



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: 2051 Butler Way, NW
APPLICATION: CA3-19-235
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2020 deferred since July 10, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Whittier Mill Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4/A

Date of Construction: 1900 (circa)

Property Location: West of Fabian dead ends on Butler Way

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

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

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20J

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 with Chapter 20 and Chapter 20J of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

COMPATIBILITY RULE

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

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes a second story addition to accommodate an interior remodel. The new addition will not go beyond the existing deck. The Applicant will extend the deck out to the sides of the house but will not exceed the sides of the house. The roof line will tuck under the existing roof line and not exceed it and the massing does not appear massive because it sits to the rear. The Applicant proposes asphalt shingles on the roof. Staff is not concerned with the proposed addition.

Windows

The Applicant proposes to add vinyl windows with SDL slides to the addition to match the existing SDL aluminum window on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

Siding

The existing siding on the house is cementitious, the Applicant proposes to install cementitious siding to match the existing.

Foundation

Concrete is proposed for the new foundation. This will match the existing concrete foundation. Staff is not concern with this proposal. Concrete is a permitted material for the foundation.

Trim and Corners boards

The proposed trim and corner boards will match the proposed siding. Staff does not have a concern with the proposal.

ALTERATIONS

Chimneys

The chimneys will remain on the existing houses. The Applicants to place caps on each and repoint the masonry on the chimney. Staff does not have a concern with this proposal. The caps can easily be removed and will not take away from the historical importance of the existing house. And repointing helps the longevity of the chimney.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 884 Oakhill Ave.
APPLICATION: CA2-20-085
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1910

Property Location: East block face of Oakhill Ave., south of the Lillian Ave. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)? Yes. Deferred August 5, 2020. *Updated text in italics.*

Previous Applications/Known Issues: In 2018, Staff the City received notice of interior work being completed without a permit. That work was permitted under an Express Permit which allowed interior work to the structure only. The scope of this approval was violated when exterior alterations including window replacement, door replacement, chimney modifications, and porch alterations were completed. The current proposal is for the review of this unpermitted work.

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.

As the project includes work which was completed without proper permitting or a review by the Commission, Staff recommends that photographs of all 4 sides of the property be submitted so that Staff can confirm the extent of the illegal work which requires a review by the Commission.

The Applicant has indicated their desire to comply with this recommendation, but photographs have not been received by Staff. As such, Staff retains this recommendation.

Windows

From the publicly accessible street view photographs, Staff finds that the original wood windows were removed and replaced. Given the length of time since the windows were removed, Staff finds it is unlikely that the windows are still on site. As such, Staff recommends the illegally installed windows be removed and replaced with new unclad wood windows matching the style, shape, and size of the original windows.

The Applicant has revised their plans to include windows that match the original windows in style. Staff finds this proposal meets the recommendation but retains the recommendation regarding the window material.

Porch

The front porch railing, floor, and columns were removed and replaced with new features. Staff finds that the replacement columns match the style and dimensions of the original. With regards to the porch flooring, Staff finds that the replacement material does not conform to the style of the original flooring. As such, Staff recommends the illegally installed porch flooring be removed and replaced with a wood 1x4 tongue and groove flooring material installed perpendicular to the front façade. With regards to the porch railing, Staff finds that the illegally installed side nailed deck railing that is currently on the structure is incompatible with both historic porch railing design and size. As such, Staff recommends that the illegally installed front porch railing be removed and replaced with a porch railing comprised of a two part butt-jointed rail with the top rail set no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows. In looking at the publicly available street view photographs, Staff finds that the front porch does not appear to exceed 3' above grade meaning that a code compliant railing will likely not be required. However, if additional height for the porch railing is required by the Office of Buildings, Staff recommends that the additional height be achieved through a simple plane extension only after the need for additional height has been documented to Staff.

The Applicant has stated their intent to remove the illegally installed railing with no planned replacement. Staff finds that this condition matches the historic character of the existing home and has no concerns with the proposal. As such, Staff finds these recommendations are no longer necessary.

Chimney

From the publicly accessible photographs, Staff has determined that siding was installed over the existing brick chimney. Staff recommends the illegally installed chimney siding be removed.

The Applicant has revised their plans to show the chimney removed entirely, citing conversations with the neighborhood where this was agreed to. However, Staff finds that the Zoning Ordinance requires the retention of the chimney. Further, in reviewing the revised request Staff researched the archival photographs of this property. Those photographs show two chimneys on the property with one on either side of the side roof plane. Staff finds that chimneys are character defining features of a Folk-Victorian cottage such as the subject property and recommends both chimneys be re-installed to match the original style, materials, and dimensions of the original chimneys.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Photographs of all 4 sides of the property shall be submitted so that Staff can confirm the extent of the illegal work which requires a review by the Commission;
2. The illegally installed windows shall be removed and replaced with new unclad wood windows matching the style, shape, and size of the original windows, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b);
3. *Both chimneys shall be re-installed to match the original style, materials, and dimensions of the original chimneys, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(e); and,*
4. *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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 1372 Fairview Rd.
APPLICATION: CA3-20-087 & CA3-20-088
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1917

Property Location: North block face of Fairview Rd., west of the Oakdale Rd. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Exhibits characteristics of Tudor revival architecture.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: contributing/non-contributing status of an accessory structure, alterations, additions, and site work.

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

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

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No **Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-087: Approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-088: Deferral to the August 26, 2020.

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

CA3-20-088

The Applicant has requested a change in the contributing/non-contributing status of an accessory structure. When the District was designated all existing accessory structures, both historic and non-historic, were given the same contributing/non-contributing status as the principal structure they were associated with. This was done due to both the high number of extant original and historic accessory structures as well as the limitations of surveying work which was limited to the public right of way.

For this request, the Applicant has submitted several documents in an effort to establish that the structure is neither original to the site or historic in its own right. The first document is the original Neel Reid site plan for the property, which shows several formal gardens in the rear yard. Of these gardens, one is still extant in the northeast corner of the property. The existing accessory structure sits in the site of the originally proposed garage on the southwest of the rear yard. As such, Staff finds that the accessory structure was not original to the site and was not contemplated as part of the original design for the property. The Applicant has also submitted photographs showing the structure to be of a more contemporary design when compared to the principal structure. Were the Accessory structure original or historic, Staff would expect the design to echo the design of the principal structure but with simpler ornamentation to establish its secondary nature. However, things such as materials, fenestration pattern, roof pitch and shape would draw from the principal structure. In the case of the subject structure, all of these elements differ from the principal structure. Most telling of all, is a chalet style window wall on the north elevation of the subject property which would establish a date of construction within the last 50 years. As such, Staff finds that the structure is not a historic or original feature to the site and has no concerns with the proposal.

CA3-20-088

In general, Staff finds that the design of the proposed structure is appropriate for an addition to a historic structure and that acceptable measures are taken to ensure that the new work differentiates from the original structure. However, Staff has some concerns with the design of certain portions of the structure as it relates to the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

The Fairview Rd. subarea of the Landmark District has a side yard setback requirement of 25'. Portions of the proposed back terrace on the west side of the addition violate this setback. As such, Staff recommends the terrace be re-designed to comply with the 25' side yard setback.

The Applicant is proposing the removal of the existing brick driveway and shows a brick tire strip driveway as its replacement in the same layout. Staff finds that the layout of the existing brick driveway matches the layout of the original driveway shown on the 1917 site plan provided by the Applicant. However, it is unclear whether the extant driveway materials are original to the site. Given that the original site plan did not include a tire strip driveway, Staff does not support this proposed change. Staff recommends the original driveway layout, design, materials, and dimensions be retained. Staff would note that this recommendation will alter the lot coverage ratios and could require revisions to the site plan to accommodate the additional impervious surfaces.

The Applicant also proposes the removal of the existing brick walk. The 1917 site plan and subsequent surveys show the existing brick walkway largely unchanged in layout and size since the construction of the home. As such, Staff finds that it is likely the extant brick is either original or replaced the original brick walkway. The proposed bluestone paver walkway would require the removal of this original site feature. Staff is concerned with the resulting loss in both historic material and character. As such, Staff recommends the brick walkway be retained.

With regards to the windows on the proposed additions, Staff finds that the wood material matches the original and has no concerns with the use of this window type. Staff does recommend, however, that all windows on the proposed addition be true divided lite.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-087: Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-088: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The terrace be re-designed to comply with the 25' side yard setback, per Sec. 16-20B.005(5)(a)(3);
2. The original driveway layout, design, materials, and dimensions be retained, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(b);
3. The brick walkway be retained, per Sec. 16-20B, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(b);
4. All windows on the proposed addition be true divided lite, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(i); and,
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: 1070 Lucile Ave. SW
APPLICATION: CA3-20-187
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: South blockface of Lucile Ave, east of Lawton St., west of Peoples St.

Contributing (Y/N)?: No.

Building Type / Architectural form/style:

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

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 CA3-20-187: Defer.

.

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.

New Construction

The Applicant is proposing constructing a new home at 1070 Lucile Ave. The proposed new construction would be a 2,180 sq. ft. single-story bungalow, mirroring much of what is found in West End. As many elements of new construction are subject to the compatibility rule, the Applicant has provided measurements of 5 similar homes along Lucile Ave. However, there is only one building of like use located on the blockface: 1076 Lucile Ave. As such, this will form the basis for compatibility.

Building Façades

The proposed front façade is setback more than 30' from the curb. Per Sec. 16-20G.006.(2)(b), the minimum setback is determined by the compatibility rule. As 1076 Lucile Ave. has an existing setback of 30', Staff finds the proposed setback to be acceptable. The proposed siding of the façades would be horizontal smooth cementitious siding. As that is permitted via the district regulations, Staff finds the siding to acceptable. The proposed height of the first floor from grade is 22'-7", which matches the compatibility of the neighboring home. As the proposed height does not exceed the existing height established by the compatibility rule, Staff finds the height in question to be acceptable.

Windows and Doors

The proposed new construction would have 2 windows and one door on the front façade, 2 windows and one door on the rear façade, 5 windows on the left façade, and 6 windows on the right façade. The ratio of openings to solid, and the size, scale, proportionality, and location of openings are subject to the compatibility rule. Of the information provided by the Applicant, only the front façade openings to solid ratio can be determined. This ratio is 3:1, which meeting the compatibility of the blockface. As such, Staff recommends that the Applicant provide information showing that the proposed windows and doors are compatible in size, scale, proportionality, and location to the existing homes on the blockface. Additionally, Staff recommends that the Applicant provides information showing the compatibility of the ratio of openings to solid on the side façade.

Foundation

The proposed foundation is to be made of concrete. As such, Staff finds the foundation to be in line with district regulations.

Chimney

The proposed chimney originates at grade and is faced with siding. As siding on chimney's is not permitted, Staff recommends that the chimney be faced with either brick or stucco to meet district regulations.

Roof

The proposed roof is styled as a dutch gable, with a slope of 12/7. The materials proposed is asphalt shingles. As roof shape and pitch is subject to the compatibility rule, the neighboring house contains a box gable roof with a slope of 12/6. After review, Staff finds that the slope of the roof and the style of the roof to be compatible with existing structures on the blockface.

Deck

The proposed deck does not extend past the sides of the proposed structure. As such, Staff finds the deck to be in line with district regulations.

Porch

The proposed porch extends 11' from the front façade and contains 6' decorative posts and railings. As new porches are subject to the compatibility rule, 1076 Lucile has a wooden porch faced with stone and short columns with stone bases. After review, Staff finds that the columns and open space between the ground and the front porch to be incompatible with houses of the blockface. As such, Staff recommends that front porch skirting be added and made of painted concrete block, brick, or stucco. Additionally, Staff recommends that the columns incorporate bases similar in size and proportionality to those found at 1076 Lucile Ave and of matching material to front porch skirting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to the August 26 hearing to address the following:

1. Applicant shall provide detailed information showing the compatibility for the size, scale, proportionality and location of the proposed windows on the side façade.
2. Applicant shall provide detailed information showing the compatibility of the ratio of openings to solid on the side façades.
3. The chimney shall be faced with either brick or stucco.
4. The front porch skirting shall be painted concrete block, brick, or stucco.
5. The front porch columns shall include bases similar in size and proportionality to those found 1076 Lucile Ave and of matching material to the front porch skirting.
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 672 Catherine St.

APPLICATION: Ca3-20-188

MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 19

Property Location:

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition and 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: N/A

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 project before the Commission at this time involves a rear addition to this existing single-family home. In general, Staff finds that the proposed work is consistent with the character of the existing home but has a few concerns with the project. Firstly, Staff recommends that the existing rear corner boards be retained on the side façades of the structure to allow proper differentiation between the new work and the original portions of the home. Secondly, Staff recommends that the new siding on the proposed addition be wood matching the reveal of the original siding. Lastly, Staff recommends that the proposed windows be wood and contain true divided lites.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The existing rear corner boards shall be retained on the side façades of the structure to allow proper differentiation between the new work and the original portions of the home, per Sec. 16-20.009(7);
2. The new siding on the proposed addition shall be wood matching the reveal of the original siding, per Sec 16-20I.006(4)(a)(4);
3. The proposed windows shall be wood and contain true divided lites, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(b)(5); and,
4. 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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 293 Ormond St.
APPLICATION: CA4PH-20-177
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction:

Property Location: South block face of Ormond St., east of the Hill St. intersection, and west of the Grant St. intersection.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: revision to previously approved plans for a second story addition to the rear of the structure.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Façades that do not face the public street.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously reviewed and approved CA3-17-203 & 206 for a variance and rear addition and CA2-18-088 for revisions to previously approved plans. In July of 2019 Staff received notification from neighbors that the structure was being demolished without proper permits and a Stop Work order was issued by the Office of Buildings. The property was then sold to a new owner who is presenting the current application to remedy the demo without permits and apply for the review of a new single family home.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA4PH-20-177: Approval.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-178: Approval with conditions.

CA4PH-20-177

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 states that the property's condition has been reported to them by neighbors. The Applicant also cites the demolished nature of the property and the Stop Work Order for the illegal demolition done by a previous owner. Given that the demolition has already occurred without approval by the Commission, Staff finds that further analysis is moot as the majority of the structure is no longer on site.

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

The Applicant has stated their desire to clean the property and salvage all useable building materials for re-use on a new structure at the site.

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 stated they are aware of the historic designation and the current zoning on the property. They have stated that the zoning pre-dates their ownership of the property.

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 states the property was purchased on 12/27/2019 for \$250,000.00 from CDO Enterprises LLC, with whom the Applicant has no relationship.

(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 stated that this criterion is not applicable to the subject property. Given the structure's demolished state, Staff agrees with this assessment.

(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 states that the current mortgage is \$202,200.00 with an annual debt service of \$18,703.44.

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.

2019	Atlanta \$3,555.35
	County \$1,161.67
2018	Atlanta \$3,472.36
	County \$1,169.41
2017	Atlanta \$2,695.96
	County \$880.16
2016	Atlanta \$3,300.43
	County \$1,083.27
2015	Atlanta \$3,301.43
	County \$1,093.39

2019 Assessment: \$114,800.00

2018 Assessment: \$112,120.00

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 provided an appraisal of the property at \$250,000.00 in as is condition .

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 stated that the property at the time of acquisition and at the time of application is \$250,000.00. Based on the length of time the property has been designated, Staff finds that the criterion asking for fair market value at the time of acquisition is not applicable to the situation.

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 through an LLC.

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. Given the short length of time that the Applicant has owned the property, Staff finds that this criterion is not applicable to the present situation

9. That the property is 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 stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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

The Applicant has stated that the property is not for sale and has not been listed for sale. Per the appraisal, the subject property is only marketable for the land price.

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 has attached an engineer's letter which confirms the level of demolition and the foundation's ability to support a new 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.

The Applicant has provided an estimate of demolition and new construction at approximately \$225,000.00. Staff would note that rehabilitation of the existing structure is not applicable to this situation due to the level of demolition.

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 cites the current value at \$250,000.00 based on the estimates provided for purchase and estimates the cost of new construction at \$745,000.00. Staff would note again the non-applicability of renovations due to the level of demolition.

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 speaks to the condition of the foundation, the only structural element remaining of the historic structure, for re-use.

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 stated the R-5 zoning and historic district zoning would allow for up to a two family structure at this property. As stated before, Staff finds that the level of demolition on the site render rehabilitation moot.

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

The Applicant has responded that economic incentives are not applicable to this situation. While the determination of eligibility for economic incentives are interpreted by the State Historic Preservation Office, the level of demolition could prevent the structure from qualifying for economic incentives.

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

The Applicant has provided photographs of the exterior of the structure.

Comment on Application Materials by the Bureau of Buildings

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

Overall Comments

Based on the pictures and testimony provided, Staff finds that the existing building has been demolished. 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. As the structure was not subjected to the proper review, it is unclear whether there were structural issues with the historic structure which would have necessitated the demolition of the structure over a less intrusive means of addressing the problems. However, given that the work has already rendered the structure to be unsound, Staff finds that reviewing alternatives to the work which has already been completed would be unproductive. Based on the photographs and testimonies provided, Staff finds that the property constitutes an imminent threat to public health and safety.

Given that the appropriate review was not completed on the structure, Staff recommends the Applicant submit an inventory of all historic building materials still on site. Staff further recommends all historic building materials which Staff has determined are feasible for re-use be used on the new structure in their original locations. Lastly, Staff recommends that any new structure match the design of the original with any new space being provided through rear “additions” and dormers on the side roof planes.

CA3-20-178

The applicant is proposing a new single family structure which will match the street facing design of the previously existing single family structure. In general, Staff has no concerns with the proposed street facing façade. Staff would recommend that the Applicant confirm that the pitch of the proposed roof would match the pitch of the previously existing roof. Staff would further recommend the new construction comply with all conditions of CA4PH-20-177.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA4PH-20-177: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit an inventory of all historic building materials still on site;

2. All historic building materials which Staff has determined are feasible for re-use shall be used on the new structure in their original locations;
3. Any new structure shall match the design of the original with any new space being provided through rear “additions” and dormers on the side roof planes; and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-178: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall confirm that the pitch of the proposed roof would match the pitch of the previously existing roof; and,
2. The new construction shall comply with all conditions of CA4PH-20-177.

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: 129 Huntington Road, NE
APPLICATION: RC-18-182
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills

Other Zoning: Conservation

Date of Construction: 1940

Property Location:

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Accessory Dwelling

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20(B)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

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

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

Accessory Dwelling

The Applicant proposes to construct a 573 sq feet accessory dwelling at the rear of the property. The existing garage will be demolished to make way for the accessory dwelling. The proposed accessory dwelling does not exceed the setbacks. Staff is not concerned with the proposed accessory dwelling. The one concern Staff has is whether the garage is historically significant. Staff suggest the Applicant research the garage's history to ensure it is not significant. To loss a structure that is significant would be the opposite of what the District regulation would want. Otherwise, the proposal set forth meets required development as well doesn't destroy the significance of the existing house.

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: 156 Huntington Rd.
APPLICATION: RC-20-189
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1925

Property Location: West blockface of Huntington Rd., south of Palisades Rd., east of Woodcrest Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Cottage

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Additions.

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

Relevant Code Sections:

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-189: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

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

Addition

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition to the primary structure and the addition of two dormers to the existing roof. The proposed addition and dormers would be visible from the public right-of-way. After review, Staff has no issues with the proposed dormers, as they not negatively impact the historical significance of the primary structure. Staff also has no issue with the proposed addition, as it does not exceed the existing width of the existing structure.

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

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 147 Huntington Road, NE
APPLICATION: RC-20-190
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Brookwood Hills **Other Zoning:** Conservation

Date of Construction: 2014

Property Location: East of Woodcrest and West of Palisades Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Pool Installation/Accessory Structure

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec 16-20(B)

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

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

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

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

POOL

The Applicant proposes to install a pool that will sit directly behind the existing structure and will not exceed the side or rear setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

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
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: Adair Park Historic District

APPLICATION: RC-20-207

MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District (Subareas 1&2) **Other Zoning:** Various.

Date of Construction:

Property Location: Adair Park Historic District

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: revisions to HD Zoning Regulations.

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: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

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 project before the Commission at this time is the revisions to the Adair Park Historic District zoning regulations. This project was a joint effort between residents of the Adair Park neighborhood and the Office of Design. The proposed regulatory framework was written by the Staff of the Office of Design with heavy input from the neighborhood. Public engagement was coordinated by the neighborhood residents.

The Adair Park Historic District regulations have not been updated since their inception in 1991. Since that time, both the philosophies regarding historic preservation as well as the regulatory tools used by the Office of Design have changed. While the proposed changes are comprehensive, notable changes include the following:

- Allowing all Type II Certificates to be reviewable by Staff. This will allow the Commission to focus on those projects which have a higher impact on both the historic structures and character of the District.
- A revised compatibility rule which will simplify the measurement method required for various types of projects and improve the design of new construction.
- Custom setbacks for both new construction and accessory structures. This would allow setback variances to be heard by the Commission, eliminating the need for Applicants to apply to multiple boards for the same project.
- Specific and clear architectural requirements which will reduce confusion in the design review process
- Revisions to the Accessory Structure and Accessory Dwelling Unit regulations which will allow a simplified review process and more predictable results.

IN general, Staff finds that the proposed revisions will allow for a simplified design review process, greater flexibility in overall site design, and will ensure that future development aligns more closely with the neighborhood's goals. As such, Staff supports the proposed revisions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File