



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: February 12, 2020 deferred from 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.

Updates in RED

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.

The Applicant has provided a “visual” report from Keystone Structural Engineering. The report is visual and not an actual structural analysis or testing because as the company states, “much of the structure was concealed at the time of the observation.”

The report lays out in detail the conditions of the windows which accordingly describe the windows as being in horrible shape with such conditions as water infiltration, water staining, cracking of unreinforced masonry at the window headers to name a few. Ultimately, the report concludes the windows need replacing with a cost at exceeds \$35,000 if the six steel windows are to be used. The company also states that replacing with a storefront system will be a reduction in cost and stresses as the Applicant that there are other properties in the surrounding areas that have storefront windows. Thus highly recommending the windows be storefront windows.

Staff recognizes the windows are in need of repair and at worst need to be replaced. While the Applicant speaks of replacement the justification for the storefront system is not merited. Justification, because others in the District have storefront windows is not a sufficient argument, there could be varying reasons why this maybe the case. In fact, storefront windows, as state before will violate the District regulation by allowing of the removal of a distinctive material that characterize the property. This would be extremely problematic. Being that is the case, Staff still holds on to it original recommendation that the windows can be repaired or replaced in-kind to the original six steel windows that are so distinctive to the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

1. The six steel windows shall not be replaced or 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.

CA2-19-629 for 200 Walker Street
February 12, 2020
Page 3 of 3

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: 1116 Selwin Avenue
APPLICATION: CA2-20-064
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: West of Wilmington Avenue and East of Arlington Avenue

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations (Porch)

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

The Applicant proposes the following porch alterations to the principle structure.

Railings

The existing elevations provided by Application depict railings that are like the department inventory photos. However, the plans the Applicant provides reference a deck railing construction for the front porch. A deck railing construction is not in compliance with the District regulations. Staff recommends the Applicant install a two-part top to bottom rail construction with the railings being no higher than bottom sill of the front window and any needed extension to comply with the building code shall be done through a simple plan extension.

Roof

Through the plans, the Applicant has referenced alterations to the front porch, but have not define this scope of work on the narrative and the Applicant has declared no roof alterations will occur. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the reference of the porch roof construction to avoid confusion.

Floor

Photos provided show the porch floor as being incomplete and need of repair. The Applicant proposes to rebuild the porch floor which is not problematic to Staff. Staff does recommends the porch floor be perpendicular in orientation and have a tongue and groove construction to reflect the porches of that era.

Siding

The Applicant has indicated no siding replacement or repair will occur on the principle structure.

Driveway

The Applicant proposes a driveway on the principle structure with a walkway that will lead to the front steps. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Staff does recommend that the driveway be ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare. The driveway material shall be compatible with the other driveways the predominate on the blockface.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall install a two-part top to bottom rail construction with the railings being no higher than bottom sill of the front window and any needed extension to comply with the building code shall be done through a simple plan extension, per Sec. 16-20M.013;
2. The Applicant shall not do any alterations on the existing porch roof and shall remove the reference of the porch roof construction to avoid confusion, per Sec. 16-20M.013;

3. The porch floor shall be perpendicular in orientation and have a tongue and groove construction to reflect the porches of that era, per Sec.16-20M.013;
4. The driveway shall be ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare. The driveway material shall be compatible with the other driveways the predominate on the blockface, per Sec.16-20M.012(4)(c) and
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 742 Lexington Avenue SW
APPLICATION: CA2-20-028
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1921

Property Location: West of Catherine Street and East of Metropolitan

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Siding and Trim replacement in-kind.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.005, Sec. 16-20I.006, Sec. 16-20.008

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

The Applicant proposes the following alterations on the principle structure: siding replacement, trim replacement.

SIDING and TRIM

The Applicant proposes to replace and repair in-kind existing clapboard wood siding on the principle structure. Photos provided by the Applicant show that much of the existing siding and trim on the house are rotten, warped and many of the patching are not correct or original to the house. The Applicant proposes to replace nonoriginal pieces in-kind to match the existing original wood siding, 8 to 10-inch reveals; repair or replace the existing viable wood siding in-kind. Staff deems replacement of these damage and non-matching pieces are warranted. District regulations states that siding repair or replacement shall match the original materials in scale and direction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant proposes to replace in-kind the trim on the principle structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 248 Oakland Dr. (Oakland Cemetery)
APPLICATION: CA2-20-032
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Oakland Cemetery Landmark District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1899

Property Location: Northeast corner of Memorial Dr. and Boulevard.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Gate and pedestrian infrastructure installation.

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

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

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 with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20E of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The project before the Commission consists of the installation of a pedestrian gate and infrastructure on the southeast corner of the property where Memorial Drive intersects with Boulevard SE. The gate proposed would consist of decorative metal matching the design of other gates on the property. Differentiation from the historic gates in the cemetery would be provided through the lack of an archway over the gate. The existing brick wall would be removed and used in the paving of the required pedestrian pathway connecting to the new gate and for other purposes. The existing brick wall was entirely re-built in the 1990's so Staff is not concerned with the loss of historic materials.

In general, Staff has no concern with a new gate being installed at the corner of Memorial Dr. and Boulevard SE. The new gate will allow for better pedestrian connectivity from both the Cabbagetown and Grant Park neighborhoods, as well as two highly utilized Marta bus stops on the 20 line. However, Staff would like clarification on the location proposed by the applicant which is several feet back from the corner of the property. Staff finds that the selected location is likely due to the grade change resulting from Boulevard SE being lowered in the past, but suggests the Applicant to clarify if there is some other reason why the gate could not be located on the corner of the property.

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

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 832 Springdale Road
APPLICATION: CA2-20-031
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: East of E. Ponce de Leon and West of The by Way

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Landscaping

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20B.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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

LANDSCAPING

The Applicant has proposed to do extensive landscaping on the site of the principle structure that consistent of installing many varies of plants, bushes, flowers and an installation of a water fountain. District regulations states that

“Minimum landscape requirements: The overall quality of the landscaped area visible from public rights-of-way should be preserved as an integral part of the historic character of the District. Any major alteration to the landscape or topography visible from the public right-of-way in the District shall maintain the general landscaping scale and character reflected in the original development of Druid Hills in order to preserve the historic landscape character of the District.”

“*Any major alteration* to the landscape or topography visible from the public right-of-way shall: Follow the standards set forth in [16-20B.003\(1\)](#); Be consistent and compatible with the overall landscape plan and design on the property and block; Maintain the spatial organization of an open space in front of the house, asymmetrical plantings on the sides of the principal structure and a rear tree canopy;(d)Not excessively or unnecessarily alter the natural topography of the site, with the exception of grading necessary to protect and preserve the integrity of a structure;(e)Ensure that any new grades shall meet the existing topography in a smooth transition;(f)Retain any existing historic circulation systems, including driveways, walkways and paths;(g)Ensure that any new circulation systems and substantial reconstruction of existing circulation systems is consistent and compatible with the existing circulation systems on the property and block with respect to layout, scale, materials, and topographic siting;(h)Ensure that any off-street parking be constructed of a material which will assure a surface resistant to erosion, have adequate access to a public street and have adequate circulation space.”

While the Applicant is planting a variety of plants and bushes the scope of work would be considered minimum. The Applicant is not installing any plants that will obscure any of the front façade that can be visible from the public-right-away; nor is the Applicant altering any of the topography through grading on the site. From the neighborhood comparisons provided by Applicant, the Applicant plantings are not different in scale from other properties in the District. Being that the Applicant is not departing from the historic patterns of the District and the listed reasons set above, Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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 ACCESSMENT

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
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: 1162 Oglethorpe Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-033
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1920 (per Fulton County Tax Assessor Records)

Property Location: South block face of Oglethorpe Ave, west of the Queen St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Queen Anne Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and rear addition

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

The Applicant proposes a rear addition to the existing structure. The District has both qualitative and quantitative regulations for alterations and additions to contributing structures in the District. If a project element is not discussed below, Staff found that the related regulations were met.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing a second story rear addition to the principal structure. In general, Staff finds that the materials and design of the addition, which contains two dormers on the west side elevation, are compatible with the existing structure. Staff does, however, have concerns with lack of windows on the addition's West side elevation. Staff finds that the resulting blank wall space is inconsistent with the design of the existing structure and recommends a window meeting the District regulations be added to the main floor level of the west side elevation.

With regards to the proposed roof forms of the rear addition, Staff has concerns only with the portion of the roof which covers the new stairwell. In reviewing the proposal, Staff finds that this new roof form would be visible from the Queen St. right of way which is adjacent to the subject property. As such, Staff recommends the stairwell addition's hipped roof form be removed and replaced with either a shed roof or a rear facing gable.

Deck

While not subject to a review by the Commission, Staff would note that the proposed deck conforms to the District regulations for such.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. A window meeting the District regulations shall be added to the main floor level of the west side elevation, per Sec. 16-20G.006(7)(d);
2. The stairwell addition's hipped roof form shall be removed and replaced with either a shed roof or a rear facing gable, per Sec. 16-20G.006(7)(d); and,
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 14 Hilliard St.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-036/037
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: 1899

Property Location: West block face of Hilliard St., north of Edgewood Ave, south of Auburn Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Multi-family

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: site work and new accessory structure.

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

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

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 with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20C of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow a reduction in the required building height from a minimum of 34' to 11'6".

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography;

The Applicant cites the lack of contributing accessory structures on the block face. The Applicant also cites the two-story contributing structures that establish the minimum height requirements for the block.

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship;

The Applicant states that building a two-story structure would be cost prohibitive and would not satisfy the program they are seeking to implement.

Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved;

The Applicant again cites the lack of comparable properties on the block relative to the accessory use that is being proposed.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant cites the location of the project behind the existing quadruplex as well as the lack of visibility of the structure from any public right of way as evidence that the relief sought by the variance would not be a detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff finds that the Applicant's responses establish a hardship that is unique to the property in question. Staff further finds that the granting of the variance would not impact the Commission's ability to properly enforce the Landmark District regulations in the future. Staff supports the requested variance.

New construction

The Applicant is proposing a new structure on the rear of the property which will consist of a bar and semi-enclosed patio space. Based on the Applicant's provided information, Staff finds that the allowable side yard setbacks are between 1.9' and 0'. The project in question would have side yard setbacks of 6". Staff finds that the proposed side yard setbacks meet the District regulations. Per the Applicant's responses, the allowable minimum rear yard setback is between 19' and 0'. The proposed structure would have a rear yard setback of 4' 6". Staff finds that the proposed rear yard setback meets the District regulations.

The Applicant is proposing a mix of masonry walls and wooden fencing for the project. Several in looking at the elevations provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the entirety of the project will be screened from public view by the surrounding properties. However, Staff find that the character of the proposed development conforms to the pattern of non-historic additions to historic properties on the block. As such, Staff is not concerned with the design of the proposed structure.

As the subject property contains an existing multi-family component, there is an open space requirement of 5% of the floor area dedicated to the multi-family use. Based on the floor area provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the required open space is 215 sf. The project will leave 2,509 sf which greatly exceeds the minimum open space requirements. As such, Staff finds that the open space requirements have been met.

The Applicant's narrative notes the intent to install bicycle parking as part of the project, however, Staff cannot find where this parking is provided on the site plan. Per the Zoning Ordinance, the subject property is required to have a total of 4 dedicated fixed bicycle rack parking spaces. The existing multi-family use requires 2 spaces and the proposed non-residential use requires 2 spaces. Staff recommends that the Applicant note on the site plan the number and location of the provided bicycle parking spaces and confirm that the provided spaces meet the requirements for such.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall note on the site plan the number and location of the provided bicycle parking spaces and confirm that the provided spaces meet the requirements for such, per Sec. 16-28.014(6); and,
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

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: 1140 Oakland Dr.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-039
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4 / Beltline

Date of Construction: 1920 (per Fulton County Tax Assessor Records)

Property Location: Southeast corner of Oakland Dr. and Wilmington Ave.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and rear addition

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & 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 with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes a rear addition to the existing structure. The District regulations allow two criteria for reviewing alterations and addition to contributing structures such as the subject property. The alterations and additions may be consistent with or reinforce the historic architectural character of the entire existing contributing structure while complying with the applicable architectural standards, or, the alterations and additions may not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. As the project proposed by the applicant will likely result in the loss of historic materials on secondary façades, Staff finds that the first of the two criterion is appropriate for use in the review of this project.

Plan issues

In reviewing the drawings received from the Applicant, Staff noted several issues with the existing and proposed drawings when comparing them to the existing structure. These issues include, but are not limited to, the absence of the faux half-timbering on the front façade gables and adding siding in their place on the drawings, the lack of what appears to be an existing crawlspace door on the shed addition of the left side façade, and noting the existing siding material as cement siding where the photographs show wood siding on the structure. Staff recommends the drawings be revised to accurately depict the existing and proposed conditions of the contributing structure.

Windows and doors

Per the Applicant's drawings, all windows and doors on the property are proposed for replacement. However, the photographs provided by the applicant show all but two of the windows boarded up. The windows which are visible are taken from an angle that does not allow Staff to make a determination on whether the windows are original to the structure or not. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic documentation that has been keyed to a floorplan for each window proposed for replacement for Staff to review. Staff recommends only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-original to the structure or beyond repair be replaced with new windows meeting the compatibility rule. Staff further recommends that any windows or doors which are original to the Structure and which Staff finds are in repairable condition be retained and repaired in-kind.

With regards to the proposed door, Staff finds that the existing front door is not original to the structure and is a recent alteration. As such, Staff has no concerns with the wooden craftsman style door proposed by the Applicant.

The Applicant is proposing several new accent or half-lite windows on the side facades both on the main floor and the basement/first floor area. Staff finds the sizes of these windows to be inconsistent with the historic windows on the property and recommends the plans be revised to show any new windows to match the size, style, and lite pattern of the historic windows on the property.

Siding

The Applicants drawings show portions of what Staff has determined to be original wood siding replaced with cement siding. From the pictures provided, Staff finds that the existing wood siding is in a condition which would be easily repairable and reusable. As such, Staff recommends all

existing wood siding be retained and repaired in-kind. Staff further recommends the cement siding on the proposed addition be smooth faced.

Due to issues with similar projects in the neighborhood removing siding for the installation of building wrap and similar weatherproofing materials, Staff finds it necessary to recommend that any weatherproofing be done completely internal to the wall structure without any siding being removed. Staff would further suggest that the Applicant research various publications on the issue of weatherproofing historic wood structures and the potential ongoing maintenance issues that can arise from rendering a historic structure completely weathertight.

Roof

The Applicant's plans note the repair and replacement of any roof sheathing and framing members. Staff is not concerned with the replacement of roof sheathing as this is a typical part of routine roof-replacement projects. Staff is, however, concerned with the potential replacement of structural roof members. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic documentation of any roof framing members proposed for replacement for Staff's review and approval before replacing the identified portions of framing.

Addition

A rear addition is proposed in place of a non-historic shed roof addition on the rear of the property. In general, Staff finds the overall design consistent with that of the existing historic structure but has concerns with portions of the structure which do not meet the Architectural Standards listed in the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed addition is constructed with a slab-on-grade foundation, which is prohibited by the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the plans be revised to remove the slab-on-grade foundation and replace it with a foundation matching the materials and style of the historic foundation.

The Applicant is proposing a gable "bump out" on the right-side façade which will contain vertical faux board-and-batten siding and which will be cantilevered due to grade change. Staff finds that both the proposed cladding style and the cantilevered configuration with the addition is inconsistent with the style of the existing contributing structure. Staff would note, however, that these concerns are not with the concept of including an otherwise architecturally sensitive side gable addition to the structure. As such, Staff recommends the side gable "bump out" be clad with horizontal lap siding and contain a foundation matching the materials and style of the historic foundation.

The existing rear corner boards are shown as being removed in the side façade elevations provided by the Applicant. Staff finds that these are character defining features of the existing structure which allow for proper interpretation of the original portions of the structure and later additions. As such, Staff recommends all existing corner boards on the structure be retained in-place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The drawings shall be revised to accurately depict the existing and proposed conditions of the contributing structure;
2. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation that has been keyed to a floorplan for each window proposed for replacement for Staff to review, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);

3. Only those windows which Staff has determined to be non-original to the structure or beyond repair shall be replaced with new windows meeting the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
4. Any windows or doors which are original to the Structure and which Staff finds are in repairable condition shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
5. The plans shall be revised to show any new windows to match the size, style, and lite pattern of the historic windows on the property, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
6. All existing wood siding shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
7. The cement siding on the proposed addition shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
8. Any weatherproofing shall be done completely internal to the wall structure without removing any existing siding, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
9. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation of any roof framing members proposed for replacement for Staff's review and approval before replacing the identified portions of framing, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
10. The plans shall be revised to remove the slab-on-grade foundation and replace it with a foundation matching the materials and style of the historic foundation, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
11. The side gable "bump out" shall be clad with horizontal lap siding and contain a foundation matching the materials and style of the historic foundation, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
12. All existing corner boards on the structure shall be retained in-place, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a); and,
13. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 215 Degrass Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-19-640
MEETING DATE: February 26, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning Inman Park Historic District (Subarea 1) **Other Zoning:** R-5

Date of Construction: 1907

Property Location: East block face of Degrass Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Victorian

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations and additions.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? *Deferred January 22, 2020. Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The project involves revisions to a design that was approved by the Commission in 2013 under CA3-13-028.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Previous approvals

As noted in the findings of fact, the current project is a revision to the previous approval issued under CA3-13-028. Staff has requested the files for this case from archives, but has not yet been able to review the plans to check whether the current proposal is consistent with the Commission's approval. As such Staff finds it appropriate to recommend that except for the current proposed revisions, the plans match the design of the project which was approved under CA3-13-028. Staff further recommends the conditions of approval for application CA3-13-028 remain in effect on the current proposal.

Dormer additions

The Applicant is proposing the inclusion of two new dormers on the property. Staff has no concerns with the design of the dormers on the right side of the property. However, Staff does have concerns with the proposed dormer over the stairs on the left side of the structure. The proposed dormer would involve the removal of portions of the existing eaves in order to accommodate a new window. Staff finds that this proposal would result in a loss of historic materials that would impact the spatial relationships of the existing property. Staff further finds that the preferred method for dormer additions is to continue the eave line across the addition to ensure minimal disturbance to the historic structure. As such, Staff recommends the left side dormer addition be redesigned to allow the eave line to continue across the face of the dormer.

The Applicant has revised their design to allow the eave line to continue across the face of the dormer. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Rear gable extension

The Applicant proposes extending the previously approved rear gable addition. As Staff is not in receipt of the previously approved plans at this time, Staff cannot verify whether the project is moving closer to the rear property line the previously approved project. The existing structure has a setback of approximately 31' and the proposed additions would reduce that rear setback to approximately 28'. Staff has not received compatibility information detailing the allowable rear yard setback. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable rear yard setback. Staff further recommends the rear yard setback conform to the range established by the comparable properties on the block face.

The Applicant has provided information detailing the proposed setback meets the District regulations. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing a series of fenestration and cladding changes to the property. While not noted as a proposed change, Staff finds that the existing and proposed front doors on the drawings do not match. Staff does not have a clear photograph of the front façade, but the available photographs appear to show either a full lite wood door or a storm door currently existing. Staff recommends the Applicant clarify their plans for the front door and whether any replacement is proposed.

With regards to the proposed siding changes, the Applicant is proposing new lap siding in place of the existing asbestos siding on the existing non-historic rear addition. Staff has no concerns with

the proposed change but recommends the proposed lap siding be wood or smooth faced cementitious siding.

On the right-side façade, the Applicant proposes the removal of two non-historic round windows on the right side façade. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

On the left side façade, the Applicant proposes the removal of two sets of non-historic paired double hung windows and proposes three double hung windows, consistent with the style of the first-floor windows on the property, in their place. Staff has no concerns with this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Except for the current proposed revisions, the plans shall match the design of the project which was approved under CA3-13-028;
2. The conditions of approval for application CA3-13-028 remain in effect on the current proposal;
3. The rear yard setback shall conform to the range established by the comparable properties on the block face, per Sec. 16-20L.006(2)(b);
4. The Applicant shall clarify their plans for the front door and whether any replacement is proposed, per Sec. 16-20L.005(1)(b)(ii);
5. The proposed lap siding shall be wood or smooth faced cementitious siding, per Sec. 16-20L.006(1)(p); and,
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
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:** Bellline.

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