



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: March 20, 2020 deferred from February 26, 2020, 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: Approval

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 /Newest edits in GREEN

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 visusal and not an actual structural analysis or testing because as the company states, “much of the structure was conceled 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 surrouncing areas that have stonefront 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 justitificaiton 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 probablematic. 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.

The Applicant has provided pricing and a diagram of an window replacement that will retention the historical pattern of the steel windows. The proposed window replacement will follow the District regulations that states, “if muntins and/or mullions are used, such muntins and/or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins

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

integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass.” And will not remove the distinctive window pattern reflective of on this building.

Staff deems that Appliant has met the conditions setforth and has no problems with the new proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

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.

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: 731 Brookline St.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-050
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1918

Property Location: North block face of Brookline St., west of the Mayland Ave. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Site work.

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

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

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. 16-20I of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing a new basketball court and goal in their rear yard. Staff finds that the proposal meets the underlying zoning requirements for setbacks and lot coverage. However, Staff finds that the location of the proposed basketball court would require a special exception as the eastern portion of the court has a direct path of travel from Brookline St. This would violate the general prohibition against active recreational uses, such as basketball courts, adjacent to a public street. Staff would note that this requirement is unrelated to the Historic District zoning regulations and would require either a change to the project design or a special exception from the Board of Zoning and Adjustment. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant apply for a special exception from the BZA or adjust the design of the basketball court to be entirely behind the principal structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall apply for a special exception from the BZA or adjust the design of the basketball court to be entirely behind the principal structure; and,
2. 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: 1268 Lucile Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-055
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1921

Property Location: North block face of Lucile Ave, west of Atwood St., east of Hopkins St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow.

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-055: Approval with conditions.

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

Alterations and Site Work

The Applicant is proposing altering the exterior façade by removing the left-side front door and replacing with a window, replacing rotten and/or damaged window trim like for like, and adding a gate along the front porch. The proposed site work is the installation of a privacy fence in the rear of the structure.

Front Door

The Applicant is proposing removing the left side front door and replacing it a window matching in style to the existing windows along the front façade. After review, Staff finds that the existing left side door opening to be historic. Based on photographic inventory, the left side door is clearly visible. Staff notes that while the door placement is unusual in its placement, the original intended use was most likely a duplex. As such, Staff recommends that the left side door opening be retained.

Window Trim

The Applicant is proposing replacing rotten and/or damaged window trim like for like. However, no pictures were provided to detail the extent of the damage, nor its location. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant document in detail the areas of proposed repair for Staff to review. Staff also recommends that any trim the is found to be damaged beyond repair shall be replaced in kind.

Front Porch Gate

The Applicant is proposing adding a front porch gate that would match the style of the existing railings. After review, Staff has no issues with the design of the gate. However, Staff recommends that the gate be easily reversable and attached to masonry joints in order to protect historic materials.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing a 6' privacy in the rear yard of the primary structure. After review, Staff supports the installation of the privacy fence.

Columns

While not proposed by the Applicant, Staff finds that the existing non-historic front porch wood columns are insufficient to hold the weight of the front porch roof. In photographs provided by the Applicant, a sag can be seen along the fascia. As such, Staff recommends that the front porch wood columns be thicker, in order to better support the weight. Staff also finds that thicker columns would be more appropriate to the design of the primary structure.

Chimney

In photographs provided by the Applicant, a chimney is present. However, none of the elevations of plans show this. Staff recommends that the elevations and plans be revised to include the existing chimney.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The left side door opening shall be retained.

CA2-20-055 for 1268 Lucile Ave.

March 11, 2020.

Page 3 of 3

2. The Applicant shall provide detailed documentation of the damaged window trim for Staff to review.
3. Any window trim that is found to be beyond repair shall be replaced in kind.
4. The front porch gate shall be attached to masonry joints in order to protect historic material.
5. The front porch wood columns shall be made thicker.
6. The elevations and plans shall show the existing chimney.
7. 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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2566 Santa Barbara Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-20-056
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: East of Chiton Drive and West of Hamilton E. Holmes Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? Y **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small House

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window replacement, metal columns replacement, doors replacement; trim repaired in-kind and painted brick.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

The Applicant proposes the following alterations: exterior door replacement, paint siding and shutters, driveway repair and replace metal posts in carport.

PLANS

The Applicant has indicated work on the existing driveway. Being that this is site work, a site plan will be required. Staff recommends the Applicant provides two to-scale site plans with FAR information included also reflecting the driveway.

DOOR

The Applicant proposes to replace the doors in-kind. Since Applicant has not provided any photographic images of the door it is very hard for Staff to discern what is exactly on the house. Staff can see there is a detail iron decorative screened front door that is a very important element of Ranch houses during this period. Replacement of that door would not be permitted. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide photographs of the existing doors. As well, Staff recommends, the Applicant retain the detail decorative screen front door.

SIDING AND SHUTTERS PAINTING

The Applicant proposes paint the existing Board and Batten siding and the shutters. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. Painting of siding and shutters is not in the purview of the Commission.

METAL COLUMNS

As with the windows, Staff doesn't have an issue with the replacement of the metal columns because they are being proposed to be done in-kind. However, the Applicant has not provided any photographic evidence demonstrating why the metal columns need replacement. Staff recommends the Applicant show through photographic evidences why the metal columns need replacing.

DRIVEWAY REPAIR

The Applicant proposes to repair the what has been described as damaged concrete. The Applicant has not provided any photos of the damage nor has the Applicant indicated the replacement material. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a photo of the damaged driveway and indicated specifically what replacement material will be used.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Applicant shall provide two to-scale site plans with FAR information and driveway on them, per Sec. 16-20Q.001;
2. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the existing doors and retain the detail decorative screen front door, per Sec.16-20Q.006(18);
3. The Applicant shall show through photographic evidence as to why the metal columns need replacement, per Sec.16-20Q.001;
4. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the damaged driveway and indicated specifically what replacement material will be use, per Sec.16-20Q.006(15) and
5. Staff shall review and approval final plans.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2848 Baker Ridge Drive
APPLICATION: CA2-20-057
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1962

Property Location: East of Duffield and West of Waterford

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window replacement, metal columns replacement, doors replacement; trim repaired in-kind and painted brick.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

The Applicant proposes the following alterations: window replacements, door replacement, replacement of metal columns in the carport and repair and paint the exterior trim.

WINDOWS

The Applicant proposes to replace three windows in-kind that are public facing. From the photos that the Applicant provided the windows are deteriorated with age. Therefore, Staff is not concerned with the replacement of windows.

METAL COLUMNS

As with the windows, Staff doesn't have an issue with the replacement with the metal columns because they are being proposed to be done in-kind. However, the Applicant has not provided any photographic evidence demonstrating why the metal columns need replacement. Staff recommends the Applicant show through photographic evidences why the metal columns need replacing.

DOOR

The Applicant proposes to replace the doors in-kind. However, the elevations reflect doors that may not be indicative of doors during this time period. Since Applicant has not provided any photographic images of the door it is very hard for Staff to discern what is exactly on the house. Staff can see there is a detail iron decorative screened front door that is a very important element of Ranch houses during this period. Replacement of that door would not be permitted. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide photographs of the existing doors. As well, Staff recommends, the Applicant retain the detail decorative screen front door.

TRIM

The Applicant proposes to repair in-kind and paint the exterior trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

UNPAINTED BRICK

On the proposed elevations, the unpainted brick siding appears to be painted. If this is the case, Staff stresses and recommends that unpainted masonry cannot be painted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Applicant shall show through photographic evidence as to why the metal columns need replacement, per Sec.16-20Q.001;
2. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the existing doors and retain the detail decorative screen front door, per Sec.16-20Q.006(18);
3. Unpainted brick shall not be painted, per Sec.16-20Q.001 and
4. Staff shall review and approval final plans.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2970 Eleanor Terrace
APPLICATION: CA2-20-058
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: West of King Grant Street and East of Woodmere Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window replacement, doors replacement; painted exterior trim.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: A Stop Work was placed on December 29, 2019 for not having permits.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

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

The Applicant proposes the following alterations: window replacement, doors replacement and painted exterior trim.

WINDOWS

The Applicant proposes to replace the windows in rear of the property and do it in-kind. Staff is not concern with the replacement of windows in the rear of the property.

DOOR

The Applicant proposes to replace the doors in-kind. Since Applicant has not provided any photographic images of the doors it is very hard for Staff to discern what is exactly on the house. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide photographs of the existing doors.

EXTERIOR TRIM

The Applicant proposes to paint all the exterior trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

UNPAINTED MASONRY

The brick on the existing house has been painted. Unpainted masonry is not permitted in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the paint through a method that is not abrasive to the masonry. Sandblasting is not permitted. Staff recommends, the Applicant consults the Secretary of Interiors Standard for Rehabilitation to get acceptable methods for removing the paint.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the existing doors, per Sec.16-20Q.006(18);
2. The Applicant shall remove the paint through a method that is not abrasive to the masonry. Sandblasting is not permitted. The Applicant shall consult with the Secretary of Interiors Standard for Rehabilitations to get acceptable methods for removing the paint Sec.16-20Q.001 and
3. Staff shall review and approval final plans.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 474 Waterford Road
APPLICATION: CA2-20-059
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1958

Property Location: East of Old Know Drive and West of Baker Ridge Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? Y **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Split-level

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Window replacement, doors replacement;
Repair damaged trim and damaged rails and replace shingle on the roof.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: A Stop Work was placed on November 25, 2019 painted masonry.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

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

The Applicant proposes the following alterations: window replacement, doors replacement and painted exterior trim.

WINDOWS

The Applicant proposes to replace one rear bathroom window that will not be visible from the public right away. Staff is not with this proposal.

DOOR

The Applicant proposes to replace the doors in-kind. Since Applicant has not provided any photographic images of the door it is very hard for Staff to discern what is exactly on the house. Staff can see there is a detail iron decorative screened front door that is a very important element of Ranch houses during this period. Replacement of that door would not be permitted. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide photographs of the existing doors. As well, Staff recommends, the Applicant retain the detail decorative screen front door.

EXTERIOR TRIM AND RAILS

The Applicant proposes to repair in-kind the damaged exterior trim and carport rails in-kind. The Applicant has not provided any photographic evidence demonstrating why the metal columns and trim need replacement. Staff recommends the Applicant show through photographic evidences why the metal columns and trim needs repairing in-kind.

UNPAINTED MASONRY

The brick on the existing house has been painted. Unpainted masonry is not permitted in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the paint through a method that is not abrasive to the masonry. Sandblasting is not permitted. Staff recommends, the Applicant consults the Secretary of Interiors Standard for Rehabilitation to get acceptable methods for removing the paint.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall provide a photo of the existing doors and retain the decorative screen front door, per Sec.16-20Q.006(18);
2. The Applicant shall show through photographic evidences why the metal columns and trim needs repairing in-kind, per Sec. 16-20Q.001;
3. The Applicant shall remove the paint through a method that is not abrasive to the masonry. Sandblasting is not permitted. The Applicant shall consult with the Secretary of Interiors Standard for Rehabilitations to get acceptable methods for removing the paint Sec.16-20Q.001 and
4. Staff shall review and approval final plans.

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 26, 2020 deferred from February 12, 2020, January 22, 2020 and 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)? Yes

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

CA3-19-583 for 1121 Oakland Street

February 26, 2020

pg. 2

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 that 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 are in line with the other comps 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 it 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 provided is detailed and provides information to determine the cost in reconstructing the house. 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's proposed 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 26, 2020

pg. 4

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions to sale the house with a Stop Work Order.

1. The Applicant shall give a full disclosure to the potential buyer regarding the requirement to return the house back to its originality and it will be the buyer's responsibility to restore the house; the Applicant shall provide 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.

Y



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: 526 Langhorn St.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-047
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: East block face of Langhorn St., south of Latham St and north of Oak St.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction.

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: Deferral.

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.

While not a requirement of the Commission's review, Staff strongly suggests the Applicant's plans not be sealed or released for construction until after the Commission has approved the design for their project.

Compatibility comparisons

The District regulations are specific on how compatibility rule measurements are to be taken. Measurements are to be taken from only contributing properties on the same block face. The Applicant has included 5 properties from the same block face as the subject property (508, 512, 516, 520, and 530 Langhorn St.) as well as an additional property on a separate block face (498 Longhorn St.) which is not one of the comparable properties for this project. Staff will review the proposed structure using only those 5 contributing properties permitted by the Zoning Ordinance on the same block face as the subject property.

Building façades

Per the District regulations, the allowable front yard setback of new construction is determined by the compatibility rule. No information showing the front yard setbacks of the comparable properties has been received. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable front yard setback range for the subject property based on the comparable structures.

Per the district regulations, the height of new structures is based on the compatibility rule. The Applicant has provided information detailing the allowable height range based on contributing structures on the same block face as being a maximum of 22' and a minimum of 16'. The proposed structure contains a height of approximately 32' which exceeds the height allowed by the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the proposed structure be re-designed to be no higher than 22'.

Per the District regulations, the first floor height is based on the compatibility rule but specify that the foundations of the property should be no less than two entrance risers each of which shall be not less than seven inches in height. The regulations for first floor height also prohibit slab on grade construction. No information detailing the first-floor height of the comparable properties has been received. Further the proposed structure is shown to contain a slab on grade foundation. Staff recommends **the Applicant provide the first floor height range of the comparable properties**. Staff further recommends the proposed structure be redesigned to contain a compliant foundation.

The proposed structure contains a mix of horizontal lap siding and vertical board and batten siding. Per the District regulations, vertical board and batten siding are not a permitted building material. Staff recommends the vertical board and batten siding be removed from the design and replaced with horizontal lap siding. Staff further recommends any cement siding used be smooth faced.

The proposed structure contains a large openwork ornament in the front facing gable. Staff finds that the proposed ornament is inconsistent with the historic structures on the property and recommends the openwork ornament in the front gable be removed from the proposed design.

Per the District regulations, building materials are subject to the compatibility rule when they are visible from the public right of way. Staff finds that this regulation would require materials on the front and sides of the property to conform to the compatibility rule. Many of the building materials including but not limited to the porch columns, porch flooring, windows, doors, and trim material are not listed on the plans. Staff recommends all exterior building materials on the front and side façades be listed on the plans and meet the District regulations.

The Applicant proposes rustic barn style shutters for the front façade of the property. Staff finds no evidence of historic shutters on comparable properties to justify the inclusion of shutters on the subject property. Staff further finds that barn style shutters are incompatible with the style of historic shutters in the District, of which there are very few. As such, Staff recommends the barn style shutters be removed from the front façade.

Windows and doors

Per the District regulations, the ratio of open to solid on new construction is based on the compatibility rule. Staff has concerns with the lack of openings on the side façades. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the fenestration pattern on the side façades of the comparable properties on the block face. Staff further recommends the side façade fenestration pattern of the proposed structure meet the compatibility rule.

The District regulations require the scale, size, proportion and location of all openings on new construction to meet the compatibility rule. Staff has not received information detailing the scale, size, and proportion of the openings on the comparable properties. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the scale, size, and proportion of the openings of comparable properties on the block face. Staff further recommends the proposed fenestration scale, size, and proportions meet the District regulations.

In looking at the front façades of comparable properties on the block face, Staff finds the predominate fenestration pattern is for the front door to be centered on the front façade and be flanked by window openings on either side. As such, Staff recommends the front façade design be changed to show a front door centered on the façade flanked by windows. Staff further recommends the front door be wood with a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion, placement, and style.

Foundations

As mentioned earlier in this report, slab on grade foundations are not permitted in the District. In addition to this requirement, the District has specific requirements for foundation materials. The predominate foundation materials on the block face are either brick or granite. As such, Staff recommends the foundation on the proposed structure be constructed of either brick or granite.

Roofs

Per the District regulations, the shape and pitch of new roofs are subject to the compatibility rule. While no information detailing the allowable roof pitch has been received, Staff finds that the predominate roof shape is a front facing gable. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposed

roof shape, but recommends the Applicant provide information detailing the allowable roof pitch based on the contributing structures on the block face.

Porch

The District regulations require new porches to contain balustrades, columns, and other features consistent with the architectural style of original porches on the block. In looking at the comparable properties, they all contain columns that have a masonry base, and are either squared or round. Staff finds the square column proposed would fit the pattern of historic porches on the block but recommends that a masonry base which meets the compatibility rule as it relates to materials, size, and style be added to the front porch columns.

As the original porches on the block face do not contain their original railing, Staff recommends any new railing meet the District regulations and be constructed of a two-part rail with butt jointed pickets. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that side nailed pickets will not satisfy the previous condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the March 25, 2020 public hearing to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable front yard setback range for the subject property based on the comparable structures, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(a);
2. The proposed structure shall be re-designed to be no higher than 22', per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(g);
3. The Applicant shall provide the first floor height range of the comparable properties, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(f);
4. The proposed structure shall be redesigned to contain a compliant foundation, Per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(f);
5. The vertical board and batten siding be removed from the design and replaced with horizontal lap siding, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d);
6. Any cement siding used shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d);
7. The openwork ornament in the front gable shall be removed from the proposed design, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
8. All exterior building materials on the front and side façades shall be listed on the plans and shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
9. The barn style shutters shall be removed from the front façade, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
10. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the fenestration pattern on the side façades of the comparable properties on the block face, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(h);
11. The side façade fenestration pattern of the proposed structure shall meet the compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(h);
12. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the scale, size, and proportion of the openings of comparable properties on the block face, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(i);

13. The proposed fenestration scale, size, and proportions shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(i);
14. The front façade design shall be changed to show a front door centered on the façade flanked by windows, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(i);
15. The front door shall be wood with a rectangular lite opening meeting the compatibility rule as to its scale, size, proportion, placement, and style, per Sec. 16-20G.006(3)(k);
16. The foundation on the proposed structure shall be constructed of either brick or granite, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(c);
17. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable roof pitch based on the contributing structures on the block face, per Sec. 16-20G.006(7)(d);
18. A masonry base which meets the compatibility rule as it relates to materials, size, and style shall be added to the front porch columns, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
19. Any new railing shall meet the District regulations and be constructed of a two-part rail with butt jointed pickets, per Sec. 16-20G.006(9)(d);
20. All updated plans shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2560 Loghaven Drive
APPLICATION: CA3-20-051
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1960

Property Location: West of Hutton Parkway and East of Hamilton E. Holmes Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Enclosed carport, stonework siding, covered stoop and shutters

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order placed on property August 8, 2018 for OOD permit approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

PLANS

The Applicant provided site plans that appear not be to-scale. Staff recommends the Applicant submit two to-scale site plans to meet the District regulations.

The Applicant proposes to retain an enclosed carport that was constructed from a carport. This work was done prior to the Applicant purchasing the property and was done without the proper permits. Additionally, the Applicant proposes to reinstall a partial stone façade that was replaced with cementitious siding prior and install a new covered front stoop.

ENCLOSED CARPORT

The Applicant proposes to retain the enclosed carport that was established by prior work. The District regulation states existing attached garages or carports may be fully enclosed into conditioned space provided the original character defining features visible from the public street are retained and are identifiable. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

STONE FACADE AND SIDING

The Applicant proposes to reinstall a partial stone façade that was original to the structure and has since been replaced with cementitious siding. Staff is not concerned with the proposed stonework; it matches the previous stonework.

COVERED FRONT STOOP

The proposed front stoop is not problematic to Staff. The original stoop is not present on the principal structure. Nor is there any photographic history of the original stoop. Therefore, the Applicant is essentially constructing an entirely new stoop which will be based off the compatibility standard. District regulation states, porches or stoops shall be a part of new principal structures or additions based on the compatibility rule and if present the front or side façade shall contain railings and decorative features consistent with the architectural style of the principal structure or shall be subject to the compatibility rule. The proposed stoop is a simple standard covered stoop that is present on the many of the principle structures on the block.

SHUTTERS

The Applicant proposes standard shutters that are indicative of shutters during that time period. Staff is not concerned with the shutters.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions

1. The Applicant shall provide two to-scale site plans to meet the District regulations, Sec. 16-20Q.001
2. Staff shall review and approval final plans.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 704 Aline Drive
APPLICATION: CA3-20-052
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1961

Property Location: East of Skipper Drive and West of Laverne Drive

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work Order placed on the house 2/14/2020 for painting unpainted masonry.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

VARIANCE

The Applicant has received a Stop Work Order on the property due to the Applicant painting unpainted masonry and the Applicant is requesting a variance to allow the paint to remain on the house. Painted unpainted masonry in historic districts in the City of Atlanta is prohibited. The Applicant has submitted the Variance application and has provided the answers to the following questions that must be considered before a variance is granted:

- 1) What are the extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular property?
The Applicant states "to be able to keep the exterior painted brick Alabaster White."
- 2) How will the Zoning Ordinance create an unnecessary hardship?
The Applicant writes, "It wouldn't. By allowing to keep the outside painted white, the property immediately attracted a buyer interested in buying within the community and went under contract."
- 3) What conditions are peculiar to the property?
The Applicant declares, "renovated, and has helped make the neighborhood more appealing."
- 4) If relief is granted would it cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair intent of Zoning?
The Applicant answers, " If granted, buyer would purchase property, paint used to paint exterior is harmless of any chemicals that would harm the outside community, also by having a new member who is productive in the community will only add value to the community."

The Applicant has not sufficiently answered the questions or provided a reason to vary the requirement of unpainted brick. The Applicant has not demonstrated any exceptional conditions or peculiarity of the property; nor has the Applicant stated any hardship or how if he is granted relief how this would not be detrimental to the community or ordinance. Staff reasons if the Applicant is granted relief, a flood gate of people painting brick would happen possibly causing deterioration of the brick widespread. This would be very detrimental to the community.

Being that the Applicant has not answered the questions in a way that addresses the problem, the Applicant should be provided an opportunity to do so.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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: 454 Park Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-053

MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5.

Date of Construction: 1906

Property Location: West block face of Park Ave, south of Glenwood Ave., north of Sydney St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-053: Approval with conditions.

.

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

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing altering the exterior of the front façade of the primary structure by repairing the front porch floor, installing new porch columns and railings, repairing of wood siding, trim, eaves, and fascia, and repairing the concrete porch steps. The Applicant is also proposing a second story addition, however the addition sits behind the existing ridgeline. As such, the second story addition is not subject to review by the Commission.

Front Porch

In the current condition, the front porch does not have any railings and contains makeshift. The Applicant is proposing adding clover moulding to the existing wood porch beam, 8' columns on wood square post bases, a 36" guardrail, and repair of the porch floor boards in kind. In a photograph supplied by the Applicant taken circa 1981, a railing exists. The Applicant is basing the design of the proposed railing off of the photograph provided. Additionally, the photograph shows columns existing in the manner proposed by the Applicant.

After review, Staff finds the proposed railing and column additions to reinforce the historic character of the primary structure. Staff also finds no issues with the inclusion of clover moulding around the existing wood porch beam, nor the repair of the concrete porch steps. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide documentation of the porch floor boards to determine the preservation of historic materials and that any repairs are done in kind.

Siding

Based on photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff was unable to determine the condition of the front façade wood siding, trim, soffit, and eaves. Staff was also unable to determine whether or not the current wood siding is original historic material. As such, Staff recommends that clear documentation be provided to determine the extent of damage to the siding, trim, soffit, and eaves along the front façade. Staff also recommends that any material that is determined to be replaced be done in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall provide documentation to the front porch flooring to determine the preservation of historic materials.
2. Damaged boards on the front porch deck shall be replaced in kind.
3. Applicant shall provide clear documentation of the front façade siding, trim, soffit, and eaves to determine extent of repairs.
4. Damaged siding shall be replaced in kind.
5. 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: 454 Park Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-053

MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5.

Date of Construction: 1906

Property Location: West block face of Park Ave, south of Glenwood Ave., north of Sydney St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Infill.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-053: Approval with conditions.

.

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

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing altering the exterior of the front façade of the primary structure by repairing the front porch floor, installing new porch columns and railings, repairing of wood siding, trim, eaves, and fascia, and repairing the concrete porch steps. The Applicant is also proposing a second story addition, however the addition sits behind the existing ridgeline. As such, the second story addition is not subject to review by the Commission.

Front Porch

In the current condition, the front porch does not have any railings and contains makeshift. The Applicant is proposing adding clover moulding to the existing wood porch beam, 8' columns on wood square post bases, a 36" guardrail, and repair of the porch floor boards in kind. In a photograph supplied by the Applicant taken circa 1981, a railing exists. The Applicant is basing the design of the proposed railing off of the photograph provided. Additionally, the photograph shows columns existing in the manner proposed by the Applicant.

After review, Staff finds the proposed railing and column additions to reinforce the historic character of the primary structure. Staff also finds no issues with the inclusion of clover moulding around the existing wood porch beam, nor the repair of the concrete porch steps. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide documentation of the porch floor boards to determine the preservation of historic materials and that any repairs are done in kind.

Siding

Based on photographs provided by the Applicant, Staff was unable to determine the condition of the front façade wood siding, trim, soffit, and eaves. Staff was also unable to determine whether or not the current wood siding is original historic material. As such, Staff recommends that clear documentation be provided to determine the extent of damage to the siding, trim, soffit, and eaves along the front façade. Staff also recommends that any material that is determined to be replaced be done in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall provide documentation to the front porch flooring to determine the preservation of historic materials.
2. Damaged boards on the front porch deck shall be replaced in kind.
3. Applicant shall provide clear documentation of the front façade siding, trim, soffit, and eaves to determine extent of repairs.
4. Damaged siding shall be replaced in kind.
5. 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: 1272 Lucile Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-054
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: North block face of Lucile Ave, west of Atwood St., east of Hopkins St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Bungalow.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, additions, site work.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-054: Deferral to March 25 meeting.

CA2-20-054 for 1272 Lucile Ave.
March 11, 2020.
Page 2 of 2

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

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing the expansion of the existing rear deck. The proposed expansion will not extend past the sides of the primary structure. As such, Staff supports the expansion of the rear deck.

Addition

The Applicant is proposing adding to the primary structure by enclosing the rear porch with cementitious siding. The proposed enclosure will have a tri-fold carriage door on the left side. After review, Staff has no issue with the enclosure of the rear porch. However, Staff recommends that the enclosure be faced with stucco to rather than cementitious siding. Staff finds that stucco is more appropriate in differentiating the ground level from the main level, as the existing ground side elevation appears to be stucco.

Site Work

The Applicant is proposing site work by repaving the existing driveway with the addition of 4" slate to define the property driveway. Staff finds no issue with the repaving of the existing driveway. However, the Wend End District regulations state that any new material of newly paved surfaced are subject to the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends deferral to the March 25th meeting in order to give the Applicant time to prove compatibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to March 25 meeting:

1. The enclosed rear porch shall be faced with stucco.
2. The Applicant shall show compatibility to the 4" stone slate.
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.allantaga.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: 647 Bryan St.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-060
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1903

Property Location: North block face of Bryan St, west of Cameron St., east of Berean Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Shotgun

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, additions, site work.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Work not visible from the public ROW.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 and Sec. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-060: Approval with conditions.

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

Alterations

The Applicant is proposing altering the front façade of the primary structure by replacing the front porch decking, replacing the front porch posts, replacing the front door and windows, and replacing the wood siding. In the application, the Applicant is proposing the construction of a second story addition. However, since it is set back from the existing front façade, it is not subject to review by the Commission.

Front Porch

Currently, the front porch deck is wrapped with lattice, has damaged columns, and boards that are perpendicular to the front façade. The Applicant is proposing replacing the lattice with brick, replacing the existing columns with 4x4 treated lumber, and replacing the deck boards with treated 5/4" boards. The Applicant is proposing replacing the porch roof that will maintain the shed style, but will increase the angle up the front façade.

After review, Staff finds that the proposed new columns and brick foundation are consistent with district guidelines. Staff was unable to determine the condition of the front porch deck. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant document the front porch deck to determine what can be preserved. Staff also recommends that any boards that are damaged beyond repair be done in kind. If it is determined that the entire deck must be replaced, Staff recommends that the boards remain perpendicular to the front façade of the structure and are done in kind.

In regards to the angle of the front porch roof, Staff finds that increasing the angle would potentially damage historic materials on the front façade, as the proposed plans show the new porch roof covering up 2 additional boards of siding. As such, Staff recommends that the original angle of the front porch roof be maintained.

Windows and Door

The proposed window on the front façade would increase the number of light divides from 12 to 18. However, Staff was unable to determine if the existing window is of original historic material. As such Staff recommends that the Applicant provide evidence showing that the existing window is not historic, otherwise Staff recommends that the existing window be retained and repaired in kind. In the event that the window is not historic or beyond repair, Staff recommends that the new window maintain the existing 12 light divisions and be made of unclad wood.

Additionally, Staff was unable to determine if the existing door is of historic material. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide evidence showing that the door is not historic material, otherwise Staff recommends that the existing door be maintained and preserved.

Siding

The current siding along the front façade of the structure is wood. The Applicant is proposing replacing any damaged wood siding. However, Staff was unable to determine if the existing siding is original historic material. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide detailed

photographic evidence of the condition of the front façade siding. Staff also recommends that any siding found to be beyond repair shall be replaced in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall document the front porch deck to determine the preservation of historic materials for Staff to review.
2. Any board on the front porch deck that is replaced shall be done in kind.
3. In the event that the entire front porch deck needs to be replaced, the boards shall be perpendicular to the front façade and be done in kind.
4. The original angle of front porch roof shall be maintained.
5. Applicant shall provide evidence showing that the front façade window is not historic for Staff to review.
6. If the front façade window is original and which Staff finds to be in repairable condition, it shall be retained and repaired in-kind.
7. If the front façade window is determined to be not original or beyond repair, the new windows shall maintain the existing 12 light divisions and be made of unclad wood.
8. Applicant shall provide evidence showing that the front door is not historic.
9. If the front door is historic, it shall be maintained and preserved.
10. The Applicant shall provide detailed photographic documentation of the front façade siding for Staff to review.
11. Only those portions of the front façade siding which Staff has determined to be beyond repair shall be replaced in kind.
12. 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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1107 Montreat Avenue
APPLICATION: CA3-20-066
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: East of Hall Street and South of Donnelly

Contributing (Y/N): No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior of the new construction

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: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Defer until the March 25, 2020 to allow the Applicant to provide the information needed for review.

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided five comparisons for review: 1115 Montreat, 1121 Montreat, 1125 Montreat, 1131 Montreat and 1135 Montreat. Staff has found more houses that should be available for comparison.

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed 20 feet for the new construction. The Applicant has not provided the height for 1135, although this is the case, three of the five comparable houses are 21 feet. Therefore, the Applicant’s proposed height meets the District regulation. Staff is not concerned with his proposal.

The Applicant has not provided actual compatibility information for the pitch. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide that information.

Roof form

The Applicant has not provided information on roof forms but instead provided information on the prevailing house styles in the District. While the house style maybe be an indicator of a roof form, it is not always. Therefore, to abide by the District regulations, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide compatibility information for the roof form.

Floor Elevations

While the Applicant has not provided compatibility for the floor elevation. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the comparable houses for comparison.

Siding

The Applicant proposes a 6- inch reveal cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is a permissible material in the District. However, siding is also governed by the compatibility standing and the Applicant has not provided any compatibility information on siding. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility on the blockface for the siding.

Windows

The proposed windows are three over one double hung wood windows with wood trim. This proposal is not problematic to Staff. As the Applicant has stated and shown, the prevailing window pattern from the comparable properties is three over one vertical although the Applicant doesn't stae material. In addition to the District regulations requiring windows style to be determined by the compatibility standard, District regulations also requires if muntins or mullions are used, such muntins or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass. Staff recommends if muntins or mullions are to be used, the Applicant abided by the District Regulations.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a full porch, front facing wood steps, brick columns with cap ends on the actual 12 inches sq. columns and wood railings. The District regulation states that "the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends." The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for porches. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed porch. Staff also recommends the railings be a two-part top to bottom construction. The height should be no higher than the front windowsill and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension

The Applicant has proposed continued cementitious 6-inch reveal siding in the roof with exposed rafters. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

On the front door, the Applicant proposes a solid wood panel door with glass lights and a transom light. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

Foundation

The Applicant has proposed a brick foundation for the front of the house and a stucco foundation for the remainder of the house. The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for the foundation comparison, which is a requirement of the District regulations regarding prevailing foundation material on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the foundation.

Sidewalk

On the site plan the Applicant has shown a 6ft sidewalk with 4 ft planting strip. District regulation requires a sidewalk and states that "the sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-feet wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick." Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Walkway

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant has not shown on the site plan a proposed sidewalk. Staff recommends, the Applicant install a walkway to abide by District regulations.

Driveway

On the Applicant's site plan, what appears to be the driveway. The driveway falls short of an extension. Staff recommends the Applicant abided by the District regulation that centered on driveway construction which reads, "if constructed, independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the March 25, 2020 meeting.

1. The Applicant shall provide all comparisons for the and pitch comparisons, per Sec.16-20M.005;
2. The Applicant shall provide all comparison for the roof form comparison, per Sec.16-20M.005;
3. The Applicant shall provide compatibility for finished floor elevations, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(h);
4. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the siding, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(m);
5. If muntins and mullions are to be used on the windows, the Application shall abide by the District regulations that governs muntins and mullions installation, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(o);
6. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the proposed porch, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
7. The rails shall be a two-part top to bottom construction with the top rail being no higher than the top of sill of the front window; any need extension for the safety code can be achieved through a simple plain extension, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
8. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information on the foundation, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(10);
9. The Applicant shall provide a walkway for the proposed construction, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d);
10. The Applicant shall abide by the District regulations that centers on driveway construction, per Sec.16-20M.012(4)(c) and
11. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 989 Dimmock Street
APPLICATION: CA3-20-067
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A/Beltline

Date of Construction: New Construction

Property Location: West of Lee Street and East of Peoples Street

Contributing (Y/N): No **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** New Construction

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior of the new construction

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: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Defer until the March 25, 2020 to allow the Applicant to provide the information needed for review.

CA3-20-067 for 989 Dimmock
March 11, 2020

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

PURVIEW

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Comparison

The Applicant has provided only two comparisons for review: 983 Dimmock and 961 Dimmock. However, from research, Staff has found more houses that should be available for comparison. To abide by the District regulations, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the houses on the blockface that can be compared to the new construction.

Height and Pitch

The Applicant has proposed 20 feet for the new construction. While this maybe an acceptable height, without the proper comparisons, Staff can not accurately say. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the comparisons for the height and pitch determination.

Roof form

The Applicant has not provided information on roof forms but instead provided information on the prevailing house styles in the District. While the house style maybe be an indicator of a roof form, it is not always. Therefore, to abide by the District regulations, Staff recommends, the Applicant provide compatibility information for the roof form.

Floor Elevations

While the Applicant has provided floor elevations for 983 and 961 Dimmock, the Applicant has not provided information on other structures. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide all the comparable houses for comparison.

Siding

The Applicant proposes a 6- inch reveal cementitious siding for the new construction. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; cementitious siding is a permissible material in the District. However, siding is also governed by the compatibility standing and the Applicant has not provided any compatibility information on siding. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility on the blockface for the siding.

Windows

The proposed windows are three over one double hung wood windows with wood trim. While the three over one double hung wood windows does not appear to be problematic to Staff, the Applicant only provided two comparisons on the blockface or provide photos to allow Staff to determine the appropriate style of window that need to be installed. District regulations requires windows style to be determined by the compatibility standard as well if muntins or mullions are used, such muntins or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass. Staff recommends Applicant provided the window information for all the comparable houses on the blockface.

Fenestration Pattern

While the fenestration pattern presented by the Applicant is not problematic to Staff abiding by the District regulations, all the windows are vertical in orientation.

Porch

The Applicant proposes a full porch, front facing wood steps, brick columns with cap ends on the actual 12 inches sq. columns and wood railings. The District regulation states that “the compatibility rule shall apply to the design and size of front porches, and the placement and orientation of front steps. Front porches shall contain roofs, balustrades, columns, steps, and other features as determined by the compatibility rule. Front porches may extend up to ten feet into the required front yard. All front porch steps shall have closed risers and ends.” The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for porches. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed porch. Staff also recommends the railings be a two-part top to bottom construction. The height should be no higher than the front windowsill and any needed extension for safety code shall be achieved through a simple plain extension

The Applicant has proposed continued cementitious 6-inch reveal siding in the roof with exposed rafters. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Doors

On the front door, the Applicant proposes a solid wood panel door with glass lights and a transom light. Staff is not concerned with this proposal

Foundation

The Applicant has proposed a brick foundation for the front of the house and a stucco foundation for the remainder of the house. The Applicant has not provided any compatibility information for the foundation comparison, which is a requirement of the District regulations regarding prevailing foundation material on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the foundation.

Sidewalk

On the site plan the Applicant has not provided information on an actual sidewalk. District regulation requires a sidewalk and states that “the sidewalk shall be the same width as the sidewalk on abutting properties or it shall be the width otherwise required by city ordinance, whichever is greater. If no sidewalk exists in the block, the new sidewalk shall not be less than six-foot wide. The compatibility rule shall apply to sidewalks paving materials. If no sidewalk paving material predominates in the block, the sidewalk shall be constructed of the historically accurate material for that block, either hexagonal pavers, concrete inlaid with hexagonal imprint, or brick.” Staff

CA3-20-067 for 989 Dimmock
March 11, 2020

recommends the Applicant abide by the specific laid out in the District requirement regarding sidewalks.

Walkway

District regulations requires a walkway to be established between the sidewalk and the front porch. The Applicant has shown on the site plan a proposed sidewalk, but Staff deems this was probably labelled in error. Staff recommends, the Applicant label he walkway correctly on the site plan.

Driveway

On the Applicant's site plan, what appears to be the driveway is also mislabeled as a sidewalk. Staff recommends, the driveway be labelled correctly. Also, the driveway falls short of an extension. Staff recommends the Applicant abided by the District regulation that centered on driveway construction which reads, "if constructed, independent driveways within the front yard or half-depth front yard shall be a maximum of ten feet wide and shall have a maximum curb cut of ten feet, exclusive of the flare." Staff also recommends the Applicant consider the use of the alleyway for driveway access.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the March 25, 2020 meeting.

1. The Applicant shall provide all houses on the blockface to allow for accurate compatibility comparisons, per Sec. 16-20M.005;
2. The Applicant shall provide all comparisons for the height and pitch comparisons, per Sec.16-20M.005;
3. The Applicant shall provide all comparison for the roof form comparison, per Sec.16-20M.005;
4. The Applicant shall provide compatibility for finished floor elevations, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(h);
5. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the siding, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(m);
6. The Applicant shall provide all the comparable windows information so that Staff can determine the appropriate windows for installations, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(n)(o);
7. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the proposed porch, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
8. The rails shall be a two-part top to bottom construction with the top rail being no higher than the top of sill of the front window; any need extension for the safety code can be achieved through a simple plain extension, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(i);
9. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information on the foundation, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(10);
10. The Applicant shall abide by the regulations set forth in District regulations for the construction of the sidewalk, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(c);
11. The Applicant shall label the walkway correctly on the site plans, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(d);
12. The Applicant shall label the driveway correctly on the site plan and abide by the District regulations that centered on driveway construction; the Applicant shall look at the alleyway for use, per Sec.16-20M.001(7) and
13. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

CA3-20-067 for 989 Dimmock
March 11, 2020

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: 1121 Merrill Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-070
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: North block face of Merrill Ave., east of Hall St, west of Lawton St.

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

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

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear deck.

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The subject property received a Stop Work Order in March of 2019 for work that was not properly permitted including the replacement of windows, siding, and the addition of a front porch. An online permit was submitted in January of 2019 but was not completed by the Office of Buildings as the work proposed exceeded the threshold allowed for online permitting.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral

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.

Alterations

The Applicant proposes the removal and reconfiguration of the existing vinyl windows, the existing non-original front door, and the replacement of the existing vinyl siding. Staff is not concerned with the removal of the windows and siding as they are non-historic elements. However, Staff finds that the regulations require the retention of the original window openings. As such, Staff recommends the plans be changed to show the original window and door openings maintained at their original size, scale, and location on the front and side façades. Staff recommends all siding on the property be a horizontal lap siding product. Staff further recommends that if cement siding is used as a replacement siding material that it be smooth faced. Lastly, Staff recommends the replacement front door meet the District regulations.

Additions

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition that will not encroach on the side setbacks of the existing structure. Additionally, the addition will conform to the Oakland City Historic District rear yard setback requirements. From the plans, the addition will contain a foundation comprised of materials compatible with the foundation of the principal structure. Staff does recommend that the plans be changed to show the rear corner boards retained in-place and the existing eave lines carrying through on the side façades to allow for the proper interpretation of the structure.

With regards to the proposed front porch, Staff finds that the proposed porch does not match the historic porches on the block face. Staff also has concerns with the porch being centered on the front façade as shown on the proposed drawings. In looking at the block face in question, Staff finds that the predominate pattern is split between houses with the door located on the right side of the front façade and those containing centered front doors. The structures containing doors centered on the front façade typically contain a stoop with or without a gabled or shed covering. On the structures that contain covered stoops, the stoops are typically minimal and cover an area that consists of the front door and a 4' by 4' landing. As such, Staff has no concerns with the inclusion of a stoop covering but finds that it should match the dimensions of the original stoops on the block face and should be centered over the location of the original front door opening. As such, Staff recommends the plans be changed to show a front stoop located over the original front door opening on the left side of the front façade. Staff further recommends that the proposed front stoop be reduced in size to match the dimensions of original porch stoops on the block face.

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

1. The plans shall be changed to show the original window and door openings maintained at their original size, scale, and location on the front and side façades, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
2. All siding on the property shall be a horizontal lap siding product, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
3. If cement siding is used as a replacement siding material that it shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
4. The replacement front door shall meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);

5. The plans shall be changed to show the rear corner boards retained in-place and the existing eave lines carrying through on the side façades to allow for the proper interpretation of the structure, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
6. The plans shall be changed to show a front stoop located over the original front door opening on the left side of the front façade, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a);
7. The proposed front stoop shall be reduced in size to match the dimensions of original porch stoops on the block face, per Sec. 16-20M.017(1)(a); and,
8. All updated plans and documentation shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

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: 909 Edgewood Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-071
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1994

Property Location: Southeast corner of Edgewood Ave. and Waverly Way.

Contributing (Y/N)? No. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Infill

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CA3-20-071 for 909 Edgewood Ave.
March 11, 2020
Page 2 of 2

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.

The Applicant proposes a rear addition and deck in place of an existing deck. Based on the information provided, the rear addition will conform to the side yard setbacks of the existing structure, and the new deck will be placed further from the rear lot line than the existing deck. Staff is not concerned with the design of the proposed addition but finds that it generally conforms to the style of the existing non-contributing structure. Staff further finds that the proposed addition meets the requirements of the Inman Park Historic District subarea 1 regulations for additions and decks as well as meets the underlying R-5 requirements for floor area and lot coverage. As such, Staff has no concerns with the project as proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions.

1. 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: 1162 Oglethorpe Ave.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-033
MEETING DATE: March 11, 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)? Yes. *Updated text in Italics.*

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.

The Applicant has updated their plans to show the inclusion of a window on the main floor level of the west side elevation for the proposed addition. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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.

The Applicant has updated their plans to include a shed roof over the stairwell which ties in to the principal rear facing gable of the new addition. Staff finds this recommendation has been met.

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. 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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 4371 Powers Ferry Road
APPLICATION: RC-20-046
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: 1999

Property Location: East of Powers Ferry Road and West of Elliott Galloway Way

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition of existing barns and rebuilds.

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

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

RC-20-046 for 4371 Powers Ferry
March 11, 2020
Page 2 of 2

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

DEMOLITION OF BARN

The Applicant proposes to demolish five existing barns and rebuild the five new barns. From the plans the Applicant provided the demolition of the existing barns do not appear to be problematic. However, Staff is concerned about the grading of the site and wonders how the Applicant proposes to handle that? Examination of the plans illustrates the Applicant proposes stormwater alterations that will address any water erosion. Staff deems this extremely important and applaud the Applicant. Plans also show that the Applicant has added more sand paddocks as well as installed ADA accessibility. The track around the grounds makes the site more accessible and brings about a warmer and welcoming environment. A family and pedestrian focus are also present in the plans, with a proposed community and picnic pavilion.

Staff has no concern with the overall project and see the changes necessary for growth. With this said, Staff wonders are other changes anticipated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.

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: 38 Camden Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-20-068
MEETING DATE: March 11, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills Conservation District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1930

Property Location: North block face of Camden Rd., east of Montclair Dr. and west of Wakefield Dr.

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant and the Secretary of the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

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 Project before the Commission at this time consists of a porch and residential square footage addition to the existing structure and requires a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment to allow a front yard setback reduction and an increase in the allowable lot coverage. As the property in question is located in the Brookwood Hills Conservation District, the Commission is tasked with both commenting on the design of the project and providing commentary on the variance request as it relates to the potential impact on the District at large.

With regards to the variance request, Staff finds that the granting of the requested variations would not impair the Commission's ability to enforce Chapter 20 of the Zoning Ordinance. However, Staff would note that the proposed design changes are considerable and would further alter the structure which has already undergone alterations in the 1970's per the inventory information on file with the Office of Design Staff.

With regards to the project design, Staff has several concerns. Firstly, Staff finds that the proposed porch addition would alter what is left of the original spatial relationships on the front façade of the structure. Staff would suggest the Applicant consider a more historically accurate front stoop configuration. With regard to the cross-member railing on the second level of the porch, Staff suggests that the Applicant consider using a historically accurate rail constructed with a two part top rail and vertical butt-jointed pickets that would be more sensitive to the original architecture of the structure.

With regards to the removal of a window and door from the front façade, Staff finds that the existing features are likely not original to the structure as they do not match the design of the features shown in the photographic inventory for this property. However, Staff would suggest the Applicant consider methods which preserve the original spatial relationships and fenestration patterns of the front façade. Staff also suggests the Applicant consider using materials which are compatible with the materials which would have been used during the time period of construction on the home.

With regards to the removal of the accent gable on the left side of the front façade, Staff has no concerns with this alteration. Staff finds that the original structure likely contained either one gable on the front façade centered over the front door or lacked gables on the front façade entirely.

With regards to the second story addition to the existing sun room on the left side of the structure, Staff finds that an addition designed to mimic the style and materials of the main portion of the structure as opposed to the design of the porch below would soften the impact of the new addition on the existing structure and reduce the perceived verticality of the addition as a whole. As such, Staff suggests the Applicant consider alternate designs for the proposed second story side porch addition which uses materials mimicking those found on the main portion of the principal structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant and the Secretary of the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

RC-20-068 for 38 Camden Rd.
March 11, 2020
Page 3 of 3

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:** 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. Updated text in italics.*

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 and the project was abandoned. 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: *Approval with conditions.*

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.

The Applicant has cited the in-rem demolition request made by the Office of Code Compliance in 2019 stating that the City of Atlanta found the structure to be unsafe. Staff would note that the calculations used in the in-rem process are purely financial and make a definitive analysis of the structures degradation based on their comparisons of the cost of repairing the structure as a percentage of the structure's estimated fair market value in its current condition. However, Staff finds the reports issued by the Office of Code Compliance to be valid. Staff would also note that this application was Denied by the Commission for the reasons listed in the Findings of Fact section of this report.

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.

The Applicant has revised their submission to state that the home is unable to qualify for a warranty in its currently condition. Staff would note that this response does not relate to the demolition criteria.

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.

The Applicant states that the owner did not have knowledge of the property's Landmark Designation at the time of acquisition. Staff's records show communication between the Office of Design Staff and the Owner's real estate agent in June of 2019 which the Owner was copied on. This correspondence happened after the Fulton County Tax Assessor's listed date of sale as March 22, 2019. In this correspondence the Landmark District regulations were sent to the Owner and their real estate agent along with an application package for projects located in the City of Atlanta's Historic and Landmark Districts.

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.

The Applicant has not provided a response to this recommendation. However, in previous responses it appears that there was not a relationship between the current owner and the previous owner before the transaction occurred. Staff recommends the Applicant confirm there was no relationship between the current property owner and the previous property owner before the sales transaction occurred.

- (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.

The Applicant has stated that the property has a negative cashflow resulting from the code enforcement violations and fines that have resulted from previous owners abandoning the property after not properly permitting the work that occurred and violating the Commission's approval prior to abandoning the project.

- (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.

The Applicant states that there is no mortgage on the property and that it was purchased with cash.

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.

The Applicant has updated their response to state that the current owner relied on the comparisons provided by their real estate agent before purchasing the property for cash.

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.

The Applicant has responded with information showing the current fair market value of the property based on the Fulton County Tax Assessor's assessment for 2020 which values the property at \$85,440.00.

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:

The Applicant has updated their responses to state that the property has no value as the Office of Code Compliance was seeking to demolish the structure in 2019. Staff finds this assessment is inaccurate in that, while leans are typically applied to a property after demolition or clean-up, the In-Rem Demolition process itself does not render a property worthless.

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.

The Applicant has updated their responses to state again that the property has no value as the Office of Code Compliance was seeking to demolish the structure in 2019. Staff does not agree with this assessment as the In-Rem Demolition process, while likely resulting in leans against a property, does not take away all value from a property. As such Staff Retains this recommendation. Staff would note for the benefit of the Applicant that this criterion is seeking to establish the value of the property based on market analysis of the property in its current condition, after completion of renovations, and after demolition of the structure.

- 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.

The Applicant has stated that the State Office of Historic Preservation incentives are not applicable due to the deterioration of the structure. As noted in the overall comments below, Staff finds that the majority of the structure has been replaced which could compromise the availability of incentives for work on the property.

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.

The Office of Buildings has not produced their inspection report for this property at the time of the writing of this Staff Report. Staff would note for the benefit of both the Applicant and the Commission that these reports are typically submitted after a finding by the Commission and are only prepared beforehand as the inspection Staff's workload allows. The Office of Buildings has confirmed that an inspection is scheduled but does not yet have an estimated time of completion.

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 finds that there are still several factual items omitted from the Applicant's responses but finds that the information received establishes the substantive requirements are met by the proposal. Staff would note for the benefit of the Commission that as a result of the non-compliant and illegal work completed by previous owners, very little of the original structure remains. From the photographs provided, Staff was only able to verify the existence of the original foundation of the property. If other original building materials still exist, they were not shown in the photographs received by Staff. This being the case, any renovation of the existing structure would result in much of the property being constructed of new materials with very little of the original structure being preserved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: *Approval with the following Conditions:*

1. *The Applicant shall confirm there was no relationship between the current property owner and the previous property owner before the sales transaction occurred*
2. *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;*
3. *Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.*

cc: Applicant
File