

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
January 13, 2014, 5:00 PM**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, January 13, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Mary Pearce
 Susan Besser
 Mike Hathaway
 Danny Anderson
 Rusty Womack
 Jim Roberts
 Jay Sheridan (arrived at 5:07 pm)

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Brad Baumgartner, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Meghan Scholl, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Catherine Powers, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Amy Diaz-Barriga, Building and Neighborhood Services Department
 Kristen Corn, Law Department

Mary Pearce called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM

**Item 1:
Minutes: December 9, 2013**

Ms. Hall noted the minutes for December 9, 2013 were not available for consideration at this time but that they will be available during next month's meeting.

**Item 2:
Election of 2014 Chair and Vice-Chair**

Ms. Pearce motioned to elect a chair and vice chairman.

Mr. Sheridan nominated Susan Besser as Chairman. Mr. Roberts seconded Mr. Sheridan's motion to nominate Susan Besser as Chairman. Ms. Besser is voted Chairman in an unanimous vote of 5-0.

Chair Besser motions to elect a new Vice Chairman.

Mr. Anderson nominated Mary Pearce as Vice Chairman. Mr. Roberts seconded Mr. Anderson's nomination for Mary Pearce as Vice Chair. Ms. Pearce is voted Vice Chair in an unanimous vote of 5-0.

**Item 3:
Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**

No one wished to speak.

**Item 4:
Consideration of Awning/Signage at 400 Main St.; Danny DeLuca, Applicant.**

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of a new awning with business-identifier signage at 400 Main St. to face 4th Avenue North and that staff has determined that the awning/signage does not qualify for administrative review, and as such, staff has forwarded the application onto the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission for review.

Ms. Hall stated that the design and placement of the proposed awning/signage are not entirely consistent with the Guidelines and that staff recommends approval with conditions of the application with the following:

The guidelines recommend that awnings cover only the storefront display windows or transoms and fit within their openings. The proposed awning/signage has not been designed to fit appropriately, as it is a singularly awning designed to span over two separate openings (transom/doors and window) without a break. The rendering also appears to place the proposed signage/awning highly above the openings to nearly meet the window sills of the second story. The Guidelines recommend that signs locations and placement be selected to complement those of neighboring or adjacent buildings. As a condition of approval, the awning must be separated into two separate rectangular awnings that only cover their respective openings (transom/doors and window). The awnings must be situated so as to increase the distance between the top of the awnings and the second-story window sills. The new configuration of the awnings must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA. The proposed material (canvas) and shape (rectangular) of the awning/signage is consistent with the Guidelines.

Mr. DeLuca, representative of the business owner, stated that he is concerned about the logo of the store not being able to fit on the awnings as recommended by staff. Mr. DeLuca stated that he would like to treat the door-to-window as one, especially since it is such a small storefront and that this way, the logo will be able to fit. Mr. DeLuca stated that the height of the exhibited awning is only supposed to be as tall as the existing awning and that the image is slightly distorted by Photoshop.

Ms. Besser asked the public if they had any questions or comments. There was no response from the public.

Ms. Pearce noted the height of the two awnings were allowed originally because of the style. Ms. Pearce recommended other opportunities for signage.

Ms. Hall stated the project could do a projected arm or a sandwich board to complement the storefront and signage.

Ms. Pearce stated that she would support two separate awnings and any more signage could be reviewed with staff.

Mr. Anderson agreed with Ms. Pearce that a hanging arm could be better.

Mr. Roberts suggested that lettering on the actual building would work as well.

Mr. Anderson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL-#2954 for the awning/signage with staff comment's, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously 6-0.

Item 5:

Consideration of Demolition (Secondary Principal) at 134 2nd Ave. N.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the secondary principal structure located at 134 2nd Ave. N. Ms. Hall stated that the structure proposed for demolition is located to the rear of the T-shaped parcel and currently functions as a hair salon and that it is a one-story gable-and-wing frame building.

Ms. Hall mentioned the item appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission at its December 9, 2013 meeting, but the item was deferred by the Historic Zoning Commission for additional information and that the proposal was discussed before the Design Review Committee on December 16, 2013.

Ms. Hall stated that the proposed secondary principal structure demolition is consistent with the Guidelines and that staff recommends approval with conditions of the application. Ms. Hall stated if a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character (loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues), the Guidelines recommend against the removal of historic buildings from historic districts if they retain architectural and historical integrity.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant noted within the application that the structure has been "moved from its original location," that "a 6' room was rebuilt in 1979 on the front of the structure," that "a concrete block foundation was added in 1979," that "the original tin roof was preplaced [sic] with shingles in 1996," and that "the interior has been completely remodeled."

Ms. Hall further stated that the exact date of the construction for the secondary principal structure is unknown, though the owner has approximated that the building was constructed approximately 1930. Ms. Hall stated that the subject building is not listed at all on the U.S.

Department of the Interior/National Park Service National Register documentation on the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District but that its absence from the documentation does not provide substantiate confirmation that the building is not contributory. Ms. Hall further explained that consultation with staff at the Tennessee Historical Commission, however, has confirmed that the relocation of a contributing (or potentially contributing) structure to a new location within a National-Register district constitutes the automatic removal of contributory status from the structure unless all necessary procedures within the National Register regulations are followed. Ms. Hall referenced Exhibit 1 as included within the application packet.

Ms. Hall stated that with no evidence submitted by the Tennessee Historical Commission staff or otherwise to demonstrate that proper procedure was followed to maintain any contributory or potentially contributory status of the subject structure, staff finds that building is non-contributing to the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District, as based on the regulations set forth by the U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service and as relayed to staff by the Tennessee Historical Commission staff. Ms. Hall states that the building must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.

Mr. Greg Gamble stated that he is representing this item with Gary Luffman, who is part of the research team. Mr. Gamble explained Exhibit E, an email from Mr. Gamble to William DePriest, to Exhibit F from Sanborn map. Mr. Gamble stated that he showed the addition that was added to the building when it was originally moved to its current location and also noted a section of the building that had been removed.

Ms. Besser asked the public if they had any questions or comments. There was no response from the public.

Ms. Pearce related a story about two ladies who told her that they did not remember this building at this location as young girls. Ms. Pearce motioned to approve the demolition of the building with staff comments.

Ms. Besser stated that given the evidence from the Tennessee Historical Commission, she agreed with the demolition on the building; however, Ms. Besser suggested relocating the house, allowing someone to move into the home.

Mr. Gamble agreed that relocation was an option.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion to approve the demolition with staff comments.

Ms. Pearce also agreed that relocation is an option, but due to the evidence from the house not contributing to the street scape or the National Registered District, Ms. Pearce stated she felt compliant with the guidelines in recommending the demolition or removal of the building.

Motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

Item 6:

Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 512 Boyd Mill Ave.; John & Marianne Schroer, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of an accessory structure to the rear of the principal structure to replace a historic structure that was recently destroyed by a fallen tree and that a chimney and slab are still present at the site. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee on December 16, 2013 to discuss the proposal.

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the application, as the design of the proposed accessory structure is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall explained that the *Guidelines* recommend that outbuildings be designed simply and utilize forms reflective of the adjacent primary structures. Ms. Hall stated that the structure is proposed to replace one that previously existed on site and to replicate its general scale and architectural features, including a porch at the front façade and storage at the rear (see Exhibit 1) and that the structure is not intended as a true reconstruction of the previous structure. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant did not submit proposed drawings for the rear and right elevations and that a complete set of elevations (with all four sides) must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA.

Ms. Hall stated that the height of the proposed accessory structure (one story) is consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the proposed accessory structure is designed to be smaller than its principal structure.

Ms. Hall stated that the placement and orientation of the proposed accessory structure are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the structure is proposed near the side and rear of the principal structure, recessed over 60' from the property line.

Ms. Hall commented that the proposed total building coverage on the lot is approximately 10%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend a maximum building coverage of 35% in specified residentially-zoned districts.

Ms. Hall stated that the materials of the proposed accessory structure (composite lap siding, stone or brick chimney, 5V metal roofing, wood French doors, wood double-hung windows, cottage style doors for storage area) are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated that Staff recommends the use of a brick chimney so as to remain in keeping with the material of the historic chimney. Ms. Hall further explained that all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension and that window and door specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation.

Kevin Coffey, representative of the applicant, stated that he has elevations in the HZC packets and that they are similar on each side. Mr. Coffey further stated that he has placed it as close to the original footprint as possible.

Ms. Pearce asked what the height was compared to the house.

Mr. Coffey answered that the height is much lower.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL-#2955 for the new construction of the accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2014.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Item 7:

Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 204 Franklin Rd.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new accessory structure at the rear of the property, to be accessed from Old Liberty Pike, and that the structure is proposed to replace an existing prefabricated building.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee on August 19, 2013 to discuss the proposal and due to inconsistencies with Street Standards, the proposal has been modified somewhat from that discussed by the DRC, specifically in relation to the directions the garage doors and proposed porch face, respectively, on the corner lot.

Ms. Hall proposed a recommendation of approval with conditions of the application. Ms. Hall stated that the height (20'-0 1/2") and scale of the proposed outbuilding are not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in height, scale, and proportion, and architectural features with adjacent structures and that new construction should be consistent with the context of the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Hall further stated that the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures should be smaller than their principal buildings. Ms. Hall explained that the height of the principal structure, as provided by the applicant, measures 22'-0 1/2" and stated so as to provide a more clear delineation between the auxiliary relationship of the accessory structure and the house it serves, staff recommends that the proposed accessory structure be lowered in height for consistency with the *Guidelines* before issuance of a COA with revised elevations returning to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA.

Ms. Hall stated that the *Guidelines* recommend that outbuildings be designed simply and utilize forms reflective of the adjacent primary structures. Ms. Hall stated that the front-facing (Franklin Rd.-facing) elevation of the accessory garage does not read as a garage, since, combined with its overall proposed height, it is also proposed to feature a covered entry area/porch to span over half the façade area. Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends the simplification of the proposed accessory garage through the removal of the proposed covered entry area/porch from the front-facing (Franklin Rd.-facing) elevation, for consistency with the *Guidelines*, and revised elevations must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA.

Ms. Hall stated that the placement and orientation of the proposed accessory structure are consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the structure is proposed near the rear of the principal structure, recessed over 60' from the property line, and due to the inability to place a new driveway off Franklin Rd., the garage is proposed to be accessed from Old Liberty Pk.

Ms. Hall stated that the proposed total building coverage on the lot is approximately 18%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend a maximum building coverage of 35% in specified residentially-zoned districts.

Ms. Hall stated the materials of the proposed accessory structure (Hardie lap siding and painted metal roof to match the principal structure, wood double-hung & awning windows) are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated that the proposed windows largely support the profile of the historic windows on the main residence. Ms. Hall explained that all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension and that window and door specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Ms. Hall stated that garage doors must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation.

Mr. Coffey stated the elevations he gave are not 100% correct due to the angle of the garage and stated one issue with the lot was with the proposed two curb cuts for a circle drive. Mr. Coffey mentioned a typical garage door placement turned the garage to face Old Liberty and the property owner will lose some backyard. Mr. Coffey stated that the 8'4" garage roof is not much room, but the roof pitch was lowered. Mr. Coffey assured the staff that they have simple porch columns and the door will not be confused with the main entrance.

Ms. Besser asked if there were any public comment on this issue. No one responded.

Ms. Hall stated that the 5'4" porch has to be at least 6 feet deep and that this may affect pitch of the entry covering.

Mr. Coffey stated it is well under square footage and they could just enclose the addition and add two (2) windows.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he thinks it is an improvement to have a garage facing Old Liberty since otherwise, historically, it will look like two separate homes. Mr. Hathaway suggested adding square footage to the lower level because he is concerned with the height.

Mr. Coffey stated he has 44 square feet to utilize.

Ms. Pearce stated she is concerned with the height as well and that she would rather have a three (3) window shed.

Mr. Coffey stated that he believes the main difference is the height of the garage addition will be much lower than the height of the main house and that the ridge is 2 feet lower.

Ms. Pearce stated that she believes there are several houses on that street that are not as tall.

Mr. Coffey stated that the house behind this home is a single story and that there is not a house on the other side of the proposed property.

Ms. Pearce said that those two facts help the case.

Ms. Besser asked if this matter can be solved now or if it should be brought to the Design Review Meeting.

Mr. Hathaway motioned to defer the proposal to the next Design Review. Ms. Pearce seconded this motion to defer the proposal to the DRC, and the motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Item 8:

Items Approved by the Preservation Planner on Behalf of the Historic Zoning Commission, pursuant to the *Historic District Design Guidelines*

- *Post-and-arm Signage at 320 4th Ave. N.; Gerald Miller, Applicant.*

Ms. Hall explained that if anyone has any questions about the approval she has made, she would be happy to explain the signage.

Item 9:

Other Business

Discussion ensued about a fence has been added to a property on 2nd Avenue South.

Ms. Hall talked about dates for the annual training times.

Mr. Anderson recommended talking about windows.

Item 10:

Adjourn

Mr. Anderson motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:04 PM. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion to adjourn meeting, and the motion passed unanimously (6-0).