

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
April 14, 2014**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, April 14, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Trisha Nesbitt  
Mike Hathaway  
Rusty Womack  
Susan Besser  
Mary Pearce  
Jim Roberts  
Jay Sheridan

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department  
Meghan Scholl, Planning & Sustainability Department  
Kristen Corn, Law Department  
Shanna McCoy, Building & Neighborhood Services  
Vernon Gerth, Administration Department

Chairwoman Besser called to order the Historic Zoning Commission at 5:02pm.

Chairwoman Besser started the meeting by thanking Mr. Danny Anderson for being a Historic Zoning Commissioner.

Mayor Ken Moore thanked the commission for giving him the opportunity to make a few words for Mr. Anderson. Mayor Moore requested Mr. Anderson and Mr. Stuckey come forward; Mayor Moore stated that Mr. Anderson has always been a great leader and has always given back to the community, that he has been an important individual in keeping Franklin a great place and has enhanced Franklin as historic.

Mayor Moore, Mr. Stuckey, and Mr. Anderson took a photo together, before Mr. Anderson accepted a gift from the City.

Mr. Stuckey thanked the commissioners for taking their time to help make important decisions that make Franklin a special place. Mr. Stuckey stated that he is glad to see there are those people like Mr. Anderson who donate their time because they care about the community.

Mr. Anderson stated that his experience with the Historic Zoning Commission was wonderful.

Chairwoman Besser stated that he will be missed from the Commission.

1. Minutes: February 10, 2014

Chairwoman Besser asked the Commissioners if any of them had a motion to approve the February 2014 Historic Zoning Commission minutes.

Mr. Hathaway motioned to approve the February HZC minutes. Mr. Roberts then seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous (7-0).

2. Minutes: March 10, 2014

The March minutes were not discussed due to them being unavailable at the time of the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

3. Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Chairwoman Besser asked the public whether there were any items not on the agenda that would like to have brought to the Commissioners attention. There was no response.

4. Consideration of Awning at 250 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S.; Nancy Whittemore, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of an awning onto the rear elevation of the residence at 250 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S. The single awning is proposed to cover a window and a door opening. Staff determined that this proposal did not qualify for administrative review and has therefore forwarded the proposal to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration. The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss this proposal at its March 17, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall added a note that the applicant has included a rendering that demonstrates the appearance of a shed-style awning over the rear door and window area. It is the applicant's proposed, however, to utilize a slant-style awning with black metal spears at this location, and to demonstrate the appearance of such an awning, the applicant has included a rendering of the this style as recently approved at the front entrance through the Administrative Review COA process (PL#4524).

Ms. Hall continued stating that the staff recommends approval with conditions of the application. The design/placement of the proposed awning is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend that awnings fit within their openings. The proposed awning has been designed as a singularly awning to span over two separate openings without a break. The proposed location of the awning at the rear elevation, combined with the very minimal spacing between the two openings (less than two brick lengths), however, provides consideration for the placement of a single awning at this particular location, as there is very little visibility and very little space for a break to allow for placement of two separate awnings.

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval of the slant-style awning at the rear elevation location for consistency with the awning styles recently approved administratively at two other locations—front elevation entry and side elevation window. The material sample appears to resemble canvas. As a condition of approval, the material must not resemble vinyl. Ms. Hall continued that as a condition of approval, the awning must be installed in such a way as to avoid damage to the building or its architectural features. It is recommended to install mounting bolts through mortar joints rather than through the face of the masonry. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the HZC for review and approval.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Ms. Nancy Whittemore stated her name and added comment to her request: a wind storm had damaged the old awning in the place where the new awning is proposed and had previously gone through Administrative Review. The side that the awning is proposed faces the west, so a contractor recommended looking into two awnings. However, the applicant stated that two awnings would not work due to both awnings being backed up to each other with barely any space between.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens who would like to make a comment on the application; there was no response.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve this proposal due to this being a situation where the location does not demand two awnings because it is in the rear of the house.

Mr. Hathaway seconded Ms. Pearce's motion.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether any of the Commissioners wanted to discuss this application. There was no response. The vote was approved unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Whittemore thanked the historic zoning commissioners for their time.

5. Consideration of Ramp at 407 Boyd Mill Ave.; Randolph Matthews, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a wooden ramp onto the front elevation of the residence at 407 Boyd Mill Avenue. Both the applicant and property owner state that access from the rear entrance is not feasible due to the exterior door width. The deck is proposed to extend flush from the front porch across the existing porch steps for about 6', then make a right angle to slope outward toward the driveway/parallel with the porch for 20'-6". The ramp is proposed to have a 3' interior width.

Ms. Hall added that staff recommends approval with condition of the application. The placement of the proposed ramp is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend the placement of ramps on rear or secondary elevations that are not readily visible. Staff from the Planning Department and the Building & Neighborhood Services Department visited the subject property with the applicant and her contractor. Staff measured the width of the face of the exterior door to the door stop with the door open at 90 degrees. The measurement was 29", which is not in keeping with the 32" width clearance requirement for ADA compliance. Therefore, the width of the exterior door is not sufficient for access, and the front entrance must be utilized. Ms. Hall noted that as a condition of approval, the ramp is to be removed within 30 days when no longer needed for use by the current tenant.

Ms. Hall continued that the design and materials of the proposed ramp are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. The design of the ramp does not involve the removal of historic features on the house or porch, and it appears to be easily reversible without negative impact to any historic features. The ramp utilizes rectangular posts that are in keeping with the style of the posts on the porch. Further, the porch does not feature a railing, so the minimal design of the ramp minimizes its impact as much as possible. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including any additional requirements due to the proposed placement within the FFO/FWO. If issued a COA, any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans due to BNS Department requirements and/or applicant request must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Planning Director and/or the HZC for review and approval.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether the public had any comments on the application. There was no response. The applicant was then asked by Chairwoman to state their name.

Ms. Randolph Matthews stated her name as the applicant of the request application for 407 Boyd Mill Avenue and stated that she respectfully request approval so that her husband may come home from patient care at the NHC (National HealthCare Corporation).

Chairwoman Besser asked if the commissioners would like to ask make comment on the proposal.

Mr. Sheridan asked about the temporary state of the ramp, if it was for just 30 days.

Mr. Womack explained that the ramp would be temporary in terms of it would need to be taken down 30 days after it is no longer needed.

Ms. Pearce stated they would need a chance to look at it after Building and Neighborhood Services.

Ms. Shanna McCoy from Building and Neighborhood Services stated that they had no issues with the temporary ramp proposed.

Ms. Nesbit asked if there was any chance it could be located on the back of the house.

Ms. Hall and Mr. Womack both responded it would not be able to be put on the back of the house.

Ms. Pearce asked whether there really was no way to put it on the back, because of the width.

Mr. Womack added that there is a great Magnolia tree in the yard that will screen basically 90% of the ramp and that this proposal is necessary. Mr. Womack then moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4530 for the placement of the ramp with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 14, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion; the vote passed unanimously (7-0).

6. Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 221 Lewisburg Ave.; Howard Switzer, Applicant.

Because Mr. Switzer, the applicant of the next item, was outside of the room, the commission decided to skip item #6 for the consideration of New Construction of an Accessory Structure at 221 Lewisburg Avenue. The item will be presented after item #7.

7. Consideration of New Construction (Principal) at 206 Franklin Rd.; Ashlyn Hines, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction of a 1.5-story single-family residence with attached accessory structure at 206 Franklin Rd.

Ms. Hall added that the applicant's architect appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) at its December 16, 2013 meeting. At the applicant's request, the item was pulled from the February 10, 2014 Historic Zoning Commission agenda. The applicant then appeared before the DRC to further discuss the proposal at its February 18, 2014 meeting. At the applicant's request, the item was also pulled from the March 10, 2014 Historic Zoning Commission meeting.

Ms. Hall continued that the design of the proposal is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends denial of the application. The proposed height of the structure as listed on the application (26'-6") is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in height, massing, scale, size, proportions, and architectural features with adjacent structures and that new construction should be consistent with the context of the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Hall stated that studies of adjacent structure heights (based on City GIS data) demonstrated that the adjacent residence at 204 Franklin Road measures approximately 22' in height (to ridge). Applicant information indicates that this height is 22'-8"; the adjacent residence at 210 Franklin Road measures approximately 17' in height (to ridge); and the adjacent mid-century style residences located across the street from the proposed structure are approximately 1-story in height. Also, the front-facing gable of the

residence at 166 Franklin Rd. (see Exhibit 5) measures approximately 21'-22' in height. The structure features a hipped roof; staff is uncertain of its overall height. This structure is situated on a different block face as 206 Franklin Rd. The side-facing gable of the residence at 214 Franklin Rd. appears to measure approximately 21.5'-22' in height. And the side-facing gable appears to be the highest roof ridge point on the structure and appears to be the highest perceived height from the street. This structure is situated on the same block face as 206 Franklin Rd. Ms. Hall added that the applicant provided that the resident at 102 Myles Manor Court has the height of 25'-6" to ridge.

Ms. Hall continued that there have been studies on the existing grade elevations, based on the City GIS data. The elevation measured at 204 Franklin Rd. (Exhibit 2) at the area right below the front porch is an approximate elevation of 644.7'. The approximate property line between 204 Franklin Rd. and 206 Franklin Rd. (approx. at the small brown tree as viewed in Exhibit 2), roughly along the proposed setback, is an approximate elevation of 643.7'. The approximate midway point of the lot at 206 Franklin Rd., roughly along the proposed setback, is an approximate elevation of 644.0'. The driveway at the face of the front façade of the residence at 210 Franklin Rd. (Exhibit 3) is an approximate elevation of 644.48'. Ms. Hall stated that based on this information, it appears the lot at 206 Franklin Rd. exhibits a very slight elevation decrease as it moves away from Old Liberty Pk., but it rises as it continues toward the adjacent lot at 210 Franklin Rd.

Ms. Hall added that the overall height of the proposed structure does not appear to be consistent with that of the adjacent structures. Staff respectfully requests that the applicant revise the proposal to be lower in overall height for better consistency with the *Guidelines* and resubmit the proposal to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, any deviation from the overall height, foundation height, relationship of roof eaves to adjacent structures based on foundation diagram, or siting of the structure approved within this application (26'-6"), due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction.

Ms. Hall continued on that the total building coverage on the lot is approximately 27% (based on a 2,503 sq. ft. footprint for the principal/attached garage & porches), which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that building coverage exceed no more than 35% within specified residential base zoning districts. Also, the foundation height, as proposed, is mostly consistent with that of the adjacent structures, as recommended by the *Guidelines*. The applicant was informed of that Franklin Zoning Ordinance requirement that all residential development have an 18" finished floor elevation and demonstrates an 18" finished floor elevation on the proposed plans. The applicant has proposed that the foundation be clad in siding up until 6 inches before grade, at which it is proposed to be brick.

Ms. Hall noted that all foundations for residential development must have a minimum 18" masonry base. Section 2.2.5(2)(c)(iv) of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, however, grants the Historic Zoning Commission the authority to make the determination on "the general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture, and material of the building or structure in relation to similar features of buildings in the immediate surroundings. However, the HZC shall not make consider interior arrangement or design, nor shall it make any requirements except for the purpose of preventing extensions incongruous to the historic aspects of the surroundings."

Ms. Hall added that the adjacent structures at 204 Franklin Rd. and 210 Franklin Rd. (Exhibits 2 and 3, respectively), each feature an approximate foundation height of 8". If issued a COA, and unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the structure design must be altered to include an 18" masonry base with revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval. If issued a COA, a scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation

Planner prior to issuance of a building permit, including the following: finished floor elevation, overall building height, foundation height, and all approved building materials, including porch steps.

Ms. Hall continued on that the proposed accessory structure is attached to the main residence at the rear elevation and the setback of the proposed principal structure is consistent with those of the neighboring residences (204 Franklin Rd. and 210 Franklin Rd, respectively).

Ms. Hall explained to the Commissioners that the materials of the proposed new constructions (cementitious siding of 5" exposure, brick fireplace, brick foundation) are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff requests clarification on the proposed roofing material. Asphalt shingle roofing is an appropriate roofing material. If issued a COA, staff recommends that all porch elements be wood in material in light of the proposed architectural style of the residence, as consistent with the *Guidelines*. 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*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to installation. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, shutters must be wood in material and appear to be operable for consistent with the *Guidelines*. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the garage doors must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval for consistency with the *Guidelines*. If issued a COA, a revised set of elevations notating all approved building materials must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Hall added that the proportion and rhythm of the window opening on the proposed resident are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Also, if issued a COA, any modification that affects the siting of the structure on the property (driveway configuration or otherwise), will substantiate reconsideration of the project for issuance of a COA by the Historic Zoning Commission. Per Municipal Code, all driveways must be 5' from the property line; to locate a driveway closer than 5' to the property line would first require approval from the Building & Neighborhood Services Department.

Ms. Hall continued that if issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. If issued a COA, any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. If issued a COA, a scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:

- scale of drawings for each page of the elevation set;
- finished floor elevation;
- overall building height;
- revised site plan depicting accurate siting of structure in relation to driveway/curb cut configuration;
- foundation height with proposed/conceptual grading from front property line to foundation of house, and proposed/conceptual grading along the front façade of the house (if such information cannot be provided, foundation height details should be given for the largest and smallest foundation heights envisioned for the site); and
- all approved building materials, including porch steps.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Ms. Ashley Hines stated her name as the applicant and mentioned to the commissioners that she was the one who renovated the red house on the corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Margin. Ms. Hines continued that she had met

with the Design Review Committee for about 45 minutes regarding this project to make the height of the structure more consistent with the *Guidelines* and neighbors. Ms. Hines stated that the project implemented every suggestion from the DRC to make it as great to go with the other homes in the area.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens who would like to make a comment on the application; there was no response.

Ms. Pearce asked about how many steps were located at the front door. Ms. Pearce stated that the foundation must be 18" even though they are not all consistent with other historic constructions and that the massing and scale make a difference to make this house work. Ms. Pearce stated that she felt that they are getting the height right. Ms. Pearce continued that applicants come back to have their 18 inch foundation, and then there must be more steps, then they start rolling down a hill where the house is not fitting in. Ms. Pearce stated that she didn't know what variances could be given.

Ms. Hall stated to the commissioners that they had the authority to specify the height of the structure.

Mr. Womack asked if someone was present from Building and Neighborhood Services.

Ms. Hall answered that Ms. Shanna McCoy was present from BNS.

Mr. Womack asked Ms. McCoy whether BNS is looking for the foundation to be 18 inches below grade to the floor joists.

Ms. McCoy answered that she did not believe it had to be; they are looking at the exterior look, so that the house is not appearing to be too close to the ground.

Discussion ensued about the foundation height for the structure proposed.

Ms. Pearce stated that if the commissioners can agree, this structure needs to be made to fit in with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Mr. Womack commented that this is all about context.

Ms. Pearce stated that, in the past, this style home did not have a large foundation; to put a tall foundation on a tall house makes the house look taller. Ms. Pearce noted that she would like to approve infill houses, however they do not want every house looking too tall.

Mr. Womack added that the commission has approved similar projects as presented with 18" taller than they had seen and approved.

Ms. Hines mentioned that BNS and Historic Zoning have different approvals for the proposal application.

Chairwoman Besser stated they had an option for a motion and asked the commission if there was an approval option.

Mr. Womack asked whether the approval would be as submitted.

The applicant's architect, Walter Pilkinton, asked the Chairwoman if he could speak, and she obliged; he stated that at their last work session, he was told by codes it could be from 18" to floor grade.

Ms. Hall stated that the Commissioners need to specifically state that it would approve this plan with the foundation height as presented.

Mr. Pilkinton added that it would be great with 8" instead of 18" because it would be consistent with the neighborhood homes. There is a 36" drop, so they can achieve the 8".

Chairwoman Besser stated that the foundation needs to be 18" above grade.

Mr. Pilkinton stated he was told in a work session otherwise.

Chairwoman Besser stated specification is needed for this motion.

Mr. Womack added that it includes the joists to grade.

Ms. Hines stated there is a visibility of 6".

Mr. Womack stated that the commission keeps struggling with this subject.

Ms. Nesbitt asked what the height of the house is.

Mr. Womack answered it is 26 feet with the 18 inch foundation from exterior.

Ms. Pearce made a motion to approve the project at 26'-6" as the earth stands right now, with no earth moved and cannot be taller.

Mr. Sheridan seconded Ms. Pearce's motion.

Ms. Hines stated that there is no intention to move the earth below the house.

Discussion ensued about the motion by Ms. Pearce as well as amending the motion that specifies the motion without any uncertainties. The height of the structure was also discussed.

Chairwoman Besser stated that there is no comfort level with this proposed application.

Ms. Pearce stated that she is concerned about how this house will fit into the neighborhood.

Ms. Nesbitt asked whether this could be clarified from codes.

Ms. McCoy answered that BNS cannot get information on the sewer.

Mr. Womack asked at what point they should know a missing link, concerning the drain and things they do not know about.

Ms. Pearce then stated that they should approve something.

Mr. Womack reminded the commissioners that this is in the area that is a gateway to the city.

Chairwoman Besser reminded the applicant that new infill is needed to fit in with the already existing historical houses and neighborhoods, and the commission is not going to take it lightly.

Mr. Pilkinton stated that they are missing the finished floor level, which has become standard.



Ms. Hathaway agreed with Mr. Pilkinton. Mr. Hathaway then added that there is not enough information about the context and they are not trying to make it look like a sore thumb.

Mr. Sheridan asked the commissioners how many more times it is going to take for this issue to be corrected.

Ms. Hines stated that if this application was approved with conditions, they will provide the information to codes. The applicant stated that she has no desire for the house to stick out sorely.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he is okay with the approval of conditions, but if it changes more than a foot either way, it needs to be brought back to the Historic Zoning Commission.

Mr. Vernon Gerth stated that he understands the situation, however there is not enough information but it is able to move through with conditions for a desired result. Mr. Gerth stated that there is an option to work with Ms. Hall and staff to come forward and talk about the top of the foundation and set standards for height elevations. Mr. Gerth stated that in the ordinance, there is an 18 inch standard that can be adjusted by the commissioners. Mr. Gerth stated that the top foundation really determines the height of the structure because the minimum grade from the top of the foundation needs to be 8" below that. Mr. Gerth stated that there is flexibility that the commissioners, depending on the other structures design and character in the location. Mr. Gerth stated to also keep in mind that because they do not know what needs to be done to the existing grade make sure it drains adequately. Mr. Gerth asked where it was that the Commissioners wanted the top of the dwelling to fall: the exposed foundation to fall 8" or 18". Mr. Gerth stated that there is going to be a need for more information with more infill projects and the commissioners can decide. Mr. Gerth told the commissioners to ask themselves "What is the existing grade?" and "What will the exposed foundation be?"

Ms. Hall added that the exposed foundation proposed in this application is 6" of brick with 18" finished floor elevation.

Mr. Pilkinton stated that the photos provided by the applicant show many of them to have three steps, or 18 inches and that he only elevation they did not see was the neighboring yellow house. He stated that he does not believe 18 inches is a scary height.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Ms. Hall if the recommendation was for 6 inches of brick plus 18 inches of foundation.

Ms. Hall stated she believed there were two things discussed: the finished floor elevations, where the first floor starts, as well as exposed foundation, usually 18 inches. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is proposing to expose 6 inches of brick and have siding go all the way down to that, so that even though the building is supposed to be 18 inches off the ground, only 6 inches of masonry foundation is exposed so that it is consistent exposed foundation with the buildings around it, which are about 8 inches each.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Ms. Hall if the 6 inches was part of the 18 inches.

Ms. Hall said yes.

Ms. Pearce discussed the neighboring homes, stating they did not have pictures of the yellow neighboring home.

Ms. Hall stated that she did have a photo of the yellow house in a staff report.

Ms. Pearce stated that the yellow house has three steps but not an 18 inch foundation.

Mr. Hathaway explained that these homes had a wide band of foundation, which is an appropriate look.

Ms. Pearce withdrew her previous motion.

Mr. Hathaway made the motion to approve the project as submitted without the requirement of 18 inches of masonry base all the way around the house, but to maintain 18 inches of finished floor elevation from grade on the porch. Also, the final grade is no more one foot above or below the existing grade.

Mr. Womack seconded this motion.

Mr. Gerth asked Mr. Hathaway to confirm that he was speaking about the difference in elevation not to be more than one foot, plus or minus, on the existing grade, and whether he was speaking about the front elevation. They are unsure of the water flow and how it could slope.

Mr. Hathaway said that that was the intent of the motion.

The vote was unanimous (7-0).

#### 6. Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 221 Lewisburg Ave.; Howard Switzer, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction of a 1.5-story detached accessory structure at rear of the property located at 221 Lewisburg Ave. The detached two-car garage is proposed to have a 576 sq. ft. building footprint, measure 21'-2" in height, and to be situated to the rear and behind the principal structure. The structure is proposed to be accessed from a new stair off the rear of the house. The exterior finish materials are proposed to consist of be composite lap siding of a 4" reveal to match the siding on the house, dimensional shingle roofing with standing seam metal roofing on the dormers, and wood windows and doors to match the house. Ms. Hall then reminded the Commissioners that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its March 17, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall continued that the design of the proposed accessory structure is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends approval with conditions. The proposed height (21'-2") and scale of the proposed accessory structure are consistent with the *Guidelines*. 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. Further, the Guidelines state that accessory structures should be smaller than their principal buildings.

Ms. Hall added that previous application materials submitted for this property by the applicant or the property owner indicated that the principal structure measures 25' in height. The subordinate height of the proposed accessory structure, combined with the proposed design over the garage floor to be incorporated the substantial drop in grade, renders the overall height of the garage as 8'-9" shorter than the highest point of the principal structure.

Ms. Hall stated as a condition of approval, any deviation from the overall height (21'-2"), foundation height, or siting of the structure as approved within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction. The proposed total building coverage on the lot is approximately 15.4%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend a maximum building coverage of 35% in specified residential base zoning districts.

Ms. Hall mentioned that all foundations for residential development must have a minimum 18” masonry base. Section 2.2.5(2)(c)(iv) of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, however, grants the Historic Zoning Commission the authority to make the determination on “the general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture, and material of the building or structure in relation to similar features of buildings in the immediate surroundings. However, the HZC shall not make consider interior arrangement or design, nor shall it make any requirements except for the purpose of preventing extensions incongruous to the historic aspects of the surroundings.” Unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the accessory structure design must be altered to include an 18” masonry base. Revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.

Ms. Hall then added that the placement of the proposed accessory structure (to the rear of the principal structure, recessed over 60’ from the property line) is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Also, the materials of the proposed accessory structure (composite lap siding of a 4” reveal to match the siding on the house, dimensional shingle roofing with standing seam metal roofing on the dormers, and wood windows and doors to match the house) are consistent with the guidelines. Ms. Hall added that as a condition of approval, the proposed composite lap siding must consist of a cement wood siding type. 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*. Window specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. As a condition of approval, the garage doors must be submitted to staff for review and approval for consistency with the *Guidelines*. As a condition of approval, the new proposed stair connection must consist of wood material. A revised set of elevations notating all approved building materials must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. The proportion and rhythm of window opening on the proposed residence are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall stated as additional comments that the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project’s corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. A scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:

- scaled drawings of the elevation set (including the west elevation of the accessory structure);
- finished floor elevation of accessory structure in relation to its principal structure;
- overall building height for both accessory structure and its principal structure; and
- all approved building materials, including foundation material, stairs, and porch steps.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Howard Switzer stated that he was the applicant and added that one thing that is not properly shown on the plans is the concrete block.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens who would like to make a comment on the application; there was no response.

Mr. Hathaway stated that the detached building does not need 18 inches masonry base, so it is not a condition.

Ms. McCoy added that the applicant needs something from water & sewer department for encroachment into the sewer.

Mr. Switzer stated that the driveway currently exists over the sewer.

Ms. McCoy stated all he needs is an email from water and sewer.

Ms. Hall mentioned that the applicant does not need to do that because it is not part of the motion.

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve with conditions to include with the exception of the foundation at 18' base.

Mr. Sheridan seconded this motion.

Ms. Pearce asked the commissioners if they meant they will not require an 18 inch foundation base, or if they can do 18 inches or less if the foundation base is required.

Mr. Hathaway stated it was outside of the movement and provides separation.

Ms. Pearce made an amendment that the base on the garage not to be more than 10 inches.

Mr. Sheridan seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous with the amendment (7-0).

8. Consideration of Demolition (Accessory) and New Construction (Accessory) at 215 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.; Howard Switzer, Applicant.

Ms. Hall started the proposal off stating that she would take each proposal in the application one by one.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a 80 sq. ft. accessory structure located at 215 5<sup>th</sup> Ave S. (this is a different accessory structure than the one considered for demolition by the Historic Zoning Commission at its March 10, 2014 meeting). Further, the applicant is proposing the new construction of a 20' tall, 720 sq. ft. (640 sq. ft. building footprint) accessory structure behind the principal structure. Ms. Hall noted that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new construction portion of this proposal at its March 17, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall started with the demolition stating that the demolition of the accessory structure proposal is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends approval with condition of the following portion of the application. Staff comments 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 subject structure is a 1-story outbuilding that appears to be situated on the rear right corner of the property. The roof is gabled and faces inward toward the backyard. A single door is situated on its left (gabled) side, and the other sides are devoid of fenestration. It has a metal roof and wood siding on the yard-facing sides. The rear side appears to feature a manufactured board/pressed wood. The Williamson County Property Assessor data for the street address does not note the estimated construction date of the structure. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from Sept. 1928/Apr. 1940 do not indicate the footprint of this particular structure on the site. Further, data prepared for the Department of the Interior/National Park Service and subsequently approved as part of the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District documentation does note the structure as a contributing structure. Based on the evidence of modern siding materials and age, the subject accessory structure is determined to be non-contributing to the Downtown Franklin National Register District.

Ms. Hall added that staff comments in regard to Structural Instability or Deterioration: While the applicant has not submitted a formal assessment report on the structure for the commission's

consideration, he has stated that within the application that “this building’s floor was framed at 48” c/c and the shed walls were framed 2” inward from the outward face of the bands allowing the deck to rot all around the perimeter thus warranting removal.” Staff comments in regard to Public Safety and Welfare: 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. No such documentation has been supplied to staff. Staff comments in regard to Unreasonable Economic Hardship: The applicant has not submitted any forms of the evidential documentation listed on the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist to address this criterion. Ms. Hall continued with additional comments stating that the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Howard Switzer introduced himself as the applicant and continued about the application. Mr. Switzer stated that there are not allowed to be two accessory structures on a property, which Ms. Hall had mentioned before. The proposed demolition accessory structure is not visible from the street and the floor is rotting through.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens who would like to make a comment on the application; there was no response.

Ms. Pearce began speaking about demolition and how one size does not fit all; some demolitions make sense, especially if it cannot be repaired and should be taken down. However, there may be issues with the Codes Department.

Ms. Hall and Chairwoman Besser stated that they agreed with Ms. Pearce.

Mr. Switzer also stated he agreed and added that the structure is on the property line against a tree.

Mr. Sheridan moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4533 for the demolition 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 April 14, 2014.

Mr. Roberts seconded Mr. Sheridan’s motion, and the vote was passed unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Hall then continued with the second issue in the application: the new construction proposal. Ms. Hall stated that the proposal is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends approval with conditions of the following portion of the application. The height (20’-0”) and scale of the proposed outbuilding are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. 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. Further, the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures should be smaller than their principal buildings.

Ms. Hall added that the height of the principal structure appears to measure approximately 20’ tall. The existing grade appears to drop from the street as it moves into the backyard area (approx. 2 feet from the front left corner of the house to the front of the existing garage as based on GIS data, and approx. 2.5 feet to the front left corner of the proposed accessory structure siting), rendering the perceived difference in height between the structures as approximately 2.5 feet. The garage structure is proposed to be situated around 20’ further back on the lot than the existing garage structure approved for demolition (PL#4507). As a condition of approval, any deviation from the overall height (20’-0”), foundation height, finished

floor elevation (difference of 2.5' between existing principal structure and proposed accessory structure), or siting of the structure as approved within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction.

Ms. Hall continued stating that the *Guidelines* recommend that outbuildings be designed simply and utilize forms reflective of the adjacent primary structures. The proposed accessory features gable roof line in keeping with the style of the principal structure as well as a large shed dormer that faces inward toward the backyard.

Ms. Hall added that the placement and orientation of the proposed accessory structure are consistent with the *Guidelines*. The structure is proposed to the rear of the principal structure, recessed over 60' from the property line. It is situated as so to meet setback requirements. Also, the proposed total building coverage on the lot is approximately 28.4%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend a maximum building coverage of 35% in specified residentially-zoned districts. It appears that the applicant did not remove the square footage footprint of the existing garage structure (approx. 804 sq. ft.), approved for demolition by the Historic Zoning Commission at its March 10, 2014 meeting, from the "footprint square footage of existing structures on lot" calculation. To meet the requirements of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance (4.1.2(8)), the residential lot shall be limited to a maximum of one accessory building.

Ms. Hall continued that the materials of the proposed accessory structure (lap siding with 4" reveal to match older siding on principal structure, new wood windows and doors to match principal structure, concrete foundation, dimensional shingles, standing seam metal roofing for shed dormer) are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff requests clarification on the material of the proposed lap siding. Wood or fiber cement siding are appropriate for use as lap siding materials. The proposed windows largely support the rhythm and profile of the historic windows on the main residence. 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*. Window specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval. As a condition of approval, the window proposed on the rear elevation for the stairway based on relocated off the corner of the house to better reflect the rhythm and spacing of the windows on the principal structure. As a condition of approval, garage door specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall then mentioned that all foundations (including slabs) in residential development must be have a minimum 18" masonry base. Section 2.2.5(2)(c)(iv) of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, however, grants the Historic Zoning Commission the authority to make the determination on "the general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture, and material of the building or structure in relation to similar features of buildings in the immediate surroundings. However, the HZC shall not make consider interior arrangement or design, nor shall it make any requirements except for the purpose of preventing extensions incongruous to the historic aspects of the surroundings." Unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the accessory structure design must be altered to include an 18" masonry base. Revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.

Ms. Hall added that if issued a COA, any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. If issued a COA, a scaled set of elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner that notates the following items prior to issuance of a building permit:

- all approved building materials of the accessory structure, including foundation material;
- the overall height of the accessory structure in relation to its principal structure; and

- the finished floor elevation of the accessory structure in relation to its principal structure.

Ms. Hall stated that the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. The dimensions of the proposed structure may need to be modified slightly to meet interior dimensional requirements for garage (20' depth minimum).

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens who would like to make a comment on the application; there was no response.

Mr. Switzer stated that he would make the 20.8" for base foundation to get the siding off of the ground.

Ms. Pearce asked what the overall height was of the structure.

Mr. Switzer asked 20 feet.

Discussion ensued about the recent height debate that the Historic Commission has been having.

Ms. Pearce then asked how far back the structure will be from the principal building. Ms. Pearce asked that when it pulls back that far, what relationship of other buildings in the neighborhood it puts the structure in relationship to.

Chairwoman Besser asked Ms. Pearce if she was regarding how the structure would affect the neighbors.

Ms. Pearce said yes, and that she is thinking how they are getting in the area of the same pallets, or any other relationship to any other buildings.

Mr. Switzer stated that there are carriage houses of the same height in the neighborhood.

Ms. Pearce stated that was the information she was looking for.

Mr. Sheridan added that there should be a one foot maximum deviation revision.

Mr. Switzer stated that the grade will not have to be raised.

Mr. Sheridan stated that if the grade differentiates, the application will have to come back to the Commission.

Ms. Hall added that the slab is different.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the proposal as submitted. If the new access request differentiates in grade, the application must come back. The masonry base must not be more than 10 inches above finished floor elevations.

Ms. Hathaway added that the slab on the grade should not be exposed.

Ms. Hall mentioned that the motion should be restated.

Ms. Pearce then stated that she moved to approve the proposal with staff comments and that if the new access request differentiates in grade, the application must come back and that the masonry base must not be more than 10 inches above finished floor elevations.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion; the vote was unanimous (7-0).

9. Consideration of Alterations and Addition (Principal) at 119 Lewisburg Ave.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated 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. Further, the applicant is requesting alterations to the principal structure, which include the following:

- the replacement of the existing roofing material for the entire structure;
- the placement of two dormers on the existing roofline;
- the alteration of existing window openings on the left elevation to create proposed bay window;
- the placement of transom windows onto the existing portion of the left elevation;
- the placement of a window within an existing enclosed arch recessed under the covered front porch; and
- the removal of glass block from a portion of the front and side façades (left corner) in order to create an open-air porch.

Ms. Hall continued that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its August 19, 2013 and October 21, 2013 meetings. The applicant also hosted a site visit of the property as part of the December 16, 2013 Design Review Committee meeting. The applicant appeared before the February 10 and March 10, 2014 HZC meetings, but the alterations and addition proposals to the principal structure were deferred for additional information and/or discussion. The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its March 17, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall started off with the addition/alteration of the existing left elevation windows on the principal structure: this portion of the proposal is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends denial of the following portion of the application. Regarding location, height, scale, and roof shape: the scale of the proposed addition/covered terrace area is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that enclosed additions not exceed 50% of the footprint square footage of the original building. 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 rear porch previously approved for demolition by the Historic Zoning Commission at its March 10, 2014 meeting (PL#2973), which measure 148 sq. ft. The existing footprint of the building, excluding the porch area approved for demolition, is 2,864 sq. ft. The footprint of the proposed addition/covered terrace area measures 2,320 sq. ft. The proposed footprint square footage of the addition measures 2,320 sq. ft., which is approximately **81%** of the footprint of the existing structure less the rear porch area approved for demolition. The proposal exceeds the *Guidelines* recommendation by **31%**.

Ms. Hall also noted that the placements of the proposed addition and covered terrace area are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend the placement of additions onto non-primary elevations. The right side elevation has some visibility from the street or public right-of-way, and the left side elevation has very little visibility from the street. The covered terrace area connects the two proposed side/rear additions at an area behind the principal structure, completely out of visibility from the street. The height/roof shape of the proposed addition is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. 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 continued that the applicant notes the height of the existing principal structure at 22” above grade and that the height of the “new construction is [substantially] lower than existing ridge.” It appears that the addition is subordinate in height at all locations. The right side elevation portion of the addition proposal is designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building. The existing portions/roof forms of the residence are definable from the proposed addition and its roof forms. The left side elevation portion of the addition proposal is less definable from the existing structure, as the applicant has proposed a series of projecting gabled areas along the elevation that makes this delineation less clear. The height of the addition and its projections are somewhat subordinate to the existing portion of the left elevation, and the elevation has minimal visibility from the street. The applicant is proposing cementitious vertical board-on-board and lap siding materials to further differentiate the addition from the existing house.

Ms. Hall then stated that the proposed alteration of an existing window area and its wall on the left elevation into a bay window area is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic window openings. Further, the *Guidelines* recommend against the enclosure, reduction, expansion, concealment, or obscuring of historic windows. Ms. Hall noted 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*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to installation. The total building coverage is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The building coverage proposed by the existing building and the proposed addition, including the garage proposed to remain, is approximately 23.8%. The covered terrace area is at the rear elevation and is not visible from the street or public right-of-way.

In regards to the material used, Ms. Hall stated that the materials of the proposed addition (hardi-board lap siding, vertical hardi board-on-board siding, possibly stone, brick bases, asphalt shingles with portions of metal roofing) are consistent with the *Guidelines*. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the area proposed for metal roofing must utilize a standing seam metal roofing profile. Any proposed metal roofing must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Revised elevations notating all materials must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval. 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*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to installation.

Ms. Hall added that the portion and rhythm of window openings on the proposed addition are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building. Additional comments include that if issued a COA, any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. If issued a COA, a scaled set of elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner that notates the following items prior to issuance of a building permit:

- all approved building materials, including porch steps; and
- overall height of existing structure and the various addition areas.

Also, Ms. Hall noted that the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Hall stated she would leave off here and continue with the Alterations of the principal structure later.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Kevin Coffey stated his name and named off some changes that happened since the last meeting with the Commission and Design Review Committee. The left side elevation has a new bay window, the office changed its usage, and the kitchen moved to the right closer to the circulation pattern of the structure. The bays are rectangular and no longer gable formed and receded more. These do not compete with existing gables. On the left side elevations, there is a recess where the siding is and a recess by the master bedroom which brings scale down. The neighbors can only see this side of the structure in the winter, but it is still hard to see.

Mr. Coffey continued that on the right side elevation looks much like what had been shown at the DRC. The existing form allows to see the original house as well as the proposed additions. The shed dormers added cannot be seen from the front elevation. The covered area has been reduced about 3 feet, from 86%-87% to 81%. The covered porch on the front was originally a covered porch and then it had been enclosed to a space with windows that are not in keeping with the original house. The applicant would like to insert a window looking out to the porch. Also, the window in the dining room has an inscribed archway in the wall that is proposed to have a window inserted there. Mr. Coffey mentioned he has no knowledge of the archway's history.

Chairwoman Besser mentioned there is a group for a meeting waiting outside and thanked Mr. Coffey for coming back and working with the Commission to allow the proposal to be appropriate and something that the Commission is comfortable with.

Ms. Hall mentioned that she has not spoken with the applicant about all the number of material for alterations, however staff is recommending approval with conditions of all the alterations proposed to the existing principal structure with exception of the projecting bay window at the left elevation. This includes the replacement of the roofing material, in-kind, over the entire structure, the paned window going into the archway area on the front porch, as a condition of approval the window needs to be historically appropriate and needs to come back to staff for review consideration prior to installation. The glass block removal from that area is consistent to the *Guidelines*. The proposed placement of transom windows onto the existing portion of the left elevation is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the windows are not proposed for placement on the primary or readily visible secondary elevations. Also, two dormers are proposed on the existing roofline. The *Guidelines* do not recommend the alteration of original rooflines on main or other visible elevations and against the placement of dormers or other additions to front or highly visible elevations. Neither dormer appears to exceed the height of the existing roofline or to be visible from the main elevation. As a condition of approval, the dormers may not exceed the existing roofline height so as to lessen their visibility for compliance with the *Guidelines*.

Discussed ensued about the meeting following the Historic Zoning Commission meeting starting at 7:30. Ms. Corn, the City Attorney, asked the Commissioners to try not to rush their decisions.

Ms. Pearce stated that this proposal keeps coming back to the HZC and DRC with the same elevations; the right side is okay but the left side variation is not appropriate.

Chairwoman Besser stated that Ms. Pearce felt very strongly about her advice at DRC and was very specific.

Ms. Pearce answered stating that the project keeps coming back with changes but the changes do not always include what the Design Review advised for the house.

Mr. Coffey stated that in the first proposal, he had messed up some but every time he has come back to the meetings he has dropped down the percentage, 80% being the lowest it has ever been. Mr. Coffey has been

juggling the program elements and a lot of money invested without doing anything. The economic impact needed for square footage would make the structure economically viable. Mr. Coffey also pointed out that the upper level is not usable, so for more square footage, the structure needs to move outward. One place for impact without effecting the view outside is along the left side elevation. Mr. Coffey continued that he had walked down Lewisburg Avenue taking pictures of other homes which the majority don't go by the *Guidelines* and have a number of additions with expansions.

Mr. Sheridan asked how long this house has been vacant for.

Mr. Coffey stated he was unsure, however Ms. Pearce answer that it has been vacant for several years.

Mr. Sheridan asked if there have been any other prospects for the structure.

Ms. Pearce stated there have been no other prospects for this lot.

Ms. Pearce noted that the historic structure must matter and that the fact that the structure is setback from the street is good.

Mr. Coffey mentioned that this is only a three bedroom house; it is not an outrageous size but the owners need proportionately sized rooms. Mr. Coffey advised that he has gone as far as he can.

Mr. Hathaway asked about taking the covered porch out of the square footage.

Mr. Coffey stated that going down to 77% is an option and to assume with other covered space because they already have an accessory structure on the property.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Sheridan asked whether the right elevation was visible from the street.

Mr. Coffey answered no, and that the left elevation is not visible.

Mr. Sheridan asked about the covered porch was, before he stated it was on the right side elevation.

Mr. Coffey stated that it takes up the whole right side of the structure. The setback is recessed to deal with the view point. Mr. Coffey pointed out sections on the elevations that were original and existing.

Ms. Nesbitt asked where the garage would go.

Mr. Coffey stated the proposed location for the garage has not changed.

Mr. Hathaway stated the only concern he has with the precedent of 30% over the 50% and that when someone else asks the same question, they will have to say no. Ms. Pearce added to this is that one important point that Mr. Coffey made was revealing the old dormers on the left side of the old house; also if you're looking at the *Guidelines* the bay window is new.

Mr. Coffey stated the bay window is new and it would be to extend that room.

Ms. Pearce noted that then the next piece of the room comes out as well.

Mr. Coffey stated this space come about 2 feet to 5 feet out.

Mr. Womack stated that again this is a context situation.

Mr. Hathaway stated that this is a 6,000 SF house with 2 bedrooms; there is a lot of space.

Ms. Pearce agreed that this is a great space with big space.

Mr. Womack stated he has been looking at the master bathroom; the shower is very large.

Mr. Coffey stated the shower is 5 feet by 5 feet.

Chairwoman Besser reminded the Commissioners that if they are not comfortable with approving this proposal, that they should not and they can defer this to another meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Ms. Hall how the historic registered area that this property is in reflect as far as the 81%, that large of an addition and what they can approve.

Ms. Hall stated that the *Guidelines* recommend no more than 50% to the historic structures in order to maintain scale and that the historic structure of the original part of the structure will be maintained as the main part of the house. Ms. Hall stated that the additions should be smaller and will not overwhelm the original, historic structure. Ms. Hall explained one other part of the *Guidelines* state that it should be compatible in that it is either clearly contemporary from the original structure or compatible with the proportions and materials to keep up with the building. Ms. Hall noted that the maximum building coverage is 35% in specified base zoning districts in order to help manage scale as well. Ms. Halle explained that when additions are more than that, it can compromise the original scale of the house. Ms. Hall noted that this is a contributing structure to the National Register of Historic Places and if the scale is overwhelmed massively, it could be perceived as non-contributing anymore.

Ms. Pearce mentioned the surveying every 10 years or so, it may be consider non-contributing if the scale is compromised.

Chairwoman Besser stated that this seems to be going into a Design Review phase.

Mr. Roberts asked the commissioners if they all agree that the main issue with this proposal is the left side of the house.

Ms. Nesbitt stated her main concern was the 81%.

Ms. Pearce stated she agreed with Mr. Roberts, that taking some square footage off would make some sense where it sticks out.

Chairwoman Besser stated that the right side is what the commissioners are looking for on the left side.

Mr. Sheridan added that they have deviated from 50% in the past and that has promoted back and forth, back and forth meetings with the applicant. Mr. Sheridan stated that he would like to see some sort of direction of what kind of deviation would be appropriate and what would not. They are now talking about 1% and 30%, and that is just an arbitrary way for the applicant to try to come back and reason. It is not a reasonable way. However, the contributing status is important. Mr. Sheridan asked, "At what point is deviation acceptable? What deviation is small and what is large?"

Ms. Pearce stated that that is why the City hired someone to help decide that 50% was acceptable.

Mr. Coffey stated that the original is apparent from the proposed addition.

Mr. Womack mentioned that the hiping roofs helped the size to take the massing away and if the commissioners choose not to go with this proposal tonight, the commission must be specific as to why.

Ms. Pearce stated that it should be clear that the commissioners have requested changes over and over again, and that significant changes not being made does not constitute the commissioners being arbitrary.

Mr. Coffey stated that he has made significant changes to the elevations and that the property is a unique sight and in a unique condition deserves an addition, not being at risk. Mr. Coffey stated that there are plenty of deviation from the national guidelines. Mr. Coffey stated that in order to save the house, they must put some addition on. Mr. Coffey stated that the site shows where the original house is located.

Chairwoman Besser stated that everyone has been heard but the commission needs to decide whether there have been enough changes to be sufficient or if the item needs to be deferred.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he thinks it deserves an up or down vote.

Ms. Hall stated all the alterations proposed were appropriate except the bay window broken from on the left side.

Chairwoman Besser advised the commissioners to make a motion with all but the bay window.

Mr. Sheridan moved to approve with conditions with staff comments.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Mr. Hathaway moved to amend the motion to include the wording “without bay window” and moved to amend the motion to eliminate the middle bay wall that goes straight across the left elevation at the bathroom location.

Mr. Sheridan seconded this amendment.

The amendment passed 5-2.

Ms. Pearce then amended the amendment, stating that however the portion is finished, to come back to the staff for review and approval of the materials and windows.

Mr. Hathaway seconded Ms. Pearce’s amendment to the original amendment. This vote passed with a 6-1 vote, with Ms. Nesbitt opposed.

Ms. Nesbitt asked whether this would reflect the 80% and changes by 75 SF.

Ms. Pearce made a motion of make another amendment, stating that there would be a one foot reveal so there would be change over time.

Mr. Hathaway stated that it is already that way.

Mr. Coffey clarified for Ms. Pearce.

Ms. Pearce withdrew her motion to amend.

Chairwoman Besser asked them to state why the commission is going against the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Sheridan stated that the commission is going against the *Guidelines* based on the condition of the house, the visibility from the street, and the lot size.

Ms. Pearce asked whether codes would deviate on foundation height.

Chairwoman Besser stated that is not of their concern and that Ms. McCoy and Ms. Hall would take care of that matter.

As for the proposed bay window, Mr. Hathaway moved to approve as submitted. Mr. Sheridan seconded this motion.

Chairwoman Besser stated she was not in favor of this vote and would like to keep the historic windows.

Ms. Pearce stated that she is also against the motion.

The vote failed with a 3-4 vote, with Ms. Nesbitt, Chairwoman Besser, Mr. Womack, and Ms. Pearce opposed this vote.

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

- Wall signage at 227 Franklin Rd.; Pam Colangelo, Applicant.
- Awnings at 250 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S.; Nancy Whittemore, Applicant.

11. Other Business.

Ms. Hall stated that the trolley tour for the HZC has been scheduled for Monday, Monday 28<sup>th</sup> at 9am. Ms. Hall stated that the Design Review committee is on Monday at 4pm.

12. Adjourn.

With no other business, Chairwoman Besser called for adjournment unopposed (7-0).