



# 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](http://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:** 304 Augusta Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-089  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1988

**Property Location:** North blockface of Augusta Ave., east of Hill St., west of Grant St.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** No.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Craftsman

**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. 16-20G

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Deferred from the August 26, 2020 public hearing. *(Updated text in italics)*

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-089: Approve.**

.

**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**

As the Applicant has not submitted any plans for review, Staff recommends deferral to the September 9, 2020 public hearing in order to allow time for accurate plans to be submitted.

*The Applicant has submitted specifications of the replacement materials, along with the proposed areas for change highlighted, in lieu of elevations. Staff finds the submitted document sufficient to detail the scope of work, along with the proposed changes.*

*The Applicant is proposing siding and band board replacement along the front façade, trim and frieze board replacement along the rear façade, soffit and fascia replacement along the side façades, and the replacement of the front porch column wrapping. The primary structure is non-contributing.*

*The proposed front façade siding is hardiplank lap siding and the proposed band board replacement is 1x10 smooth fiber cement board to match the existing. The proposed column wrap is 12” and would not affect the capital. After review, Staff finds the proposed replacement materials to be consistent with and reinforce the architectural character of the existing structure. As the proposed hardiplank siding has an exposure of 7”, Staff finds that this would better match wood siding present on the immediate blockface. As the band board and column wrapping will be done in-kind, Staff has no issues with either proposed work.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve.**

1. Applicant shall provide to scale drawings of the existing conditions and proposed changes.

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 778 Caron  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-209  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1960

**Property Location:** East of Peek Road

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Window replacement and Painted Removal

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20Q.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** On 2/20 a Stop Order was placed on the property for painted masonry. The painted was removed.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

## **WINDOWS**

The Applicant is proposing to replace all the windows on the house. The photos that Applicants provides, and research show original windows were metal on the exterior and have wood framing on the exterior. The District regulations requires original or historic windows or exterior doors that cannot be rehabilitated be replaced with windows that match in light design, function, materials, shape, and size. Staff recommends the Applicant comply to the District Regulations and install windows that meets the regulations.

## **PAINTED MASONRY**

The Applicant paint the masonry which his prohibited. However, the Applicant removed the paint. Staff has no concerns regarding the painted masonry.

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

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.**

1. The replacement window shall be match in light, design, function, material, shape and size to the original window, per Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(c) and
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://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:** 555 Robinson Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-212

**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

**Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1930

**Property Location:** South block face of Robinson Ave., west of the Boulevard SE 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 & Sec. 16-20K

**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 and Sec. 16-20K of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The subject property has sustained fire damage to the front and side façades. The current proposal is to replace all doors, windows, and siding on the front façade. Work is proposed for the side façades, but Staff would note that those façades are not subject to review by the Commission. The enclosed front porch, installed before the designation of the district, is proposed for removal. Staff has no concerns with this proposal, but notes that many of the original front porch features such as columns, railing, and ceiling material are missing. Further, no information showing the proposed front porch replacement features has been provided. Staff recommends plans for the front porch showing the proposed replacement features be provided by the Applicant. Staff further recommends the proposed front porch replacement materials match the original in material and style.

In general, Staff finds that the damage to the original front façade siding does warrant replacement for the entire left side of the front façade. However, Staff finds that replacement of the front façade siding with a cement siding product as proposed would be inconsistent with the architectural character of the existing home. As such, Staff recommends any siding replacement on the front façade be comprised of a horizontal wood lap product matching the style and reveal of the original materials.

With regards to the front door, Staff finds that the existing door is not original to the structure. As information detailing a replacement door material has not been received, Staff recommends any front door be wood with a rectangular lite opening matching the style of the home.

The Applicant has provided photographs of one window on the front façade proposed for replacement. From the photographs provided, Staff does not see evidence that the window is in a condition where replacement is warranted. Staff finds that additional information on the front façade windows is warranted before a final determination as to their treatment can be approved. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide detailed and well lit photographs of each window on the front façade showing their condition. Staff further recommends only those windows which Staff has determined are non-original or require replacement be replaced with the wood windows proposed by the Applicant. Staff further recommends that any window Staff has determined are in a repairable condition be retained and repaired in-kind.

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

1. Plans for the front porch showing the proposed replacement features shall be provided by the Applicant;
2. The proposed front porch replacement materials shall match the original in material and style, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);
4. Any siding replacement on the front façade shall be comprised of a horizontal wood lap product matching the style and reveal of the original materials, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);
5. Any front door shall be wood with a rectangular lite opening matching the style of the home, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);

6. The Applicant shall provide detailed and well lit photographs of each window on the front façade showing their condition, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);
7. Only those windows which Staff has determined are non-original or require replacement shall be replaced with the wood windows proposed by the Applicant, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1);
8. Any window Staff has determined are in a repairable condition shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20K.007(2)(d)(1); and,
9. 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](http://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:** 395 Edgewood Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-220

**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District (Subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** 1946 with additions up to 1962.

**Property Location:** South block face of Auburn Ave west of the Jackson St. intersection.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** 19<sup>th</sup> century commercial/industrial.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations and new signage.

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

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

**Alterations**

The Applicant proposes the replacement of three sets of windows and two sets of existing doors. The Applicant also proposes the installation of compatible windows and doors on secondary façades. Staff has no concerns with the new windows and doors proposed by the Applicant, but finds that additional clarification is needed on the existing windows and doors before approval is given to replace these items. Of particular concern to staff are the two sets of doors being replaced on the front façades. Staff recommends the Applicant provide information detailing whether the doors on the front facade are original or historic for review by Staff. If Staff determines that the front doors are original or historic to the structure and are in repairable condition, Staff recommends the doors be repaired and retained.

Secondly, only one photograph has been provided for window group A. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide photographic documentation of the remaining window in group A.

Lastly, as this project could be seeking historic tax credits for the proposed work, Staff recommends that any alterations from the current proposal required as part of any historic tax credit application be subject to Staff review and approval.

**New signage**

The Applicant has provided information showing the original signage for the building. The current proposal would be to mimic this original signage in material and design. Staff would note that the color and messaging of the signage is not subject to review by the Commission. Staff finds that this approach is appropriate for use on a historic building and would re-establish the historic character of the structure and the streetscape. As such, Staff supports this request.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with the following conditions.

1. The Applicant shall provide information detailing whether the doors on the front facade are original or historic for review by Staff, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
2. If Staff determines that the front doors are original or historic to the structure and are in repairable condition, the doors shall be repaired and retained, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
3. The Applicant shall provide photographic documentation of the remaining window in group A, per Sec. 16-20C.004(1)(b);
4. Any alterations from the current proposal required as part of any historic tax credit application shall be subject to Staff review and approval; and,
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve any 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1043 Metropolitan  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-222  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1930

**Property Location:** West of Elbert and East of Catherine Street

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Deck replacement, patio, retaining walls and steps in rear of the property. Second level of front porch floor replacement.

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

**ALTERATIONS:**

The Applicant proposes the series of alterations and additions to the principal structure.

**Rear**

*Deck, Patio and Step Replacement*

Photos provided show an existing upper wood deck with a concrete patio underneath. The Applicant proposes to remove the existing deck, patio and steps; proposing a new deck, covered patio and steps while utilizing much of the footprint with a reduction. There will be a different orientation for deck, patio and steps. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. The patio deck and patio are using the setback established by the existing deck, patio and steps and will not exceed the corner of the existing principle.

*Retaining Wall Addition*

In the rear of the property the Applicant proposes to expand the existing retaining wall from 230sf to 580 sf concrete retaining wall. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**Front**

*Second Level Porch Floor*

The Applicant proposes to remove and replace the floor and sub floor on the second level of the front porch for waterproofing. The Applicant proposes the new floor to be tile. The District Regulations states that all building materials which upon completion that are visible from the public right-of-way, shall be compatible with those which predominate in the subarea. Staff deems that because the proposal to replace the floor and sub floor is happening on the second level on the front that level will not be visible from street. Otherwise, the District Regulations would require the Applicant's proposed material match which predominate in the subarea. As stated Staff does not think visibility is an issue.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood



# 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](http://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:** 486 Oakland Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-20-224  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East blockface of Oakland Ave., north of Sydney St., south of Glenwood Ave.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Craftsman

**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. 16-20G

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-089: 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**

The Applicant is proposing replacing a window on a public-facing façade. The proposed window would match in size to the existing and have two vertical and horizontal bars per sash.

After review, Staff was unable to determine whether or not the window is historic and original to the house. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide further documentation of the window. If the window is determined to be historic, Staff recommends that the window be maintained and preserved. If the window is determined to not be historic, Staff recommends the new window have two horizontal bars on the bottom sash in order to accurately reflect the style of the existing window.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve with the following conditions:**

1. Applicant shall provide documentation showing whether or not the existing window is historic for Staff to review.
2. If the existing window is historic, it shall be maintained and preserved.
3. If the existing window is not historic, the proposed window shall have two horizontal bars on the bottom sash.
4. Applicant shall provide to scale drawings of the existing conditions and proposed changes.

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1132 St. Louis  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-219  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** East of Briarcliff Road and West of North Highland

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Reduction of rear porch and screened in porch

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-200

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

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

**REAR PORCH**

The Applicant is proposing to screen in a partial porch/deck in the rear of the house that is not visible from the street. And the deck is using the same foot print of the existing deck. In fact, the new proposed deck will be reduced in size and will not extended beyond the sides of the house or violate the any of the setbacks. Staff is not concerned this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

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

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner  
  
Design Studio  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 192 Degree  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-19-224  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1901

**Property Location** East of Dekalb Avenue

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

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

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

A series of work showing on the plans were completed during the City's shutdown due to the pandemic. Such work included: the duplex being converted back to original single-family residence. The porch steps, columns and railings which were non-historic were replaced with period-appropriate designs. A plain extension was added to the existing 30" high railing to bring it up to code. The rear non-historic stairs were replaced, and the existing CMU foundation was repaired. The following site work and addition were completed: The front retaining wall and walk were replaced, a new driveway with pavers were constructed. A new wood fence in the rear of the property was constructed. And an accessory structure with a two-car garage accessory dwelling was built.

This Staff Report will focus on the proposed addition to the rear of the existing structure, two added dormers and various alterations and repairs.

Most importantly, this proposal is seeking the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Preservations Division tax credit program.

## **ADDITION**

With proposed interior renovations, the Applicant proposes two dormers to allow for headroom in the attic for two bathrooms and three bedrooms as well as a playroom. Plans illustrate the dormers will meet the existing roofline and will not exceed it. As the Applicant has indicated the predominate roof form for compatibility is a dormer roof, the proposed dormers will essentially create a hip formation. With the requirement to show the differentiation between old and new required by the tax credit that the Applicant must show, Staff is not bothered with this construction. Staff is not concerned with this dormer's proposal.

### *Windows*

On the dormers, the Applicant proposes side-by-side one over one windows with 5/4x4 and 5/4x6 with top trim with backer band on the house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **ALTERATIONS**

### *Siding*

The Applicant proposes a 5-inch reveal smooth-face cementitious siding on the dormers. On the front the Applicant will match the siding for the demo door to the existing siding. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### *Roof Shingles*

The Applicant proposes asphalt shingles on the dormers. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### *Skylight*

One new skylight is proposed on the top of the roof. Staff is not concerned with this proposal if the skylight is constructed in a manner that comply to the District regulation which requires the installation not be visible from the public-right-away or street and not the bubble skylights.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The skylight shall be installed in a manner that the skylight is not visible from the street and the no bubble style skylight can be installed, per Sec.16-20I.006(1)(x) 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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 864 Rose Circle  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-226  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

**Date of Construction:** 1935

**Property Location:** West of Joseph E. Lowery and East of Lee Street

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Double Deck Construction, Fence Construction, Ornamentation removal and Alteration.

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20G.006

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions.

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

## **DECK**

With the removal of a single deck and an awning due to rotting wood and improper construction at the base, the Applicant proposes a double deck that will sit at the rear of the existing house. The upper deck will be screened and the lower deck will remain open. From the diagram presented by the Applicant this double deck will not exceed the rear or side yard setbacks, nor will the deck extend beyond the sides of the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **FENCE**

The Applicant proposes a 6ft wood privacy fence on the perimeter of property; allowing for a 1feet space on the left side between the chain link fence belonging to the neighbor to the left. Staff is not concerned with the proposal of the actual fence construction. However, the Applicant has indicated a removal of the chain link fence that belongs to the neighbor. This is problematic to Staff. Staff cannot sanction the removal of the neighboring fence. If the Applicant wish to remove the chain link refenced, the Applicant must get permission from the neighbor. The Applicant has verified that there will be no remove of the neighbor's fence. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **SIDING/Ornamentation**

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing siding on the left and right sides of the house and replace the siding with wood shingles. Staff clarified that the shingles under the gables on the sides are asphalt shingles that can be removed. The Applicant proposal for replacement shingles to be wood shingles is fine once the Applicant can demonstrate through photographic evidence that the wood shingles mimics the shingles that were original to the house. If not, the Applicant shall install wood siding that would be permissible to the District Regulations.

## **GENERAL REPAIR**

The Applicant proposes to repoint and repair the mortar on the existing masonry. Photos provided indicates the mortar needs repair. Staff is not concerned with this proposal; such work is considered general repair.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The Applicant shall demonstrate through photographic evidence that the proposed wood shingles mimics the shingles that were original to the house Or the Applicant shall install wood siding that will be permissible to the District Regulations, per Sec. 16-20G.006(2)(d) 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](http://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:** 1070 Lucile Ave. SW  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-187  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 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)?:** Deferred from August 26, 2020 public hearing.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-187: Defer.**

.

CA3-20-187 for 1070 Lucile Ave.

September 9, 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.

**New Construction**

The Applicant is proposing a new construction at 1070 Lucile Ave. As the West End district regulations require compatibility to be based on any contributing structures on the immediate blockface, regardless of use, the Applicant has applied for a variance to base compatibility on the Lawton side of the block. As such, Staff recommends deferral to September 23, 2020 to allow for the variance to be advertised for the required timeframe.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer to September 23 public hearing.**

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 2710 Loghaven  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-202  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District      **Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1955

**Property Location:** East of Chalmers and West of W. Simons Terrace

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Additions and Alterations

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

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20Q.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral to the September 23, 2020 to allow the Applicant to provide updated plans and information.

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

### **COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

### **DOCUMENTATION**

On the site plan the Applicant does not supply the FAR information. Also, the Applicant has not shown the proposed dormer on the site plan. Staff recommend the Applicant update the site plan to include the FAR information as well as the proposed dormer.

### **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes to add 675 square footage to the existing structure to allow for a master suite and laundry room. This addition does not exceed the side setbacks or rear setback and does not go beyond the sides of the house. Staff deems the position of this addition is fine. However, Staff will need to know the FAR information to determine if the addition fits all the underlying requirements for development.

#### *Dormer*

The Applicant proposes what appears to be a decorative dormer. Such dormer installation would be governed by the compatibility standard, which is based on what predominates on the blockface. The Applicant has not provided any information that show a dormer is a predominate feature on other contributing houses on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information showing a dormer or the Applicant remove the dormer and retain the vent which is original to the house.

#### *Deck*

Staff is not concerned with the proposed deck.

### **ALTERATIONS**

#### *Front of the house*

The Applicant has not stated but demonstrates that there will be a significant change to the front of the house. The Applicant is proposing to change the front porch with a gable roof covering to a full porch with a shed roof coverage. This is very problematic to Staff. Changing the front porch will essentially create a different house form. Additionally, the District regulations require original porches be retained. The Applicant has not provided any photos or evidence to demonstrate that a new porch is merited. If a new porch is merited, the replacement roof should be a replica of what is existing to retain the original style of the house. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the original porch and roof form. If the porch is deteriorating, Staff recommends the Applicant provide

photographic evidences show the condition of the porch for replacement. If the porch is deemed acceptable for being removed, Staff recommends the porch mimic the existing porch.

### ***Windows***

As with the porch, the Applicant has not specified the window changes, but they are shown on the plans. The Applicant is proposing three-over- one windows on the front façade. The problem with this proposal is these types of windows are not original to the style of house. The style of windows that are on the existing house are the appropriate windows for this style house and appear to be original. Additionally, the Applicant has not provided any photographic evidences to support the removal of these windows. Staff recommends, the Applicant retain the existing windows and repair in-kin any windows that are existing.

### ***Foundation***

On the plans, the foundation appears to be to brick, however from research the foundation and the front porch floor is concrete. Staff have no evidence that the foundation or front porch is brick. If the Applicant is proposing to change the foundation and front porch floor to brick, Staff finds it problematic. If the concrete foundation is the original material, it shall remain so.

### ***Side Porch***

The proposed work is to install a side porch. Porches are governed by the compatibility standard. However, the Applicant has not provided any comparisons to show that a side porch is predominate feature on the blockface. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence showing other house on the blockface with side porches.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Deferral to the September 23, 2020 to allow the Applicant to provide updated plans and information.

1. The Applicant shall update the site plan to include the FAR information as well as the proposed dormer, per Sec. 16-20Q.001;
2. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information showing a dormer or the Applicant remove the dormer, per Sec. 16-20Q.005(3);
3. The Applicant shall remove the dormer and retain the vent which is original to the house, per Sec.162-20Q.005(3);
- 3 The Applicant shall retain the original porch and roof form, per Sec. 16-20Q.006(10)(a);
- 4 If the porch is deteriorating, the Applicant shall provide photographic evidences showing the condition of the porch for replacement, per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(b);
- 5 If the porch is deemed acceptable for being removed, the porch shall mimic the existing porch, per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(c);
- 6 The Applicant shall retain the existing window and repair-kind any windows that are existing, per Sec.6-20Q.006(2);
- 7 The concrete foundation if original shall be retain, per Sec.16-20Q.006(4);
- 8 The Applicant shall provide photographic evidence demonstrating that a site porch is a dominate feature on the blockface, per Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(d) and
- 9 All final plans and photos shall be reviewed and approved by Staff.

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](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 765 Bonnie Brae  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-211  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** West of Tift Avenue and East of Pearce

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

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Deck removal and 1/3 addition, alteration

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

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

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** No

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

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

## **PLANS**

The Applicant has not provided site plans. Due to the increase in space by 550 sq. a site plan is required. Staff recommends, the Applicant provide a site plan that lists the FAR information on it.

## **ADDITION and ALTERATIONS**

### **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes the removal of an existing deck on the left elevation providing increased space for a master suite and bathroom and hallway leading out to a new deck on the right elevation. The new deck will be located directly behind the principal structure and does not appear to go beyond the side of the house. To allow for the proposed addition, one third of the existing roof will be removed. The proposed roof will continue and tuck under the existing hip roof. The Applicant has provided the height of the existing and proposed elevations. However, the Applicant has not provided the pitch of the roofs. From the plans, it appears the proposed pitch maybe higher than the existing. Staff doesn't know if the discrepancy is due to a drawing error or if the new proposed roof is higher. Staff recommends the Applicant provide the pitch information for better determination of the build out.

#### *Roof material*

Plans show the Applicant proposes to install the same roofing material that is on the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Windows*

On the new addition, the Applicant proposes two wood windows that will match the one-over-one wood windows and trim. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### *Foundation*

The Applicant proposes to install CMU on the new addition. CMU is a permissible material for new foundation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal. While Staff would prefer the Applicant install masonry to match the existing, it is not required.

#### *Siding*

The Applicant has not indicated the proposed siding on the new addition. Staff recommends the Applicant match the proposed siding with the existing to maintain consistency or Staff recommends the Applicant install siding that is predominate in the district to abide by the District Regulations.

## **ALTERATIONS**

#### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes reinstalling reclaimed windows from the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

- 1) The Applicant shall provide a to-scale site plan that includes FAR and setback information, per Sec 16-20I.001;
- 2) The Applicant shall provide the pitch on both existing and proposed roofs per, Sec.16-20I.006(4)(f)(3);
- 3) The siding shall match the existing siding or siding that predominate in the District, per Sec. 16-20I.006(4)(a)(3) and

4) Final plans and photos to be reviewed by Staff for final 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](http://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:** 154 Walker St.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-20-218 & CA2-20-229

**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 2020

---

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Historic Zoning:** Castleberry Hill Landmark District (Subarea 1)

**Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:**

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

**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. 16-20N

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** In 2018, the Commission approved work which included the retention of an extant historic façade and conditioned their approval on the third floor windows meeting the compatibility rule. Staff was alerted in July 2020 of structural issues by the Chief Inspector in the Office of Buildings that have led to the removal of the historic wall section. The current proposal is for the alterations to the original design due to the removal of the historic façade and a variance to allow a window pattern not based on the compatibility rule.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-218:** Denial.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-229:** Approval with conditions.

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

**CA3-20-218 – Variance**

The requested variance is to allow a window pattern that is not based on the compatibility rule. Below is a summary of the Applicant’s responses to the criteria and Staff’s analysis.

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

The Applicant states that due to the property constraints, the unit size that is achievable is diminished therefore requiring a higher price point per unit. Staff finds that this response does not meet the requirements as it does not establish that the conditions on the property are extraordinary or exceptional. The subject property is of average size and shape for the block face in question, which is comprised of industrial structures which have been converted to residential or commercial space.

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

The Applicant states that the neighboring properties are of lesser value than the neighboring properties and due to the ongoing global pandemic, fenestration cues are needed to attract “luxury” buyers. Staff finds that this response does not satisfy the criterion as the Applicant has not shown how compliance with the compatibility rule would incur an unnecessary hardship for the project.

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

The Applicant states that their proforma requires “luxury” fenestration cues to increase curb appeal. Staff finds that this response does not meet the criterion as a hardship has not been established and the Applicant has not demonstrated how the conditions on this

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

The Applicant states that granting of a variance for windows not based on the compatibility rule would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta. Staff disagrees with this statement as the compatibility rule is intended to protect the public good by ensuring that new development conforms to, and does not detract from, to the character of the historic structures on the block.

Staff finds that the Applicant has not satisfied the variance criteria. No hardship has been presented but numerous references have been made to financial considerations, which on their own do not constitute a hardship as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. As such, Staff recommends denial of the variance request.

**CA2-20-229 – Revisions to previously approved plans**

The Applicant is proposing alterations to the previously approved plans as a result of recently discovered structural issues with the extant historic façade. The original plans called for the historic façade to be retained, but the information provided by the Chief Building Inspector in the Office of

Buildings shows that the existing façade is structurally unstable and presents an immediate threat to public health and safety do to its direct connection to the public right of way and proximity to several multi-family and commercial properties. As such, the removal of the wall was granted by Staff so that permitting of the project could proceed while the Commission considered the appropriateness of the request.

The current proposal calls for the removal of the existing wall and the installation of an identical wall using as much original materials as can be salvaged. The new façade would require some slight alterations to the fenestration openings, but Staff finds that the changes are compatible with the character of the historic façade and would otherwise meet the compatibility rule. As such, Staff has no concerns with the proposal. Staff would however, recommend that the project conform with the conditions placed on the project under CA3-18-469.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-20-218:** Denial.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA2-20-229:** Approval with the following conditions:

1. The project shall conform with the conditions placed on the project under CA3-18-469;  
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](http://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:** 135 Sunset Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA4PH-20-086  
**MEETING DATE:** July 29, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Sunset Avenue Historic District      **Other Zoning:** SPI-19 (Subarea 6)

**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. 16-20P

**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. 16-2PC 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 and notes the engineer's assessment that the most cost effective method of addressing the issues is demolition. However, Staff finds that the engineer's report does not speak to the major and imminent threat to public health and safety as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The Applicant also notes an evaluation by the City of Atlanta regarding the home which states the structure is 50% deteriorated. However, Staff would note that this analysis does not remove the requirement for the Applicant to provide independent analysis. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant submit independent analysis and supporting information that a major and imminent threat to public health and safety exists.

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

The Applicant has provided estimates for repairing the existing structure as evidence that repair is unfeasible. However, this criterion speaks to the feasibility of repair and not the financial cost associated. Based on the information provided, Staff finds that repair of the existing structure would be possible.

**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 property was purchased before the historic designation. The Applicant is aware of the historic significance of the district due to the prominent figures in the City's history who lived there while the owner was the occupant of the structure.

**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 owns the property outright. Staff finds that since the property was purchased many years before the District was designated this criterion would not apply to this request.

- (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 states that the subject property does not produce income.

- (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 there is no mortgage or financing on the property.

- 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	\$262.10
2017	\$276.81
2018	\$453.39
2019	\$904.85

2018 Assessed value- \$14,200.00

2019 Assessed value- \$26,800.00

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

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

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

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion. Given the age of the structure and given that the structure was purchased decades before any designation on the property, Staff finds that this criterion does not apply to this 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 by James Marshall.

- 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 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 they have received requests to purchase the lot for \$100,000.00 after demolition of the primary structure. However, the Applicant states that they have not listed the property for sale or engaged an agent to sell the property.

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

No response received.

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

No response received.

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

No response received.

**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.**

Staff has not received information detailing the cost to demolish the structure and build a new structure meeting the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a response to this criterion.

**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 not provided a response to this criterion. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a response to this criterion.

**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 that they are aware of funds available through State and Federal grants but that the home is not "significant." Staff would suggest the Applicant research the various financial incentives available to properties which are located in historic districts and which still retain much of their character.

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

Staff has not received photographs of the interior and exterior of the structure. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographs of the interior and 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 documentation provided by the Applicant, Staff finds that the existing building is in a state of disrepair. 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 not been proven and 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. Further, the materials submitted by the Applicant show that it would be possible to repair the structure without demolition but discounts this possibility for financial reasons. As discussed above, the Applicant has not submitted several of the items required for the issuance of a Type IV Certificate of Appropriateness based on a Threat to Public Health and Safety. Staff finds it appropriate to require the submission of this information before making any recommendation as to the appropriateness of demolishing the structure.

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

1. The Applicant shall provide responses to criteria 1, 10b, 10c, and 12.

cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://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:** 128 Huntington Rd.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-20-221  
**MEETING DATE:** September 9, 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:** Alterations and addition.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior renovations.

**Relevant Code Sections:**

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION RC-20-200:** Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.

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

**Addition**

The Applicant is proposing an addition along the side façade of the primary structure. The addition would require altering the existing second story roof along the front façade. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing the conversion of the rear screened deck to heated space.

The proposed side addition would be visible from the public right-of-way and extends 1'-6" away from the house, with a cedar shake roof material. The addition would have four new windows made of iron, one with 12 light divides and 3 with 6 light divides. The roof alteration would also match the existing pitch. After review, Staff finds that the proposed addition does not compromise the historic character of the house. Additionally, Staff is finds that the roof alteration is compatible with the historic character of the house. Staff does suggest that the proposed windows are proportionate to the existing windows located on the second story left façade and are constructed with wood to match the existing.

As the enclosure of the rear screened deck is not visible from the public right-of-way, Staff has no issues with this.

**Alterations**

The Applicant is proposing alterations to the front façade of the house by extending the front porch and covering it with a new cedar shakes roof. The proposed porch would have iron rails and 8x8 posts. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing replacing the first story window on the front façade with an iron window containing 24 light divides, and adding new trim around the door.

After review, Staff is concerned that the proposed front porch does not reinforce the historic character of the primary structure, as it detracts from the catslide roof, a defining feature of the existing home. Additionally, Staff is concerned that the proposed front window will not match the existing windows on the front façade. Staff suggests that the front porch not be covered and that the existing window on the first story of the front façade be maintained.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Applicant.**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File