staff. However, the Applicant's proposal to add a gable roof on the front of the house is a concern to Staff. Inventory photos, as well as, photos provided by the Applicant show the original front roof over the porch to be a shed construction. Staff recommends, the Applicant not add the gable front porch roof and retain the shed roof that is currently over the front.

Chimney

On inventory photos, a chimney is shown. However, the Applicant has not shown the chimney on the plans. Staff recommends the chimney either remain and be shown on the new set of plans or just shown on the new set of plans if the Applicant does not plan to remove it.

Windows

The proposed windows for the second-story addition are double hung four over four lite divide windows will trim. The Applicant doesn't specify what material the window will be. Staff recommends, the Applicant abide by the District regulation and install windows that are compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors.

ALTERATIONS

Porch

As mention, the Applicant proposes to add a Gable roof over the porch. Staff recommends the shed roof remains. The Applicant proposes also to restore the porch back to its' original orientation. From the plans, the Applicant has shifted the off centered front door to the center of the principle structure. While this is visually appealing, Staff has no evidence from the Applicant or department inventory photos to support the shift. With this being the case, Staff recommends the Applicant keep the door in its current position and provide photographic evidence or information supporting

the claim the door was originally in the center. Staff also recommends, any remaining original trim on the porch shall be retained and replace or repair in-kind.

Windows

The Applicant has added two additional double hung 6 over 6 windows with lite divides to the front façade. Department inventory photos illustrate there are only two front windows, respectfully on each side. Staff recommends that Applicant retain the original fenestration patterns and not add the two additional windows.

Additionally, the Applicant proposes to add two 36 x36 windows on the side of the house to allow for the interior remodel for a kitchen and a bathroom. Each of these windows appear to retain the patterns of windows that are on the principal structure. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

Foundation

Right now, older inventory photos illustrate the front porch foundation is not as pronounced as recent photos and brick, not stucco. If the Applicant plans to return the porch foundation as well as the entire foundation to brick and remove the stucco, Staff is not concern for that proposal.

Railings

The Applicant also proposes to remove the non-original porch railings and install new railings. Staff recommends the Applicant install porch railings that are wood with a two-part, top to bottom construction that is no higher than the front windowsill with a simple plain extension to satisfy building code regulations regarding the guard-rail.

Siding

Currently, the siding on the principal structure is stucco. The Applicant has proposed to remove the stucco to expose the wood clapboard siding and repair in-kind. Any new siding will be replaced to make the pre-existing clapboard siding. As well any new siding for the addition will be matched in-kind. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

Door

The current door on the principal structure is non-original. The Applicant proposes to install six panel wood door that is conducive to door of that time period. Staff is not concerned with this proposal but does recommend this door match other doors that predominates on the block to abide by District Regulations.

Deck

The Applicant has stated on the front of the cover a proposal for deck, however, has failed to show the deck on the site plan. Staff recommends, the Applicant place the desk on the site plan so that Staff can determine if the deck is meeting District regulation concerning decks.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. The Applicant shall not add the gable front porch roof and retain the shed roof that is currently over the front porch, Sec.16-201.006(4)(g)(1);
2. The chimney shall either remain and be shown on the new set of plans, if the Applicant plans to remove it or just shown on the new set of plans if the Applicant does not plan to remove it per, Sec. 16-201.006(4)(e);
3. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulation and install windows that are compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors, per Sec.16-201.006(4)(b)(5);
4. The Applicant shall keep the door in its current position and provide photographic evidence or information supporting the claim the door was originally in the center per Sec.16-201.006(4)(b);
5. The Applicant shall retain all the original trim on the house and replace and repair in-kind, per Sec.16-201.006(4)(g)(2);
6. The Applicant shall retain the original fenestration patterns and not add the two additional windows per, Sec.16-201.006(4)(b)
7. The Applicant shall install porch railings that are wood with a two-part, top to bottom construction that is no higher than the front windowsill with a simple plain extension to satisfy building code regulations regarding the guard-rail per, Sec.16-201.006();
8. The door shall match other doors that predominates on the block to abide by District Regulations per, Sec. 16-201.006(4)(g);
9. The Applicant shall place the desk on the site plan so that Staff can determine if the deck is meeting District regulation concerning decks per, Sec. 16-201.006 and
10. The final plans shall be reviewed and approved by Staff

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1121 Oakland Drive

APPLICATION: CA3-19-583 (Financial Hardship)/FINAL

MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020 January 22, 2020 Deferred from January 8, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location: East of Arlington and West of Avon Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: roof form, porch, siding, windows

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: 20M.007

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Applicant was nearly finished with the renovations when he received a Stop Work Order. The Applicant originally received permits for only interior work, thinking he had permission did exterior work as well. Urban Design Commission required the Applicant to return the principal structure back to its' originality. Applicant is petitioning for financial hardship.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Condition

**** Updated comments in RED (Final Recommendation in PURPLE)**

BACKGROUND

The Minimalist Traditional Cottage has been transformed into a Gable roof cottage. In doing the work, the Applicant has changed the roof, windows, sidings and added a porch. At the May 2019 Urban Design Meeting, the Commission voted, the Applicant had to return the principal structure back to its original form. The Applicant has reported due to the lack of funds returning the house back to its original form is impossible. It is now the burden of the Applicant to state and demonstrate the financial burden.

District Regulation states

The commission shall consider the following factors in determining whether an economic hardship exemption in whole or in part will be granted: The present income of the property owner(s) and those occupying the property; The age of the property owner; The length of time the property owner has resided in the neighborhood or in the residence for which the exemption is sought; The availability of other sources of funds that are appropriate to the circumstances of the applicant, including loans, grants, and tax abatements; The costs associated with adherence to these regulations; The degree of existing architectural significance and integrity of the structure; and The purpose and intent of this chapter.

The commission shall consider these factors and shall grant an exemption, in whole or in part, as appropriate upon a finding that the applicant's economic hardship outweighs the need for strict adherence to these regulations.

STAFF ASSESSMENT

The Applicant has provided a market analysis that demonstrates the profitability of the pending house. In doing this, the Applicant has also provided a comparison of other houses in the District regarding their prices. 1121 Oakland values is as high as the other comp in the District. The Applicant has also provided current listing of neighboring houses. However, what the Applicant doesn't do is show or state whether these neighboring houses are in their original state, which his is not. What this shows and demonstrates is that right now Oakland City is a profitable community. Which is good. However, it doesn't demonstrate how profitable the house would be if returned to it originality.

The market analysis or listings doesn't really give a screen shot into the Applicant's financial affairs or address whether this Applicant is able to financially restore the house back to what is once was. The Applicant does provide information regarding his 2018 tax returns and the settlement on the property. His current income is minimum at best if only going by the tax return. And the Settlement Statement indicates the Applicant owes a significant amount on the house. However, the Applicant doesn't address if he has access to other sources or funds to

restore the house back to its originality. The Applicant does provide an invoice from J&S Remodeling Llc. detailing what it cost to transform the house initially from its original state.

However, the Applicant does not provide any definitive information on what it will cost to bring the house back to its original state. It could be much less. Staff does not know. With that said, Staff finds it hard to determine the feasibility of the Applicant's request. Staff recommends the Applicant provide more financial information that show his inability to undertake the work needed to bring the house back or meet to seek a resolution.

The Applicant has provided additional financial information to support the request for financial hardship: printout of charges occurred on the AAA card and an estimate to restore the house back to it originality.

CHARGES

Although the Applicant has provided charges which are presumed to be from the initial construction on the principal structure, Staff finds the charges not to be clear as to what the charges were for. For example, on 12/09 there is a charge for \$186.66. Staff can not determine what this charge would be for. There are several charges to The Home Depot, and they may have been for the work done at 1121, without descriptions, it is impossible for Staff to discern that. Staff recommends, the Applicant flush these charges out more by providing actual descriptions. This should allow Staff to determine if cost is related to the actual construction.

ESTIMATE

The estimate the Applicant is detailed and provided much need information to determine the cost to bring the house back to its' originality. While this may be the case, Staff does question for example the cost of gutters and down spouts. Considering the gutters and down spouts are new on the house and perhaps can be reused why would gutters and downspouts be \$900. Staff recommends the Applicant get more than one estimate to get the best cost analysis for the project.

Applicant has purported to have provided all the evidence for charges and estimates. The Applicant states that the intention at this point is to sale the house considerably lower than market value thus allowing the potential buyer revenue to restore the house back to its originality. The Applicant has also stated that a full disclosure of the house situation will be provided to the potential buyer and that the potential buyer is expected to restore the house back to its originality. Staff is in full agreement with the Applicant actions but also recommends the Applicant provide detail photographs of the original house, along with elevations to the potential buyer. This should mitigate some of the rigor on the buyer as well as provide a better example of what the restored house is expected to be.

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

CA3-19-583 for 1121 Oakland Street

February 12, 2010

pg. 4

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Condition

1. The Applicant shall detail photographs of the original house along with elevations to the potential buyer to lessen some of the rigor and to provide a better example of what the restored house must be, per Sec. 16-20M.001 and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 674 Lexington Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-20-009
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: East of Catherine and West of Metropolitan

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition of an accessory structure

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The Applicant proposes to construct a 352 SF accessory structure (garage) in the rear of the main structure and will not exceed the rear set back. It will be constructed in the buildable area of the lot; however, the proposed accessory structure will exceed the side yard setback. Adair Park's current regulations does not govern over side yard setbacks and only speaks of the buildable area of the lot. This will violate the underlying R-4A zoning requirement for exceeding the side yard setback and for the Applicant to do the proposed work a variance must be submitted to the BZA. Staff would suggest the Applicant consider siting the accessory structure and building it directly behind the principle structure so that it cannot exceed the side yard setback does negating the variance.

The overall design of the accessory structure does not concern Staff, the Applicant has used many of the design elements that are presented on the principle structure. Additionally, the proposed accessory structure will primarily be in the rear of the principle structure and not be visible from the public right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 82 Hogue St.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-20-007
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 2) **Other Zoning:** Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1900

Property Location: West block face of Hogue St., south of Irwin St., north of Old Wheat St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The project received a Stop Work Order in February 2016 for repeated work without permits. Later that year, the Commission approved CA2-16-550 for alterations. In August 2017 the project received another Stop Work Order for failing to clean the site after construction stopped. In October of 2018 a Stop Work Order was posted after all permits were revoked by the Office of Buildings. In May of 2019, the Commission reviewed CA4PH-19-193 which was submitted by the Office of Code Compliance as part of the In-Rem Demolition process. The Commission denied this application after learning a new owner had purchased the property.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

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

Staff Response to the Application Submitted

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

The Applicant has submitted an engineer's report detailing structural issues resulting from unpermitted alterations by a previous property owner.

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

The Applicant has not provided information detailing the feasibility of repair to the current structure, but has again cited the Engineer's recommendation that replacing the structure is more cost-effective than repairing the existing structure.

3. Demonstrate that the costs associated with rectifying the threat would create a condition whereby the investments in the project are incapable of earning a reasonable economic return. This finding shall be made by considering, and the applicant shall submit to the Commission evidence establishing, each of the following factors:

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing their knowledge of the landmark designation on the subject property at the time of acquisition.

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

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion, however, as much of this information is publicly accessible, Staff will provide what information is listed on the Fulton County Tax Assessor's website for the convenience of the Commission. The Tax records show the property as being sold for \$280,000.00 on March 22, 2019. The property was sold to Lorraine Summers by Puneet Mehta. No information regarding the relationship between the buyer and seller has been provided. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information providing a description of their relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased.

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion, but Staff would note that the property was purchased in March of 2019. However, Staff finds that a response to this criterion for the period between the time the structure was purchased to the present time is required by the zoning ordinance. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing The annual gross and net income, if any, from the property for the time period between the date of purchase and the present day; itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the time period between the date of purchase and the present day; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period.

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. Again, Staff would note that the property was purchased after March of 2019 and finds it appropriate to limit the information required of the Applicant to the period of time between the date of purchase and the present day. Staff recommend the Applicant provide information detailing the remaining balance on any mortgage or other financing secured by the property and annual debt service, if any, during the for the time period between the date of purchase and the present day.

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

Staff would note that the Applicant did not provide responses to the real estate taxes paid for the previous 4 years, but did provide information on the 2 most recent assessed property values. As the real estate tax information is public record, Staff has provided this information for the Commission's convenience.

2016	\$1,626.57
2017	\$1,781.49
2018	\$2,627.05
2019	\$3,926.39

2018 Assessed value- \$208,300.00
2019 Assessed value- \$289,300.00

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

The Applicant has stated there were no appraisals completed on the property in the previous 2 years.

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation and the fair market value of the property (in its protected status as a designated building or site) at the present time.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is owned by Lorraine Summers.

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

According to the Applicant, there are not tax records available.

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

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

According to the applicant, this question does not apply.

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

According to the Applicant the property is not for rent or for sale.

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

According to the Applicant, no advertisements have been placed and the property has not been listed.

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

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

The Applicant cites the engineer's report. Staff would note that the recommendation provided by the Applicant cites the cost effectiveness of rehabilitating the existing structure but does not speak to the feasibility of rehabilitating the structure.

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

Per the Applicant's response and documentation, the estimated cost to demolish the property would be \$14,890.00.

c) Estimated market value of the property in the current condition; after completion of the proposed construction, alteration, demolition, or removal; and, in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing property for continued use.

The Applicant has stated there are no comps for this property after it is demolished. However, the Applicant has not provided a response regarding the properties current condition or if the property were rehabilitated. Staff recommends the Applicant provide the estimated market value of the property in the current condition, and after renovation of the existing property for continued use.

- d) **In the case of a proposed demolition, the testimony of an architect, developer, real estate consultant, appraiser, or other real estate professional experienced in rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure on the property.**

The Applicant cites their Engineer's letter which gives their opinion that demolishing the property would be more cost effective than rehabilitating the structure.

- e) **The infeasibility of new construction around, above, or below the existing protected building or site, and the infeasibility of a transfer of development rights, including an assessment of the monetary value that could be derived from such a transfer, pursuant to section 16-28.023 of the Code of Ordinances.**

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. However, Staff finds that this criterion is not applicable to the subject property as a single-family residential structure on a small lot.

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

The Applicant has responded "no" to this criterion. Staff recommends the Applicant research the economic incentives for historic preservation offered by the State Office of Historic Preservation for contributing properties in a national register historic district, such as the subject property, and provide information relating to the available incentives and funding that could impact the proposed work.

12. **Also, please provide photographs of the existing conditions of the building, both exterior and interior.**

The Applicant has provided interior and exterior photographs.

Comment on Application Materials by the Bureau of Buildings

One of the requirements of the Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness process is for the Office of Buildings to comment on the application materials via a written report. Staff has submitted a request to the Office of Buildings to inspect the property and produce a report regarding this property. When the inspection and report are complete, Staff will include the report in the file for future reference.

Overall Comments

Based on the pictures and documentation provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the existing building is in a state of disrepair and that much of the original structure has been removed without proper permits or approval by the Commission. Staff defines a major and imminent threat to public health and safety as a situation where a building is in immediate threat of collapsing and causing harm to people on the public ROW. Based on the information submitted, Staff finds a major and imminent threat has been proven but that there is not enough information at this time to establish that demolition is the only method available to address the issues on the property. As discussed above, the Applicant has not submitted several of the items required for the issuance of a Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness based on a Threat to Public Health and Safety. Staff finds it appropriate to require the submission of this information before making any recommendation as to the appropriateness of demolishing the structure.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide information detailing their knowledge of the landmark designation on the subject property at the time of acquisition;
2. The Applicant shall provide information providing a description of their relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased;
3. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the remaining balance on any mortgage or other financing secured by the property and annual debt service, if any, during the for the time period between the date of purchase and the present day;
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the fair market value of the property immediately prior to its designation and the fair market value of the property (in its protected status as a designated building or site) at the present time;
5. The Applicant shall provide the estimated market value of the property in the current condition, and after renovation of the existing property for continued use;
6. The Applicant shall research the economic incentives for historic preservation offered by the State Office of Historic Preservation for contributing properties in a national register historic district, such as the subject property, and provide information relating to the available incentives and funding that could impact the proposed work; and,
7. The Applicant shall submit all updated materials and responses no later than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Interim Director, Office of

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 201 Washington St. (Central Presbyterian Church, LBS)
APPLICATION: RC-20-008
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Landmark Building/Site **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 1)

Date of Construction: 1889

Property Location: Southwest corner of Washington St. and MLK, Jr. Dr.

gy

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Transfer of Development Rights

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: N.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the Applicant and the Zoning Review Board.

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

The Application before the Commission at this time for Review and Comment is the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) which would sever 1,000,000 square feet of unused residential and non-residential development rights from the sending property at 201 Washington St. (Central Presbyterian Church, LBS), to an undetermined receiving property.

The Applicant has submitted detailed calculations that indicate the sending property holds 2,399,726 square feet of residential and non-residential development rights. The proposed transfer would leave the sending property with 1,399,726 square feet of residential development rights remaining for future transfers.

Staff would add that the proposed TDR will not result in any physical alteration to the existing building located on the sending property and will decrease the development pressure on the site. Staff finds that the proposed TDR would provide additional benefit to the sending property in that the residential development rights which would otherwise be unused given the limitations regarding development on the sending property would be sold to the receiving property providing income to the sending property and additional density to the receiving property. Based on the information we have at this time, Staff has no concerns regarding the proposed TDR.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter of support to the Applicant and the Zoning Review Board.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: Griffin St. NW from MLK, Jr. Dr. to Jefferson St.

APPLICATION: RC-20-024

MEETING DATE: February 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Griffin St. NW from MLK, Jr. Dr. to Jefferson St.

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Street renaming.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 138-8

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant and appropriate City agencies.

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

The naming or renaming of a street (or any other City-related facility) is a significant undertaking by the City as it is one of the few ways for a person or event to be honored by the City by giving their name a potentially permanent place in the City's future and thus its history. When streets and facilities (whether from the City's founding or more recently) are considered for renaming, the Staff finds that it is not appropriate to compare the significance of the existing name to the proposed name (and by extension the people, events, or locations memorialized in those names). It is more appropriate to consider the respective honorees in relation to the era in which their significance is associated and how that significance is related to the City of Atlanta.

When taking this approach into account, Staff finds that Ivory Lee Young, Jr was a significant figure in the City's more recent history for several reasons which are laid out in the proposed ordinance and which are listed below for the Commission's reference:

WHEREAS, Griffin Street N.W. is a street located within the corporate limits of the City of Atlanta; and
WHEREAS, Ivory Lee Young Jr. was elected to the Atlanta City Council in 2001 and diligently served 17 years as the District 3 representative before his untimely death in November 2018; and
WHEREAS, Councilmember Young was truly a bright light on the city council. He was a committed leader and positive role model to the constituents in District 3; and
WHEREAS, Councilmember Young expanded parks, enhanced streetscapes, and contributed to the rebirth of west Midtown to help strengthen and further stabilize the northwestern portion of his district; and
WHEREAS, Ivory was a champion for his community, advocating for jobs and affordable housing, and fought tirelessly to provide opportunities to improve the quality of life of every resident in his district; and
WHEREAS, placing honorary street signs on Griffin Street, N.W. is a befitting recognition for Ivory Lee Young, Jr's contributions to the City of Atlanta.

In conclusion, the Staff finds that Ivory Lee Young, Jr is worthy of recognition for his role in the City's more recent history and for his contributions to Council District 3 and the City as a whole. Additionally, Staff is unaware of any other official City recognition (by way of a street or facility name) for Councilmember Young and supports the proposal to honorarily rename a portion of Griffin St. to honor his contributions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant and appropriate City agencies.

cc: Applicant
Department of Public Works
File