

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
February 10, 2014**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, February 10, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Danny Anderson
 Susan Besser
 Mike Hathaway
 Trisha Nesbitt
 Mary Pearce (arrived at 5:08 PM)
 Jim Roberts
 Jay Sheridan

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

Chairwoman Susan Besser called the meeting to order at **5:02 p.m.**

1. Minutes: December 9, 2013

Ms. Besser asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes from the December 9th meeting. Mr. Hathaway made the motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. Anderson seconded this motion. The vote passed unanimously (6-0).

2. Minutes: January 13, 2014

Ms. Besser asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes from the January 13th meeting. Mr. Hathaway moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Anderson seconded this motion. The vote passed unanimously (6-0).

3. Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Open for Franklin citizens to be heard on items not included on this Agenda. As provided by law, the Historic Zoning Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director for administrative consideration, or to schedule the matter for Historic Zoning Commission consideration at a later date.

Ms. Besser asked if there were any questions by the public. There was no response. Ms. Besser continued stating there had been a request by Mr. Crosby, owner of the property at 209 Lewisburg Ave., for item #7 to be discussed before item #4. Mr. Anderson made a motion to move item #7 forward, and John Roberts seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously (6-0).

7. Consideration of Partial Demolition, Alterations, and Additions (Principal) at 209 Lewisburg Ave.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new enclosed addition and screened porch (638 sq. ft.) to the rear of the residence located at 209

Lewisburg Ave. Ms. Hall stated that the house has an older addition (an original 1938 porch that was later enclosed, measuring 182 sq. ft.) as well as a non-historic 1970s addition that measures 176 sq. ft. Ms. Hall added that the commission approved a similar proposal to this application at the October 2013 meeting; the applicant is requesting to alter the proposal in such a way that is considered nearly an alteration to the previously-approved proposal because it is significantly different but it is asking for the same type of alteration.

Ms. Hall noted the Historic Zoning Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of an addition and screened porch onto this residence at its October 13, 2013 meeting. Ms. Hall explained that according to the applicant, determinations by a structural engineer have rendered the existing slabs underneath the areas adjacent to the proposed addition and that the applicant has requested partial demolition and some reassembly of the existing porch structures and that the new addition/porch proposal be considered in lieu of the previously-approved plan. Ms. Hall stated that the proposal requests alterations to the roofline on the original 1938 porch and the 1970s porch, similar to that previously-approved by the HZC.

Ms. Hall continued stating that the proposal is not consistent with the *Guidelines* and that staff recommends denial of the application. Ms. Hall stated that the size of the proposed rear addition is consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend that enclosed additions not exceed 50% of the footprint square footage of the original building (1693 sq. ft.). Ms. Hall stated that the footprint of the proposed addition measures 638 sq. ft., combined with the existing 1970s addition (176 sq. ft.; which is not considered historic and is therefore not contributing to/considered part of the original residence), bringing the rear addition footprint to a total of approximately **48.1%** of the original structure's footprint.

Ms. Hall continued, stating that the placement of the proposed rear addition and screened porch is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated that the tie-in of the proposed addition at the 1938 porch portion does not allow the 1938 portion of the residence to read as a distinctive portion from the proposed contemporary addition to the building and is therefore not compatible with the proportions of the building, as recommended by the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall clarified that the 1938 portion of the structure will be partially demolished.

Ms. Hall noted that the roof shape of the proposed addition is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the proposed partial demolition, partial reassembly, and addition alters the roofline of the 1938 porch area. Ms. Hall stated that with the exception of the roofline of the 1938 porch/enclosed area, the proposed addition is compatible in height (14' -4" +/-) and roof shape with the existing structure (18' -3"). Ms. Hall added that the total building coverage would not be an issue because with all the building coverage on the side the proposal is only about 7.6%.

Ms. Hall stated that staff requests clarification on the proposed foundation cladding material and that as a condition of approval, if approved, the foundation cladding material must consist of a masonry type that is recommended by the *Guidelines* and required by the Zoning Ordinance and that revised elevations notating all materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval. Ms. Hall also noted that if approved, as a condition of approval, the roofing material must be consistent with the roofing material on the existing residence, though standing seam metal roofing is also appropriate for the lower-sloped portions of the roof. Ms. Hall stated that any proposed metal roofing must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Ms. Hall noted that revised elevations notating all materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval. Ms. Hall added as a condition of approval, if issued a COA, all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines* and that window specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation.

Ms. Hall noted that if issued a COA, prior to a building permit, a revised set of elevations notating all approved building materials must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for record.

Ms. Besser asked the applicant to state their name.

Kevin Coffey stated his name and added information regarding the 209 Lewisburg Avenue proposals for partial demolition, alterations, and additions. Mr. Coffey stated that there were two additions added to the back of the principal structure and that a timeline given for reference notes both the 1970s and 1938 additions to the house. Mr. Coffey stated that both additions have lost their original value of what they were supposed to be and that the porch had been modified, which is now a bedroom, and another addition was added and enclosed. Mr. Coffey explained that the previously approved larger addition was not the best solution for the sight but may have been the only solution.

Mr. Coffey stated that the new room frame was to be modified and that the slab foundation under the additions is inadequate with no gravel, footing, or turndown. Ms. Coffey stated that the plans were changed where the screened-in porch was moved to the other side of the house, behind the breakfast room, and to extend the 1938 porch out to accommodate the master bedroom. Ms. Coffey further explained that the back addition was left where it was on the last submission; this causes two gables out the back of the shed door. Mr. Coffey stated they are covering a smaller footprint.

Ms. Besser asked the members if they had any questions regarding the 209 Lewisburg Avenue proposals.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if the entire rear is original.

Mr. Coffey answered, stating that only the left piece of the rear is original. Mr. Coffey noted the timeline shows the covered porch in the middle (enclosed) and the porch added in the 1970s, which was also enclosed.

Ms. Nesbitt stated that she wanted to clarify that the only 1938 portion is original.

Mr. Coffey stated the set back at the edge on the right includes more additions and enclosures and that the 1970s addition is not a historically-modified roof, and also includes a court yard and flat shed roof that does not match the roof from the historic piece of the structure.

Mr. Sheridan asked what part of the proposal was visible to the street.

Mr. Coffey answered that nothing was visible, and that this proposal will actually lessen any visibility, if any.

Ms. Pearce asked how large the structure is in square feet.

Mr. Coffey answered that there is 638 square feet.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #2972 for the partial demolition, alterations, and rear and screened porch additions to the principal structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2014. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding the accordance with *Guidelines*, including an amendment by Ms. Pearce of the previous motion: the windows, roofing materials, and siding detailing in wood should coincide with the *Guidelines* as staff conditions of approval. This amendment was seconded by Mr. Hathaway.

Ms. Besser asked if all were in favor of the motion with amendments. The vote was unanimous (7-0).

4. 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. Ms. Hall stated that the structure is proposed to replace an existing prefabricated building and noted that the applicant appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission with the proposal on January 13, 2014, and the HZC deferred the item to the January 21, 2014 Design Review Committee meeting for additional discussion.

Ms. Hall noted the design of the proposed accessory structure is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines* and that staff recommends approval with conditions of the application. Ms. Hall stated that the height (approx. 19'-10") and scale of the proposed outbuilding are mostly 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 also stated that the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures should be smaller than their principal buildings.

Ms. Hall continued, stating that the height of the principal structure appeared to measure 21'-11 1/2" and that the height of the garage has been lowered by 1 foot to better delineate the auxiliary relationship of the accessory structure and the house it serves. Ms. Hall noted that the accessory structure is situated 11" lower in grade than the principal structure, rendering the perceived difference in height between the structures as approximately 3'-11 1/4". Ms. Hall noted that as a condition of approval, any deviation from the overall height (approx. 19'-10") and finished floor elevation height elevation (difference of 11' between existing principal structure and proposed accessory structure) as submitted by the applicant and approved within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to construction.

Ms. Hall mentioned 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 has been modified from to remove the previously-proposed porch area and that it is now proposed to feature a covered awning structure over paired sliding barn-style doors instead. 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, is 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 Pike.

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 are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines* but that all foundations (including slabs) in residential development must be clad in masonry materials per Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Hall stated that the *Guidelines* recommend that accessory infill structures utilize forms reflective of the adjacent primary structures; as such, Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends that the applicant use a foundation cladding of the same appearance as that of the principal structure and that revised elevations notating all approved building materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Ms. Hall stated that staff requests clarification on the intent for the bracket material and that as a condition of approval, the awning/overhang material must be consistent with that of the overall roofing material and revised elevations notating all approved building materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Ms. Hall stated that the proposed windows largely support the profile of the historic windows on the main residence. Ms. Hall pressed that as a condition of approval, all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines* and stated that window and door (garage and sliding) specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation.

Ms. Hall also stated that any proposed fencing or walls are subject to review for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness but that fencing and walls may qualify for administrative review.

Mr. Coffey began stating that in the previous meeting regarding this proposal, there were two main issues: the height of the structure, and the open porch facing Franklin Road. Mr. Coffey stated that the open porch facing Franklin Road was modified for both issues that were brought up at the Design Review meeting and that the solution to the front was a vestibule and the addition of two barn style doors facing the house. Mr. Coffey stated there may potentially be fencing initiated in the proposal.

Mr. Coffey mentioned the curb cut had been approved by the City and he added a metal roofing. The applicant stated that he lowered the roof by one (1) foot and clarified that the peak of the accommodating roof is three (3) feet lower than the ridge of the main house. Mr. Coffey noted that this was done by clipping the gables. Mr. Coffey mentioned there is an addition of awnings and brackets, which are the same brackets used on the main house.

Ms. Besser asked if any interested citizens had any questions about the proposal. There was no response.

Mr. Hathaway asked if whether the foundation was subservient to issue without requirement.

Mr. Hall stated that the foundation has to be masonry.

Mr. Sheridan added whether the foundation had to be exposed.

Mr. Hathaway stated that the Zoning Ordinance shows that the foundations help show that the structures are not just shoved into the ground, but resting on a foundation. Mr. Hathaway used the example of a fishing house.

Mr. Coffey noted that the foundation could be poured into the ground or placed as blocks for foundation.

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that the foundation material and height must be clarified.

Ms. Nesbitt asked whether it had to be the same height required by the main structure.

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that the foundation can be slab but will not be a required 18 (eighteen) inches because it is an accessory building.

Ms. Pearce mentioned another accessory structure she had seen with the 18 (eighteen) inches of foundation and stated she was hesitant on whether the 18" was a requirement for accessory buildings as well. Ms. Pearce also stated that she disagrees that the roof looks shorter by Mr. Coffey clipping the corners of the peak roof.

Mr. Coffey added that there is more of a difference from the main house now that the roof had been clipped.

Ms. Pearce asked how big the garage was.

Mr. Coffey stated the garage was 955 square feet.

Ms. Pearce asked if there was an upstairs.

Mr. Coffey stated there is an attic.

Mr. Hathaway stated there were adjustments made from the previous meeting regarding 204 Franklin Road.

Ms. Besser asked if the members were ready to take a vote.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #2855 for the new construction of the accessory structure garage with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2014. Mr. Anderson seconded this motion. The vote passed unanimously (7-0).

5. Consideration of New Construction at 206 Franklin Rd.; Ashlyn Hines, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that item #5 had been removed from the agenda due to a request of deferral by the applicant. Ms. Besser noted that the item will be discussed on Tuesday, February 18th at the Design Review Meeting.

6. Consideration of Demolition (Partial Principal, Full Accessory), Addition (Principal), and Alterations (Accessory) at 119 Lewisburg Ave.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Before Ms. Hall stated information regarding the proposal for 119 Lewisburg Avenue, the commission members decided that taking the sub-items of item #6 one at a time was more efficient for consideration and voting. Ms. Hall mentioned that the mentioning of a proposed alteration to the principal structure was not brought to attention until the day of the meeting, resulting in non-consideration at this time.

Ms. Hall continued stating that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a side elevation and rear elevation addition, connected with a proposed covered terrace area, onto the structure located at 119 Lewisburg Ave. Ms. Hall stated that the proposal also includes the removal of existing porches at the rear of the principal structure (partial demolition-principal) as well as the demolition of an entire accessory structure built circa 1936 per Williamson Co. Property Assessor information. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is further requesting alterations to the other accessory structure onsite, which replacement windows and doors, a new door location, and an awning onto the front façade with brackets. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its August 19, 2013 and October 21, 2013 meetings and that the applicant also hosted a site visit of the property as part of the December 16, 2013 Design Review Committee meeting.

Ms. Hall stated that the following portion of the proposal—demolition of the full accessory structure—may not be consistent with the *Guidelines* and that staff recommends deferral of the following portion of

the application. Ms. Hall stated that the demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met:

- a) 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);
- b) If the denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the Historic Zoning Commission (please refer to the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist as provided. The HZC will use this checklist to assist with the review of economic hardship claims);
- c) If the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure of building;
- d) If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

Ms. Hall also noted the following staff comments on this portion of the application in regard to Architectural and Historical Integrity:

The *Guidelines* recommend against the removal of historic buildings from historic districts if they retain architectural and historical integrity. The applicant notes within the application that the "guest house structure at the rear of the property" is proposed for demolition due to "poor condition." According to the Williamson County Property Assessor data, the accessory structure was constructed in approximately 1936, which makes it likely that it was constructed around the same time as the principal structure that it serves. Data prepared for the Department of the Interior/National Park Service and subsequently approved as part of the Lewisburg Avenue National Register Historic District documentation estimate that the accessory structure was built circa 1920 (as well as its principal structure) and notes that it is contributing to the character of the district.

Ms. Hall stated that no photographic documentation or physical description of the property that substantially addresses the relevant issues was submitted by the applicant, as recommended by the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall noted that the applicant hosted a site visit of the property with the Design Review Committee on December 16, 2013, at which the subject accessory structure was viewed. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant has not submitted an assessment report from a structural engineer or architect that addresses the structural integrity of the structure.

Ms. Hall noted that staff has requested copies of any existing documentation from the Building & Neighborhood Services Department indicating any potential public safety and welfare concern at the site and that no such documentation has been supplied to staff.

Ms. Hall noted the applicant has not submitted any forms of the evidential documentation listed on the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist to address this criterion.

Ms. Hall stated that if the accessory structure demolition portion of the application is issued a COA, the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Ms. Besser asked the applicant to state their name.

Kevin Coffey stated his name and added information regarding the 119 Lewisburg Avenue proposals for the consideration of demolition of a full accessory building, an addition, as well as alterations.

Mr. Coffey stated that he needed more documents regarding this structure because it is not habitable but a restoration could be done. Mr. Coffey stated he believed the structure would need to be a complete rebuild because the floors, foundation, and roof framing are not stable. Mr. Coffey stated that the initial budgeting from a contractor would be \$95,000 to allow the structure to be ready for rebuild and added that he had no information regarding the porch on the back, which is also in poor condition. Mr. Coffey also added the ridge in the roof's center is sagging in two middle portions.

Ms. Besser asked if there were any public citizen who wanted to comment on the project; there was no response. Ms. Besser then reminded the members to direct their questions to her as chairwoman.

Mr. Anderson stated he had no questions, but he mentioned he had taken the tour of the structure and saw that it was, in fact, in very poor condition.

Ms. Pearce mentioned she also took the tour in the structure and that it is in rough shape. Ms. Pearce then stated that if it is a contributing structure, it needs to be taken as seriously as any other proposal at the Historic Zoning Commission meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt agreed with Ms. Pearce in that it should be taken seriously and stated that she also had seen that the structure is in poor shape.

Ms. Besser asked whether the demolition of the structure affect the property footprint.

Mr. Coffey answered no and stated that he would not have a problem with deferral, given that the structure is grandfathered in, being one of two accessory structures on the property, and also given that he does not have the proper documentation. Mr. Coffey stated that he does not believe the demolition should affect the footprint of the property.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Ms. Hall how the demolition of this structure would affect the historic register.

Ms. Hall noted that the demolition of the accessory structure would result in it no longer being a non-contributing structure, and that loss of contributing structures affect the ratio of contributing to non-contributing and can render the district to be ineligible as a historic district over time. Ms. Hall stated she will need to record with the Tennessee Historical Commission if the building is approved for demolition.

Ms. Pearce stated she would like to keep the properties eligible for the Register and stated that this magnificent of an addition could render the house non-contributing as well.

Mr. Hathaway moved to defer the demolition of the full accessory structure to next month's meeting on March 10, 2014. Mr. Sheridan seconded this motion. The vote was passed unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Hall then began discussion on the second sub-item on item #6: partial demolition of the principal structure. Ms. Hall stated this portion of the proposal is may not be consistent with the *Guidelines* and

that staff recommends deferral of this portion of the proposal. Ms. Hall then noted that staff does not find that the applicant has submitted sufficient documentation to support the partial principal structure demolition request. Ms. Hall stated that if the partial principal structure demolition portion of the application is issued a COA, the porch area to be demolished must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records prior to issuance of demolition permit. Ms. Hall also noted that if the partial principal demolition portion of the application is issued a COA, the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Ms. Besser stated that they could not allow the consideration of the photographs since the photographs were submitted after the deadline for applications.

Mr. Coffey added information about the porch off of the kitchen, stating that the slab was of different construction and may have started as a porch and later enclosed. Mr. Coffey stated that the roof is flat with existing structure added later and that the bracket detail is different from the rest of the house. Mr. Coffey added more information that helps him believe that this structure proposed for removal was added later to the structure, making it not historical.

Ms. Besser asked if any public citizens had any comments. There was no response.

Mr. Hathaway moved to defer this proposal to next month's meeting due to there not being enough information to make a decision. Ms. Nesbitt seconded the motion.

Mr. Sheridan added that he would like to see photographs along with the proposal.

All were in favor of this motion with amendment of adding photographs and defer the item, and the vote passed unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Hall continued on about sub-item of an addition to the principal structure. Ms. Hall stated that following portion of the proposal is not consistent with the *Guidelines* and that staff recommends denial of the following portion of the application. Ms. Hall stated that the size of the proposed rear addition is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend that enclosed additions not exceed 50% of the footprint square footage of the original building. Ms. Hall stated the applicant has not provided information to break down the square footage calculations to account for additions to the building over time, with the exception of the porches at the rear proposed for demolition (partial demolition-principal), which measure 148 sq. ft. Ms. Hall noted that the footprint of the proposed addition measures 2,431 sq. ft.

Ms. Hall continued, stating that the existing footprint of the building, including the porch area proposed for demolition, is 3,012 sq. ft. and that the proposed footprint square footage of the addition including the porch area proposed for demolition is 2,579 sq. ft., which is approximately 85.6% of the original structure's footprint. Ms. Hall explained that the request addition, calculated with and without the porch area proposed for demolition, exceed the *Guidelines* recommendation by 35.6% and 34.8%, respectively.

Ms. Hall continued that the placement of the proposed rear addition and screened porch is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall noted that while the *Guidelines* recommend the placement of additions onto non-primary elevations, the *Guidelines* also recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building. Ms. Hall stated that it does not readily appear that the proposed right side elevation addition ties into the existing proportions of the building so as to allow those proportions to continue to read as distinctive

forms on the building; the side addition appears to envelop those forms (it is difficult to note without a roof plan).

Ms. Hall noted that the height/roof shape of the proposed addition are not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated that the bulk of the addition is proposed at 22” above grade, a height at which the applicant notes that will allow “new [construction] to match and not go above existing roof line.” Ms. Hall stated that a dormer appears to be proposed on the existing roofline as visible from the right side elevation, which appears to exceed the height of the existing roofline. Ms. Hall explained that the *Guidelines* do not recommend the alteration of original rooflines on main or other visible elevations. Ms. Hall further explained that the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of dormers or other additions to front or highly visible elevations. Ms. Hall stated that the drawings presented by the applicant indicate that both the dormer and the side addition will be visible from the front elevation and that no left side elevation information has been submitted to substantiate adequate review of height and roof shape.

Ms. Hall added that the total building coverage is consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the building coverage proposed by the existing building and the proposed addition, including the garage proposed to remain, is approximately 23.7%. Ms. Hall stated that the building coverage proposed by the existing building and the proposed addition, including the garage proposed to remain AND the accessory structure proposed to be demolished, is approximately 25.8%. Ms. Hall noted that the Williamson County Property Assessor information indicates that the “guest house” accessory structure on the property measures approximately 596 sq. ft.

Ms. Hall added that the materials of the proposed addition (half-timbering, stone, metal roofing at some areas) are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated that if issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the area proposed for metal roofing must utilize a standing seam metal roofing profile, and that any proposed metal roofing must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Ms. Hall explained that revised elevations notating all materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval. Ms. Hall also explained that if issued a COA, as a condition of approval, all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines* and that window specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Ms. Hall further noted that if issued a COA, as a condition of approval, a revised set of elevations that includes the left side elevation (which is not included as part of the application submission) and notes all approved building materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Mr. Coffey stated that there may not be any reason to continue on this portion of the item because the addition of the porch was deferred. Mr. Coffey continued about the doctor who owned this home years ago had an office and patient entrance in the home to explain why the property owners are asking for these proposals. Mr. Coffey stated that the gable in the back becomes a screen porch, which is still intact.

Mr. Coffey added that the heated square footage is only 2,600 sq. ft. and that the upper level of the structure is no adequate living space, as the ceilings are low and the stairs are unstable. Mr. Coffey stated that with the restoration of the front porch, that could head the square footage to be 4,700 sq. ft. and without the demolition, there is no scheme for the decisions of the addition of the porch.

Ms. Besser asked if there was any public comment about this item. There was no response.

Mr. Sheridan asked what they would do with the upper floor area.

Mr. Coffey answered that it would become volume for the rooms that are in the revised scheme. Mr. Coffey stated that the library will be kept with a volume of ceiling where the windows are at the top of the

rooms, that there is a make shift bathroom which is not suitable at the attic portion in the back, and that the roof to the old addition is trying to keep some parts to recognize its historic value.

Ms. Besser stated that she concurs with Ms. Hall's recommendation.

Mr. Coffey added that he did make some changes in the division pattern and windows, and that the pitched metal roof is no longer flat.

Ms. Besser asked whether any commissioners were ready to make a motion.

Ms. Nesbitt stated it was apparent that the entire item needs to be deferred.

Mr. Coffey stated that he could remodel the garage without any alterations to the principle structure.

Mr. Sheridan then asked what the shape of the house was in.

Mr. Coffey answered that the whole house is in rough shape but that there is someone there maintaining the house. Mr. Coffey stated that there were leaks previously discovered, ongoing issues, but they are doing what they can to keep it together.

Mr. Anderson made recognizable that he has represented Mr. Paynes and he is recusing himself from the vote.

Mr. Hathaway agreed with Ms. Nesbitt that the whole item needs to be deferred. Mr. Sheridan seconded Mr. Hathaway's statement.

Ms. Pearce added that she appreciates how much attention this structure is receiving.

Mr. Roberts asked how that determines the structure to be non-contributing.

Discussion is ensued about the guidelines for rehabilitation in the historic district.

Ms. Besser asked if everyone was in favor of the deferral of the entire item to the next Historic Zoning Commission meeting on March 10, 2014. The vote was unanimous (6-0), with Mr. Anderson recusing.

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

a. Awning Replacement (Canvas Only) at 227 Franklin Rd.; Pam Colangelo, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant at 227 Franklin Rd proposed to maintain the existing awning frame on the building but to take the fabric off and add new fabric on without any signage. Ms. Hall noted that if the applicant has any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the plans approved, they must return to the HZC for review and approval.

9. Other Business

a. Recommendation Request for Amendment to the *Historic District Design Guidelines* to adopt Certificate of Appropriateness extension policy.

Ms. Hall stated the purpose of this recommendation request is to address the issues encountered regarding the issues of COA expiration policy. Ms. Hall explained that COAs are valid for one year from the dates

of issuance but that recently, several projects that have come through the City for the planning and development processes must also go through many other review bodies, notably the department reviews with City staff or the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission or the Board of Mayor and Alderman. Ms. Hall noted that it may be difficult for the applicants to achieve the approved work specifications of the COAs within one year's time. Given this, Ms. Hall stated that staff has proposed a new extension policy of two COA extensions to be granted.

Ms. Hall added that the first COA extension may be granted by the Preservation Planner or the Planning & Sustainability Director, upon written request and submittal of one (1) set of plans by the applicant. Ms. Hall stated that if approved, work specifications must not have changed. Ms. Hall explained that a second COA extension may only be granted by the Historic Zoning Commission, if the applicant can show good cause and that an applicant must submit the plans through the regular monthly COA application review process for consideration by the HZC for a second COA extension request. Ms. Hall noted that each COA extension request is for six months and that the two requests shall not be submitted or granted simultaneously. Ms. Hall also stated that the COA extension shall be requested prior to the original expiration date or the expiration of the first extension and that all dates are calculated from the original approval date.

Ms. Hall then noted that if an applicant desires to amend a project's approved work specifications as defined by an approved COA, the amendment must be reviewed as a new COA application by the HZC unless it otherwise qualifies for administrative review.

Other discussion ensued about a potential bylaws amendment on Robert's Rules of Order.

Mr. Anderson asked Ms. Hall about a follow-up on the fence at a 2nd Avenue South home. Ms. Diaz-Barriga added that the fence owner has been given a 30-day notice of violation, which ends February 15, 2014, and the meeting is set for February 13, 2014, at the request of the owner.

Ms. Pearce added that sliding fence gates are not appropriate, but it might work if just one side of the fence gate is fixed; Ms. Pearce noted there is a possibility that there could have been more fencing, which would have made the gate smaller.

10. Adjourn.

Ms. Besser asked members of the Commission if there was a motion to adjourn. Ms. Nesbitt motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Roberts seconded the motion at 6:48 PM. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).