



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 852 Skipper Drive NW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-370
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-3

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Southwest of intersection of Skipper Drive NW and Jones Road NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: N/A

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Contributing home previously on lot was demolished due to fire damage in 2019

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. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, the application was deferred at October 9th, 2024 UDC Hearing to the October 23rd, 2024 Hearing.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral to the November 13th, 2024, UDC Hearing.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20. & Sec. 16-20Q. of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes to build a new structure on the vacant lot at 852 Skipper Drive NW. There had been a previously contributing residence on the lot before it was demolished in 2019 after a fire caused significant damage to it.

Because the previously contributing home was a permitted demolition, the proposed construction can differ from the old. However, when proposing new construction within the Collier Heights Historic District, the Applicant is required to submit a compatibility study to determine whether the proposed construction will be compatible with the contributing buildings within the immediate vicinity of the block face in terms of design, proportion, scale, massing, and general character. Staff have concerns with the existing compatibility study submitted by the Applicant, as some of the information is incorrect, and it appears that the response for each component is based on the underlying zoning rather than actual measurements. Staff recommends that the Applicant revise their compatibility study to include accurate measurements and materials.

As a result of Staff's analysis of the proposed plans and elevations submitted, several discrepancies have been identified which are causing concern. It is observed that the lot proposed for new construction has a grade change that results in an incline that slopes downward from the driveway of the property to the front yard of the adjacent property at 844 Skipper Drive NW. This grade change should be addressed in the Applicant's plans, as the proposed plans do not seem to do so. Furthermore, Staff finds that the proposed two front doors on the new construction are not in kind with the single front doors on the existing contributing homes on the same block face. Staff recommends that the Applicant revise the elevation drawings so that a compatible front door is included. Due to the information missing from the analysis, Staff would support a deferral of the project to allow for the required analysis to occur.

Revisions for October 23rd, 2024 UDC Hearing:

Following receipt of the Staff Report on October 9th, 2024, Staff has not received any further correspondence from the Applicant, nor has Staff received any updated or revised plans that address concerns of the Staff. As such, Staff recommends a second deferral to the November 13th, 2024 UDC Hearing in order to allow the Applicant more time to address the listed items below.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral to the November 13th, 2024, UDC Hearing to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall revise their compatibility study to include accurate measurements and materials;
2. The Applicant shall revise their elevation drawings and site plan to account for the existing grade change on the property's lot; and,
3. The Applicant shall revise their elevation drawings to include a compatible front door.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 837 Metropolitan Parkway SW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-407
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District

Other Zoning: C-1

Date of Construction: 1920

Property Location: West block-face of US Interstate-19 and south of Gillette Avenue SW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Early 20th century Bungalow

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations to front facade and driveway

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20I.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: The Application was originally assigned to be heard at the September 11th, 2024 UDC Hearing. On September 10th, the Applicant let Staff know that they would like to request a deferral to the September 25th, 2024 UDC Hearing. Due to inclement weather, the case was deferred from the September 25th Hearing to the October 23rd UDC Hearing. In order to ensure that the Applicant had a sufficient amount of time to revise their plans, Staff deferred this case to two hearings from September 25th: on October 23rd, 2024. The Applicant last communicated with Staff on September 25th in response to an email that included their Staff Report and recommendation from the September 25th Hearing. Staff has not received any additional correspondence or revised plans from the Applicant since September 25th.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Subject property received a Stop Work Order (23CAP-00000169) in February 2023 for unpermitted work being done.

CA3-24-407 for 837 Metropolitan Parkway SW
October 23, 2024
Page 2 of 4

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Denial without Prejudice.

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

In February 2023, a Stop Work Order (23CAP-00000169) was issued for unpermitted work on the property at 837 Metropolitan Parkway SW.

The Applicant's plans do not accurately depict the house as it appears today. Consequently, Staff believes that one final deferral should be granted to the Applicant in order to bring the plans into compliance. The property's existing conditions are not in compliance, including an unpermitted parking pad located in the front yard, the removal of character-defining architectural elements, such as the front door archway, and the enclosure of an existing front corner porch.

Discrepancies in Plans

As shown in the submitted elevation drawings, the existing gable roof form is not included; instead, a hipped roof form is shown. This is inaccurate and the plans need to be revised in order to show the accurate roof style.

There is a discrepancy in the location of the fenestrations on the façade. Revisions must be made to the plans to ensure that all windows and doors are accurately positioned.

The drawings fail to include the existing porch at the corner of the front façade. The plans should be revised to include the character-defining front corner porch.

The site plan does not accurately depict the location and dimensions of the driveway and walkway, nor does the plan include a proposal to eliminate the unpermitted and noncompliant parking pad. Existing plans must be revised to accurately depict the location and measurements of the driveway and walkway, and proposed plans must include the removal of the non-compliant parking pad. The plans submitted appear to propose increasing the width of the driveway, which is not permitted.

In the plans, the existing historic chimney is missing. This needs to be added and it must be demonstrated that it will remain.

Staff Conclusion

To provide the Applicant with additional time to provide revisions, Staff recommends one final deferral to the October 23rd UDC Hearing. As the existing elevations are not accurate, Staff is unable to review this application as it stands. Since the elevations do not correspond to the actual conditions, it would be unfeasible to make any recommendations on the basis of the submitted elevations.

Revisions for October 23rd UDC Hearing:

Staff has not received any further correspondence from the Applicant, nor has Staff received any updated or revised plans that address concerns of the Staff. As this case has already been deferred several times, Staff finds it appropriate to deny this application without prejudice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial without Prejudice.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

CA3-24-407 for 837 Metropolitan Parkway SW
October 23, 2024
Page 4 of 4

File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 2625 Santa Barbara Drive NW
APPLICATION: CA3-24-458
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: North block face of Santa Barbara Drive NW, west of intersection of Santa Barbara Drive NW and Santa Lucia Terrace NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Enclosure of car port to create an addition, interior renovations, window replacement and siding repair as needed, replacement of roof shingles

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes to enclose an existing carport as a third bedroom for an existing one-story, two-bedroom Minimal Traditional home located in the Collier Heights Historic District. According to the project description on page A.01 of the architectural plan set, the project will also include interior renovations, window replacement, siding repair, and roof shingles replacement as needed.

Firstly, Staff would like to note that the square footage assessment featured on page A.01 is inaccurate. Based on the measurements listed on the Fulton County Tax Assessors website, the home has an existing square footage of 920 square feet. By enclosing the car port, 180 square feet would be added to the total square footage. To reflect these changes, the square footage assessment on page A.01 as well as the analysis of floor area ratio and lot coverage on page AS1-02 in the plan set should be revised.

Additional work proposed by the Applicant includes window, siding, and roof shingles replacement as needed. Staff recommends the Applicant submit photographs of each window on the home, as well as photographs of each of the four facades of the home that demonstrate the current state of the siding and roof. Research of photographs accompanying the sale of the property indicates that the windows and siding appear to be in sufficient condition, such that they could be restored rather than replaced.

The elevations on page A.03b of the plans do not depict the existing window pattern, storm door, and awnings. Furthermore, the existing front elevation incorrectly depicts the double-hung window on the right side of the facade as a single-pane window since its lower half appears to be boarded up. This should be revised to include the accurate window type. A double-hung window should be installed on the enclosed car port to match the existing front facade windows.

Furthermore, the elevations do not indicate that asphalt shingles or exterior siding will be replaced. The Applicant shall indicate in their plans whether roof shingles are to be replaced in-kind as needed, and which portions of exterior siding need to be replaced. To ensure compliance with district code, the Applicant shall submit material specifications for replacement asphalt shingles, replacement windows, and replacement siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall revise the square footage assessment on page A.01, as well as the floor area ratio and lot coverage analysis on page AS1-02 in order to ensure accuracy.
2. The Applicant shall provide photographs of each window on the home, as well as photographs of each of the four facades on the home that demonstrate the state of degradation of the siding, roof, and windows.
3. The elevation drawings shall be revised to portray the correct existing window patterns, storm door, and window awnings.
4. The front façade elevation drawing shall be revised to depict that the enclosed carport's windows will match the existing windows on the house.
5. The Applicant shall indicate in their plans whether roof shingles are to be replaced in-kind as needed, and which portions of exterior siding need to be replaced.
6. The Applicant shall submit material specifications for replacement asphalt shingles, replacement windows, and replacement siding.
7. The Applicant shall submit revised architectural plan set to HP Studio Staff for final approval.

CA3-24-458 for 2625 Santa Barbara Drive NW
October 23, 2024
Page 3 of 3

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 501 Edgewood
APPLICATION: CA3-24-460
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Martin Luther King, Jr. Landmark District **Other Zoning:** Subarea 4

Date of Construction: originally 1968

Property Location: Intersection of Edgewood and Daniel Streets

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Commercial Building

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: Sec.16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: No, none known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval

ADDITION

Height and Massing

The Applicant proposes a three-story addition (Building B) for the existing commercial building (Building A) that will be resident dwellings. The addition will sit over the existing building at a total height of 50 feet with the parapet of 53.8 This does not exceed the required 55 feet required height.

Since the addition will be erected over the existing building, massing is of no concern for Staff.

Windows

The proposed windows are wood clad and glass storefront, operable muntins and double hung, Staff are not concerned with this proposal, the comparable buildings demonstrate the same style and material.

Building Material

The proposed building material is brick. Staff are not concerned with the proposed material.

Architectural Details

The Applicant proposes the railings be metal with brick headers. Once again this is consistent with the other comparable buildings.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 408 Woodward Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA3-24-462
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Grant Park Historic District, Subarea 2

Other Zoning: RG4, SPI-22 SA4

Date of Construction: n/a

Property Location: Southwest corner of Woodward and Oakland Avenues SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a

Building Type / Architectural form/style: New Construction

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. 16-20K

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Yes, U-23-33, V-23-161

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

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

The Applicant proposes new construction of a church and office building on the vacant lot. In reviewing the proposed site plan Staff has concerns regarding the proposed setbacks. The special use permit was not tied to a site plan. The current proposed site plan for new construction does not meet the requirements of the zoning code. Since the special use permit approval allows for a non-residential use, Sec. 16-20K.008 (4)(a)(1) outlines the setback requirements as, “The front yard setback shall not be less than five feet nor greater than 15 feet. Other setbacks shall be regulated by the applicable commercial district regulations.” Based on these requirements the front yard setback (along the frontage along Oakland Avenue SE) cannot exceed 15 feet. Currently the proposed front yard setback is proposed as 19.12 feet. The half-depth front yard setback proposed along Woodward Avenue SE is 8.63 feet. Staff does not have any concerns with the proposed side yard setback of 7.67 feet, which is greater than the minimum 3-foot requirement. Staff is also not concerned with the proposed rear yard setback of 30 feet which also meets the requirement of the zoning code. The Applicant shall revise the proposed front yard setback along Oakland Avenue SE to not exceed 15 feet to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.008 (4)(a)(1). The Applicant shall revise the proposed half depth front yard setback along Woodward Avenue SE to not exceed 7.5 feet to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.008 (4)(a)(1).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the Following Conditions:

- 1.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed front yard setback along Oakland Avenue SE to not exceed 15 feet to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.008 (4)(a)(1).
- 2.) The Applicant shall revise the proposed half depth front yard setback along Woodward Avenue SE to not exceed 7.5 feet to meet the requirements of Sec. 16-20K.008 (4)(a)(1).
- 3.) Staff shall review, and if appropriate, issue final approval of the plans.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Interim Director, Office of Design

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 896 Marion Avenue SE
APPLICATION: CA4PH-24-434
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: 1922

Property Location: Southeast of intersection of Marion Avenue SE and Atlanta Avenue SE

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Minimal Traditional Craftsman

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition due to a threat to public health and safety

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

Relevant Code Sections: Section 16-20. & Sec. 16-20K.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: Yes, Application was deferred during the October 9th UDC Hearing to the October 23rd UDC Hearing. Following the October 9th hearing, the Applicant had a meeting with Staff to discuss alternative options, as well as request a deferral to the November 13th UDC Hearing. Staff found a deferral to the next UDC Hearing date to be appropriate, in order to give the Applicant sufficient time to find an architect who specializes in historic preservation.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Deferral to the November 13th, 2024 UDC Hearing.

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

CA4PH-24-434

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 provides a photographic report along with analysis from licensed professionals documenting the condition of the structure and site. See *Attachment 1*, *Attachment 3*, and *Attachment 4*.

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

The Applicant states that there are no reasonable alternatives for rectifying the threat, and did not submit an analysis of alternatives. The Applicant states that it is not feasible to renovate the house based on existing conditions and points to an analysis provided by the project architect as evidence of the infeasibility of any alternative to demolition.

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 states that the owners were aware that the home is in a historic district at the time of purchase.

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 June 21, 2024, for \$295,000 from the previous owner, Ashley Ann Garland. The Applicant states that there was no relationship between them and the seller other than the purchase of the property. The Applicant included all additional information regarding the purchase of the home in *Attachment 2*.

(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, to their knowledge, there has been no annual gross or net income from the property in the last 3 years. The Applicant states that operating and maintenance expenses are unknown, and depreciation is unknown as well.

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

The Applicant has stated there is no remaining balance on any mortgage for 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.

The Applicant has provided city and county tax history for the past 4 years (*see Attachment 6*) and has provided valuations from tax years 2022, 2023, and 2024.

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 states there have been no appraisals obtained within the previous 2 years in connection with the purchase, financing or ownership of the property.

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 states that the fair market value of the property is currently \$330,000. Given that this property was part of the original District designation in 1999, Staff finds that the criterion requiring the value of the property prior to its designation is not applicable.

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 states that the property is privately owned by Mark Vickers and Sophia Yun with the intended use as a primary residence.

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

The Applicant states there have been no tax returns on or relating to the property for the past two years.

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:

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

The Applicant has not stated whether a real estate professional has been secured by the project team. However, given that the stated intent of the Applicant is to use the site as their primary residence, Staff finds it unlikely that a real estate professional would have been secured. However, Staff recommends the Applicant confirm whether or not a real estate professional has been secured.

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

The Applicant states they are not selling or renting the property.

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

While the Applicant has stated they are not selling the property, they do state that the property is able to be sold for lot value since the home is uninhabitable.

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 provided reports from their structural engineer and architect, see *Attachment 3 – Structural Engineer Assessment* and *Attachment 4 – Architect Assessment*. Staff would note that the engineer assessment states that the assessment was “visual only and limited to the exposed portions of the structure.” Staff recommends that the Applicant provide a more comprehensive engineer’s analysis that includes an inspection of the interior of the structure, the crawlspace, and the existing foundation in greater detail. Staff recommends that the Applicant obtain an analysis of structural soundness and suitability for rehabilitation from a third-party architect who is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans.

- 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 the cost for demolition and new construction at \$420,000, and states that additional costs are unknown, see *Attachment 5*. A thorough cost analysis and estimate for the proposed restoration and rehabilitation of the property was not received. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide a valuation of the total restoration costs for the property to facilitate a fair comparison of all alternative options.

- 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 states that the value of the property in the current condition is \$300,00, the estimated market value of the property after demolition is \$300,000, and the estimated market value after construction of the new structure would be \$720,000. No estimate of the market value after renovation of the existing property for continued use was received. Staff recommends that the Applicant provide an estimated market value after the structure has been renovated in the manner considered under criterion 10(a).

- 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 has submitted a statement from their architect, see *Attachment 4*. The Applicant’s architect assessment summarizes, “*the house was poorly sited and cheaply built from day one... Almost every single component and every system will require extensive repair, modification, or replacement. It is my opinion the house should be demolished.*” Staff recommends that the Applicant obtain an analysis of structural soundness and suitability for rehabilitation from a third-party architect who specializes in historic preservation and is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans.

- 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 states that, due to the hazardous condition of the foundation and the undersized floor system, any new construction around, above, or below the existing building would be inadvisable.

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

The Applicant states that there are currently no economic incentives and/or funding available to the Applicant through federal, state, city, or private programs. However, due to the structure's location in the Grant Park National Register Historic District, it is possible that renovation and rehabilitation of the structure and site would qualify for the 20% tax credit managed by the State Historic Preservation Officer and the National Park Service. Staff recommends the Applicant provide an analysis of any funding, tax credits, or grants that the subject property may qualify for due to its location within the Grant Park National Register Historic District.

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

The Applicant has provided photographs and a narrative depicting the existing conditions, see *Attachment I*.

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

Staff agrees that the property appears to have wood rot, termite damage, and water damage, as well as other structural defects. Staff finds, however, that most of the structural damage to the home is consistent with what is expected of a century-old house after many years of use. Further from the photographs provided, it is unclear whether these issues have affected every part of the structure or if they are located only on certain parts of the structure. Additionally, the use of non-historic materials and alterations in a structure's past are not uncommon conditions for structures in Atlanta's historic and landmark districts, and that the majority of structures weather such past treatment well.

In keeping with past interpretations made by the Commission, Staff finds that a structure that is a major and imminent threat to public health and safety would be a structure that is deteriorated to the point where it could collapse and harm someone on the public Right of Way. While the subject property is clearly in a state of disrepair, Staff does not find evidence in the submitted materials that the structure is in a state where collapse is imminent and could harm someone on the public Right of Way. As such, Staff cannot support the project in its current submitted form. However, due to the information missing from the analysis, Staff would support a deferral of the project to allow for the required analysis to occur.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the November 13th, 2024 UDC Hearing to allow the Applicant time to address the following:

1. The Applicant shall confirm whether or not a real estate professional has been secured;
2. The Applicant shall provide a more comprehensive engineer's analysis that includes an inspection of the interior of the structure, the crawlspace, and the existing foundation in greater detail;
3. ~~The Applicant shall obtain an analysis of structural soundness and suitability for rehabilitation from a third-party architect who is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans;~~
Condition was removed at October 9th, 2024, UDC Hearing.
4. The Applicant shall provide a valuation of the total restoration costs for the property to facilitate a fair comparison of all alternative options;
5. The Applicant shall provide an estimated market value after the structure has been renovated in the manner considered under criterion 10(a);
6. The Applicant shall **obtain a financial analysis determining the** ~~of structural soundness and suitability~~ **feasibility for rehabilitation and restoration** from a third-party architect who specializes in historic preservation and is not directly involved in the proposed new construction plans; **Condition was revised at October 9th, 2024, UDC Hearing.**
7. The Applicant shall provide an analysis of any funding, tax credits, or grants that the subject property may qualify for due to its location within the Grant Park National Register Historic District.; and,
8. All updated plans and materials shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

JAHNEE PRICE
Commissioner

ANDRE DICKENS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matt Adams, Interim Executive Director
ADDRESS: 278 Hamilton E. Holmes Drive NW
APPLICATION: CA4PH-24-471
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: 1955

Property Location: East side of Hamilton E. Holmes Drive NW

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Compact Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Demolition due to a Threat to Public Health and Safety

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: n/a

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: n/a

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial

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

The Applicant proposes demolition of the contributing structure due a threat to public health and safety. During the pre-hearing assessment of application materials required by Section 16-20.008(d)(3)(a), which states that the Executive Director is required “to notify the applicant of any deficiencies in the documentation or other evidence provided. Failure of the applicant to submit said required documentation and/or evidence shall be construed as a failure on the part of the applicant to meet the standard for which the documentation and/or evidence is lacking.” The pre-assessment notification was sent to the Applicant on October 7, 2024. As such, Staff has determined that items were submitted for each of the criteria.

When the materials were evaluated by Staff, though information was submitted for each of the required criteria, Staff found the materials for Criteria 1, 2, 3bii, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11 to not have been adequately addressed. The photographs provided for Criteria 12 were also very low quality, however, Staff obtained sufficient photographs during a site visit and those have been included in the materials submitted to the Commission. Staff reached out to the Applicant on October 1, 2024, to request additional information and received no response.

Staff finds that the responses given show a lack of understanding regarding the requirements of the process for demolition. The Applicant has not considered any alternatives to demolition, all of their responses are solely in regards to their desire for that outcome. Of particular concern are the following:

- In regard to Criteria 1 and 10, the structural engineering report completed by Mr. Mohamed Said Mahmoud, states that there are attachments to his report (which were not included). Given the very vague description in this assessment, it seems that all the conclusions were drawn from just looking at photos, and these attachments may contain a more thorough assessment of actual structural issues. The description in the letter is almost comically short, and reveals virtually no details of the assessment, or photos keyed to the structural engineer’s report. Staff requires a full engineering report that is detailed in the information as to specifics of the structure, including photos and documentation completed by an independent party.
- In regard to Criteria 2 and 3, an estimate was provided by the same contractor who was hired to complete the demolition for new construction. This is an issue, as this is a conflict of interest, where an independent estimate for repairs was never considered and does not directly address the criteria, which states “present all reasonable alternatives to rectifying the threat”. This appears to be an estimate for new construction, not rehabilitation. It is virtually impossible to tell as there is no itemized estimate, only a single number quoted of \$278, 801. The application clearly states an estimate is needed for rehabilitation, not new construction. The description cannot be verified as an accurate representation of repairs, because it is assuming all new materials, including grading of the lot. Further, what plans for new construction is this estimate based on? For example, Staff notes items in the description which would not be allowed by the zoning code (for example slab on grade

construction. This estimate needs to be completely revised to include only rehabilitation, not new construction. This estimate must include a detailed accounting of the repairs, ensuring that the proposed repairs meet the requirements of the zoning code.

- Multiple criteria address that the parcel that 278 Hamilton E. Holmes Drive NW has been consolidated with the adjacent church property (286 Hamilton E. Homes Drive NW). The application materials state that a consolidation was completed in February 2024. Staff finds no record of any such consolidation under 286 (the church address) or 278 (the house address) in our system. Staff has confirmed with the Office of Zoning and Development that no application was ever filed to undertake this action. Therefore, any statements in the responses, which claim that there are limitations on the use or sale of the property are irrelevant. The church property (286) and the ranch house property (278) are legally two separate parcels, though they are contiguous and owned by the same entity. This is of major concern for Criteria 9 regarding the sale of the property. The Applicant acquired the property knowing it was in a historic district with restrictions on demolition and has continued to allow the property to decline. While the application materials state that approximately \$3,000 has been spent on maintenance of the property, including tarping of the roof, enclosure of the structure, and clearing of vegetation, Staff sees no evidence of this. The only tarps visible on the roof to prevent further water damage are in October 2019, two years prior to the Applicant's acquisition of the property. While the grass has been mown, overgrowth was not visible on the property until after the Applicant's acquisition in 2021. No new boards have been installed to secure the property, and it appears that demolition by neglect was the goal with maintenance declining since the Applicant's acquisition. Consolidation is not the impediment to the sale of the property or acquisition of alternative funding for its restoration. Demolition of property for open space is strictly prohibited by code, and the Applicant's acquisition for this purpose will not be permitted.

Staff find that the case presented lacks the detailed attention or documentation of appropriate procedures to fulfill the required criteria. The non-profit status of the Applicant and supposed consolidation of the properties is the only information on which the demolition is based. Demolition for open space is not permitted by the zoning code. Ignorance of this fact does not exempt the Applicant from the requirement to appropriately address the required criteria for a demolition to a threat to public health and safety, and explore the possibility of restoring the property, not new construction, using the zoning code as a guide, or exploring the sale of the property so another party seeking to restore the structure can do so. As such, Staff recommends denial of the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 663 Waterford (Jennie Drake Park)
APPLICATION: RC-24-463
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: West of Shorter Terrace and East of Old know road and Waterford crossing.
And Waterford.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Playground site improvements.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Comments delivered and adopted at the Urban Design Commission.

Proposal

The Applicant proposes to upgrade the park's playground by installation of steppingstones at the entry; installation of 38-inch handrail bioswale; installation of a rain garden and site drainage. Staff

RC-24-463 for 663 Waterford
October 23, 2024
Page 2 of 2

understand improvements as these are vital for the longevity of the park. Staff is not concerned with the proposals.

Staff support the improvements.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Comments delivered and adopted at the Urban Design Commission.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 0 18th Street NW (1345 Piedmont Avenue NE, Piedmont Park)
APPLICATION: RC-24-464
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A

Other Zoning: R-4

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Located directly east of intersection of Piedmont Avenue NE and 14th Street NE

Contributing (Y/N)?: No

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Public city park

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Installation of Vietnam War Memorial

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 6-4043.

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 6-4043. of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta.

This project proposal is for the installation of a permanent memorial plaza dedicated to Vietnam War veterans. The memorial will consist of a paved plaza with memorial plaques recognizing those who served in that conflict and will also include some historical information about their service and sacrifice during that period.

Consisting of a pentagon shape, the memorial will have 35 feet of length and 17 feet of height on each side. The pathway leading up to the memorial will be constructed from greystone bricks. The interior of the memorial will be composed of brick pavers, stained and dyed concrete, stone pavers, granite, and cast bronze. A large bronze star will be inscribed with medallion emblems of various branches of the military, as well as the statements "SONS OF ATLANTA WAR MEMORIAL" and "FREEDOM IS NOT FREE."

As a whole, Staff has no concerns about the proposed project. Staff encourages the use of memorial spaces to educate the public about significant historical events and lost lives. Staff believes that this would be an excellent addition to an already thriving city park.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

Cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 100 Bagley
APPLICATION: RC-24-475
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2024

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: East of Pharr Road

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Installation of a baseball field

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: None known.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS: Comments delivered and adopted at the Urban Design Commission.

Proposal

RC-24-475 for 100 Bagley
October 23, 2024
Page 2 of 2

The Applicant proposes take a grass area and convert it into a baseball field with artificial turf. The turf is designed not to increase the existing runoff. The outfalls will remain in place. Staff

Staff support the baseball field and any improvements necessary to maintain it.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Comments delivered and adopted at the Urban Design Commission.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

ANDRE DICKENS
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

Jahnee Prince
Commissioner

DOUG YOUNG
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Matthew Adams, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 822 Oakdale Rd.
APPLICATION: CA2-24-454
MEETING DATE: *October 23, 2024*

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Date of Construction: DOC

Property Location: West block face of Oakdale Road, between the Ponce De Leon Ave. intersection and the City Limits.

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

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Revision to previously approved plans.

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

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** *Yes. Deferred by the Applicant's request at the October 9, 2024 Hearing. Updated text in italic font*

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

At the October 23, 2019 public hearing, the Commission reviewed and approved CA2-19-459 which included alterations to the front landscaping. At the October 14, 2020, hearing, the Commission reviewed CA3-20-255, which included the installation of a pool, accessory building, and the review of unpermitted/unreviewed work to the front façade and unpermitted/unreviewed work in the front yard. The Commission placed several conditions on their approval of CA3-20-255, which were shown on the final plans approved by the Office of Design. However, the required corrective work was never completed. The Applicant has provided new information for the Commission to consider in relation to the front door and the front patio area.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

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.

Summary of issues on the site

The following issues noted in the Staff Report for CA3-20-225 are still present on the site based on the photographs provided by the Applicant and inspections made by the Office of Building Zoning Enforcement team:

- The front façade still includes a non-compliant French Door in place of the door and sidelites which the Commission required to be installed per CA3-20-225;
- The front stoop still contains the non-compliant brick patio extensions which the Commission required to be removed per CA3-20-225.

Per the Druid Hills Landmark District regulations, work in the Druid Hills Landmark District must conform to the following requirements which Staff finds are applicable to this project:

Sec. 16-20B.003. General regulations.

The following general regulations shall apply to the entire district which includes the following subareas: (1) the Ponce de Leon Corridor; (2) Fairview Road; (3) Springdale Road/Oakdale Road/Lullwater Road/Lullwater Parkway and (4) Emory University. Any proposed development, new construction, addition, alteration, or demolition shall require a certificate of appropriateness as noted below and shall conform to the following regulations:

- (1) *General standards.* In the Druid Hills Landmark District, the Commission shall apply the following general standards only if the standards set forth elsewhere in this chapter 20B do not specifically address the application:
 - (b) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 - (c) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes shall not be undertaken that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties.
 - (i) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Front Door

As shown in the Druid Hills Landmark District photographic inventory sheets for this property, the original structure originally had a Colonial Style 6 panel door, flanked by sidelights, and capped with a transom and broken pediment. The current proposal includes steel double doors with wood double doors behind them. In their review of the unpermitted alterations to the structure under CA3-20-225, the Commission found that the removal of the Colonial Style side lites and 6 panel door were inconsistent with the historic character of the property. Staff has not received information showing that the structure originally contained double doors in the configuration proposed by the Applicant. As such, Staff cannot support the request as currently proposed.

Brick Patio

Regarding the brick patio extensions, no change is proposed to their configuration. However, Staff finds that their retention is in violation of the Commission's previous approval of CA2 19459 and CA3-20-225, and that

CA2-24-454 for 822 Oakdale Rd.

October 23, 2024

Page 3 of 3

new work cannot be considered with the violations still in place. This feature was originally proposed under CA3-19-459, and was denied by the Commission at that time. After the Commission required its removal from the plans, the patio extensions were installed on the site. In their review of both CA3-19-459 and CA3-20-225, the Commission found that the property contained a simple brick stoop without patio extensions. This is verified by the photographs contained in the Druid Hills Landmark District photographic inventory and the surveys provided for review under CA2-19-459. Publicly available Streetview photography also shows the brick patio as a non-original feature which was installed between 2019 and 2020. Further, in their review of both CA2-19-459 and CA3-20-225, the Commission found that the brick patio extensions were inconsistent with the historic spatial relationships that characterized the front of the structure and the front yard of the site. Staff has not received information showing that the structure originally contained a brick patio in the configuration proposed by the Applicant. As such, Staff cannot support the request as currently proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

Cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File

Attachments: Druid Hills Landmark District Inventory Photographs
Office of Buildings Zoning Enforcement Inspection Photographs
Streetview Photographs from 2016 to 2021
Survey provided for CA2-19-459
Approved plan set for CA3-20-225