

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
May 12, 2014**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, May 12, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Chairwoman Susan Besser
 Rusty Womack
 Mike Hathaway
 Jay Sheridan (left the meeting at 6:36 pm)
 Kate Reynolds
 Mary Pearce (arrived at 5:12 pm)

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Meghan Scholl, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Kristen Corn, Law Department
 Steve Haynes, Building and Neighborhood Services Department
 Donald Anthony, Planning & Sustainability Department (5-6 pm)

Chairwoman Susan Besser called the meeting to order at **5:08 p.m.**

1. Minutes: March 10, 2014

Chairwoman Besser asked the Commissioners if there was a motion to approve the minutes from April 14, 2014. Mr. Hathaway moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Womack seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

2. Minutes: April 14, 2014

The minutes for April were not available, therefore not discussed.

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.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any items that were not on the agenda that anyone would like to discuss. There was no response.

4. Consent Agenda.

The items under the consent agenda are deemed by the commission to be routine in nature and will be approved by one motion adopting the staff comments as part of the approval. The items on the consent agenda will not be discussed. Any member of the commission or the public desiring to discuss an item on the consent agenda may request that it be removed and placed on the regular agenda. It will then be considered in its printed order. Staff recommends that **item 5** be placed on the consent agenda.

Chairwoman Besser mentioned that item number 5, the previously approved wall plans at the Brownstones located at Emily Court between 1st Ave S., 2nd Ave S., and Church St, was itemized on the consent agenda.

The commissioners were asked if there was a motion to move this item to the consent. Mr. Sheridan moved to approve item number 5 to the consent agenda. Mr. Hathaway seconded this motion and the vote was unanimous (5-0).

Chairwoman Besser stated to the Commissioners, staff and citizens that she must recuse herself from items #6 and #7, however since Ms. Pearce the Vice Chairwoman is not present yet, they will have to skip to item #8.

Mr. Sheridan will also be recusing himself from items 9 and 12.

As Mr. Womack began making a motion to skip over items #6 and #7 and move to item #8, Ms. Pearce arrived to the meeting (at 5:12 pm). Mr. Womack withdrew his motion.

Chairwoman Besser stated that Ms. Pearce will be presiding on behalf of the Chairwoman for items #6 and #7.

Chairwoman Besser walked out of the meeting.

5. Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Plan (Walls) at the Brownstones, located at Emily Ct. between 1st Ave. S., 2nd Ave. S., and Church St.; Nancy R. Smith, Applicant.
6. Consideration of Demolition (Accessory) at 216 Bridge St.; Jason Allen & Nick Shelton, Applicants. Ms. Pearce announces the item and asked Ms. Hall to present the staff recommendation.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certification of Appropriateness for the demolition of a small shed structure located at the rear of the property at 216 Bridge Street. The shed is situated behind and very close to a garage structure, but the two structures are detached from one another. This application request is specific to the removal of the small shed structure only.

Ms. Hall continued stating that the proposed demolition of the shed structure is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends approval with conditions of the application. Staff comments in regards to the historical and Architectural 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 single story shed with a slanted roofline that extends backward from the front façade. A four-panel door and small window are on the front façade, and the structure is clad in vertical lap on the front and side elevations and horizontal siding on the rear. The side and rear elevations are devoid of fenestration. The rear overhanging eave appears to be reinforced by exterior support.

Ms. Hall continued that while the age of the shed accessory structure is unknown, the structure does not appear to be historic. Williamson Co. Property Assessor data lists the subject structure as a utility shed of 162 sq. ft. 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 not note the structure as a contributing structure. Further, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from September 1928/April 1940, do not depict a corresponding building footprint at the location of the existing shed accessory structure (see Exhibit 2). As such, it would appear that the subject accessory structure was not constructed by September 1928, nor was it constructed by April 1940, when the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps were revised. Ms. Hall added that the building must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records prior to issuance of demolition permit.

Vice Chairwoman asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Jason Allen stated his name as the applicant and continued on that the only comment he has regarding this item is that it is an eyesore with no historic value. This property is becoming a residence and would need more green space.

Vice Chairwoman Pearce asked if there were any public citizens that would like to comment this item. There was no response. Ms. Pearce then asked the commission if there was a motion.

Mr. Womack moved the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4556 for the demolition of the shed accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014.

Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion. Vice Chairwoman Pearce added comment that this structure is not contributing to the National Historic Register. The vote passed unanimously (5-0).

7. Consideration of Partial Demolition (Accessory) and Alterations (Ramp) and 216 & 220 Bridge St.; Jason Allen & Nick Shelton, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition of a garage structure located at the rear of the properties at 216 & 220 Bridge Street (the structure is cited on both properties). The garage features a covered awning area that appeared to function as a carport, and the applicants are seeking to remove the covered awning portion only and to maintain the garage structure otherwise. Further, the applicants are requesting to place an ADA access landing and ramp off the left side of the porch that would tie into the parking at the rear of the property.

Ms. Hall continued that the proposed partial demolition of the garage structure through the removal of the awning only is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends approval of the following portion. While the age of the garage accessory structure is unknown, the awning portion appears to have been added to the structure. Williamson Co. Property Assessor data lists the subject structure as a detached garage of 360 sq. ft. with a flat carport of 220 sq. ft. 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 not note the structure as a contributing structure. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from September 1928/April 1940, may depict a corresponding building footprint at the location of the existing garage accessory structure (see Exhibit 2), but the awning/carport portion was not part of the structure and does not provide any specific historic or architectural significance to the structure. Ms. Hall added that the depiction of a corresponding building footprint was unclear on the Sanborn maps. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Vice Chairwoman asked the applicant to please state their name to discuss the partial demolition portion of item #7 for 216 & 220 Bridge Street. Mr. Jason Allen stated his name as applicant and stated that he had no comment on the partial demolition.

Vice Chairwoman Pearce asked if there were any public citizens that would like to comment this portion of the item. There was no response. Ms. Pearce then asked Commissioners if there was a motion.

Ms. Reynolds moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4557 for the partial demolition of the garage accessory structure through the removal of the awning portion only with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014.

Mr. Sheridan seconded the motion and the vote passed unanimously (5-0).

Ms. Hall then continued on about the alterations (ramp) portion of the item: the proposed placement of the landing and ramp is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, therefore staff recommends deferral. The placement of the proposed landing and ramp is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend the placement of ramps on rear or secondary elevations that are not readily visible. If the rear elevation serves as a public entrance, staff's recommendation is for placement of the access ramp at the rear elevation, unless the rear elevation door is not sufficient for ADA compliance (the width of the face of the exterior door to the door stop with the door open at 90 degrees must measure a 32" width clearance requirement for ADA compliance). Additional information is required in order to make this determination.

Ms. Hall added that the design and materials of the proposed ramp may be consistent with the *Guidelines*. The design of the ramp does not appear to involve the removal of historic features on the house or porch, and it appears that it may be easily reversible without negative impact to any historic features. **Staff requests additional information about the proposed landing and ramp/sidewalk materials and design with the following requirements for ramps and landings in mind (as noted by Building & Neighborhood Services Department staff):**

- Ramp needs handrails on both sides when the ramp slope has a rise greater than 6";
- Ramp slope shall be greater than 1:20 and no steeper than 1:12;
- When the floor level of the landing is above 30", then guardrail shall be 42" minimum height for commercial buildings; and
- A 4" curb is required along ramp and landing so wheels do not fall off ramp surface.

Vice Chairwoman Pearce asked the applicant is there was anything they would like to add.

Mr. Allen stated that the door projected is the only area allowable for a ramp.

Ms. Pearce asked if there were any public citizens that would like to comment on this portion of the item. There was no response. Ms. Pearce asked the Commissioners to please keep in mind that Ms. Hall recommended deferral because it goes against the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Reynolds asked the applicant whether the back door was wide enough.

Mr. Allen answered no and that the ramp needs 32 inches and the only door on the structure with 32 inches is the front door.

Mr. Nick Shelton introduced himself as the second applicant of the item and stated that the engineer working on the project believes the front door is the least obtrusive and allows some access and parking on Bridge Street is not an option.

Mr. Womack stated that looking at this in an aesthetic stand point, asked if the ramp will be put in concrete.

Mr. Allen answered yes, but there are still other commissions to go through.

Mr. Shelton added that the next step is to just move the shed out of the way but because the Historic Commission needed more information to get the right material, they wanted to make sure they got everything correct the first time. They have no materials or site plans yet.

Ms. Hall stated that in the city review, to add additional parking for ramp access is considered as well.

Mr. Allen then added that the driveway between the structures at 216 Bridge and 220 Bridge is not very wide and is a secondary access.

Vice Chairwoman Pearce asked if there was any more discussion regarding the ramp alterations at 216 & 220 Bridge Street.

Ms. Reynolds asked if there was a drop off.

Mr. Allen answered the drop off was 4 inches and grows to 32 inches at the corner. There is a slope.

Ms. Reynolds asked if the inches were foundation.

Mr. Allen answered yes.

Mr. Shelton added that they need a landscape architect to build it up a bit because it is very minimal at first; that being the trickiest part of the project, but looks good.

Mr. Allen then mentioned that there is vinyl siding by the porch at the back corner by the 32 inches. The grade drops every 7 feet of length of the structure.

Mr. Hathaway asked the applicants to make sure the drainage is not draining into some other property and to look to the Building and Neighborhood Services for guidance and suggestion.

Mr. Shelton assured the Commission that they would make sure of that.

Mr. Allen stated that they would run the water to the back of the property.

Ms. Pearce asked whether there was a motion.

Mr. Hathaway moved that that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve as presented a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4557 for the placement of the landing and ramp off the left side of the front elevation porch with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014.

Ms. Womack seconded this motion, and the vote passed unanimously (5-0). The Commissioners then proceeded to ask Chairwoman Besser to step back into the Historic Zoning Commission Meeting.

8. Consideration of Addition (Screened Porch) at 1001 Fair St.; Kelly Harville, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a 300 SF screened porch at 1001 Fair Street in the Hincheyville Historic District. The screened porch is proposed to be attached to the principal structure at the rear and also share a wall with an existing contributing accessory structure on site, thus connecting the principal structure to the accessory structure. The screened porch is proposed to also be connected to the existing outbuilding with a cricket roof. The principal structure features a recent 629 sq. ft. addition, which was approved by the Historic Zoning Commission in 2008. The area at which the proposed screen porch is to be placed is currently hardscape as a flagstone patio.

Ms. Hall continued that the applicant appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration of the proposal at its March 10, 2014 meeting, and the HZC deferred the item for additional information.

The applicant then appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its April 21, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall added that the application is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, therefore staff recommends denial of the application. The total proposed building coverage on the lot (including existing structures and the proposed screened porch addition) is approximately 34.8%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend building coverage of no more than 35% for specified residential zones.

Ms. Hall continued that the placement of the proposed screened porch addition is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. The proposed shared wall/roof connection between the existing principal structure and the existing outbuilding, however, is atypical. The *Guidelines* do not specifically address such a situation, but the *Guidelines* recommend limitation of addition size to no more than half of the square footage of the footprint of the original building. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the screened porch addition must be installed in such a way so as to ensure the essential form and integrity of the historic outbuilding if the screened porch were to be removed in the future. While the *Guidelines* support the placement of additions onto non-primary elevations, the *Guidelines* also recommend against the placement of porches onto primary or secondary elevations visible from the street if they did not exist historically. Based on *Guidelines* 5-7, however, it is staff's interpretation that open-air (non-enclosed/non-screened) porches are not recommended for placement on primary or readily visible secondary elevations. The proposal involves the construction of a new screened porch that reads as an enclosed addition, not the enclosure/screening of an existing porch, nor the construction of an open-air porch.

Ms. Hall stated that the materials/details of the proposed addition (standing seam metal gable roof with exposed 2x8 yellow pine rafters, rubber membrane cricket roofing material, concrete block walls with painted brick veneer, fiberglass and block aluminum screens, gutters, and siding on south elevation gable area) are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. If issued a COA, staff requests clarification on the material of the framing proposed for use for the fiberglass screening. For consistency with the *Guidelines* for porch enclosure and new construction, staff recommends the use of wooden frames. If issued a COA, staff recommends that the screen door be an aluminum screen door with an anodized or baked enamel finished or a wooden screen door that has been primed and painted, for consistency with the *Guidelines* on screen doors for entrances. Ms. Hall added that if issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the eave details must be similar to that of the main house. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the proposed metal roofing must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines*. Revised elevations notating all approved materials on the elevations/drawings must be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Kelly Harville stated her name as the applicant and continued with comment on the application. Ms. Harville stated that accompanying her is Contractor Keith Rice. The action steps that have been taken since last meeting with the Commission and Design Review Committee are as follows: a concern with lot coverage prompted a survey within the setbacks; the DRC was very helpful and requested she provide more photos of the property and views from neighboring properties (exhibit pages 11 and 12), as well as 3D drawings and aerial photographs; a request to meet with storm water engineer, Jeff Willoughby, whom discussed with Ms. Harville that the proposed solution would be a good solution; for the drainage issue, this is the best option that is aesthetically pleasing, because it is said by many people she talks to that her property is a "real mess".

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any public citizens that wished to ask any questions about the proposed application. There was no response.

Ms. Pearce stated that she believed the 3D drawings were a great addition to the photographs requested. Also, her mind is leaning more toward the fact that the proposal does not fully comply with the *Guidelines*, and asked whether the Commission has any control over the porch being enclosed and whether it needs to go back to the Historic Zoning Commission.

Ms. Hall responded that they would have to submit an alteration proposal for the enclosed porch.

Ms. Pearce mentioned that color would make a difference since the porch will be visible from the street and it will be detrimental if painted a different color.

Ms. Harville stated that the brick will be the same color.

Ms. Pearce stated that the brick being the same color is a concern of hers.

Ms. Hall added that it will not be anything new.

Mr. Hathaway added that he agreed with Ms. Pearce about the color; it is a physical issue but they are open to a creative solution. Mr. Hathaway mentioned he is also glad that they have control over the enclosing and stated he was glad Ms. Pearce brought it to the Commission's attention. Also, the cricket should not be split both ways.

Ms. Reynolds asked the applicant if the existing roof was asphalt shingles and whether the enclosed porch will be asphalt as well.

Ms. Harville stated that the original footprint structure had a porch there. The proposed roof will be metal so that it allows a distinguished difference in age.

Mr. Rice added that the brick aligned with the roofline will match the existing brick on the house.

Ms. Reynolds advised the applicant to break the roofline and bring it down.

Mr. Rice stated that they may be able to do that but it will cause new issues.

Ms. Harville stated that the proposed addition will not affect the original structure if it is ever taken down or demolished.

Mr. Womack agreed that the metal meeting the asphalt will not work.

Mr. Rice asked whether a couple inches would be sufficient.

Ms. Reynolds stated that 6 inches would be okay, but not 2 inches.

Mr. Womack added that the thickness of the molding on the side of the house would be okay.

Mr. Rice agreed that that would be doable.

Mr. Womack stated he agreed with Mr. Hathaway on the cricket.

Mr. Rice mentioned that the reasoning for the cricket is to keep any water from flowing there.

Chairwoman Besser added that on page 8, the drawing looks a bit unfinished.

Mr. Hathaway then added that there is no other way with the slopes with a cut off frame and it will not have a vertical surface.

Mr. Rice stated it is more noticeable in the drawings, not on the lot itself.

Chairwoman Besser stated to the Commissioners that this application is recommended by staff for deferral, therefore when speaking in terms of a motion they must state specifically as to why they approve the project, if they desire to approve this proposal, because it will go against the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4508 for the construction of the screened porch addition with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014. Staff advised the applicant that with alterations of the cricket of screen porch to the cottage and lower the back half by 6 inches of metal roof from the asphalt roofline. The Commission approved this application because of its unique Stormwater condition.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Sheridan. Ms. Pearce added, before vote, that she is willing to hear suggestions and help with paint color since the Commission does not regulate paint color. The vote passed unanimously (6-0).

9. Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 1007 W. Main St.; Chris Rudd & Kristen Hobday, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the 2-story single-family residence and detached accessory structure at 1007 W. Main St. previously approved by the Historic Zoning Commission at its July 8, 2013 meeting. The alterations include the modification of the construction material on the principal structure from lap siding to brick, the screening of the rear porch, the enlarging and modification of elevations/rooflines of the previously-detached accessory structure, and the creation of a breezeway between the accessory structure and the principal structure. Ms. Hall added that the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 21, 2014 to discuss the proposal.

Ms. Hall continued that the design proposal is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines* and with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee on April 21, 2014. Staff recommends approval with conditions of the application.

Ms. Hall stated that the alterations include the enlarging and modification of elevations/rooflines of the previously-detached accessory structure, and the creation of a breezeway between the accessory structure and the principal structure. The proposed modification of the previously-approved construction material from lap siding to brick is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that new construction use frame, brick, or stone construction, and the Hincheyville Historic District features residences predominantly of frame and brick construction. Ms. Hall stated that as a condition of approval, the brick used for new construction must match the surrounding historic masonry in width of the mortar joints, size/scale of bricks, color, and texture. The brick must be submitted to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hall continued that the proposed screening of the rear porch is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The porch is approved at the rear of the principal structure, and its screening appears to utilize minimal framing members. Staff recommends the use of wood porch elements for consistency with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall added that the proposed alterations to the previously-approved accessory structure are consistent with the *Guidelines* and with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee. The *Guidelines* recommend that accessory structures be designed simply and to use forms reflective of their adjacent principal buildings. The height and scale of the accessory structure, as proposed to be altered, continue to be subordinate to the principal structure. Due to the conversion of the elevations to an 8 ½ x 14 print, it appears the scale is off. Staff requests clarification on the overall height of the accessory structure. The location of the accessory structure, as proposed to be altered, continues to be consistent with the *Guidelines*, as it is located to the rear of the principal structure and is recessed over 60 feet from the front property line. The modification of the roofline and elevations of the accessory structure are consistent with the *Guidelines*. The roofline is reflective of the principal building. The use of a 1'-3" brick water table/foundation is in keeping with the principal structure and is consistent with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Hall then stated that the proposed alteration proposed through the creation of a breezeway to connect the principal and accessory structures is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends the use of wood elements on the breezeway for consistency with porch *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall also mentioned that the total building coverage on the lot is proposed at 25.7%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend no more than 35% building coverage in specified residential base zoning districts. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. All existing conditions of approval for approval new construction (PL-#2801) remain valid for the project. Ms. Hall noted that a revised set of elevations notating the height of the principal structure, accessory structure, and the breezeway area, as well as all approved building materials, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name. Mr. Chris Rudd introduced himself as the applicant and continued on with comments on the application.

Mr. Rudd stated that there is not much else to comment on; however, he would like to share the brick and mortar sample that he brought to show the Commissioners and answer any questions the Commissioners may have for him. Mr. Rudd showed the Commissioners the sample and notified them that the mortar color will be slightly darker, a color called "Southern Champagne Buff."

Mr. Womack stated that the mortar to be used is a softer buff.

Mr. Rudd stated that he would be happy to put together a sample with the proposed buff and believes it will look nice.

Ms. Pearce noted to the applicant that this infill project has been very successful.

Chairwoman Besser asked the Commissioners whether they have any questions for the applicant to proceed to a motion.

Mr. Hathaway asked the applicant whether the brick on the side of the structure was darker.

Mr. Rudd confirmed this.

Mr. Hathaway stated that there is good contrast there.

Ms. Hall asked the Commissioners if they would like her to pull up a photograph of the structure. The Commissioners obliged.

Mr. Rudd stated he wanted to also let the Commissioners know that regarding the conditions of approval to use wood in the breezeway, he agrees however it will be better to use brick. The applicant continued that because the breezeway is so close to grade, brick elements would be better for support here than wood elements.

Ms. Reynolds asked if there were details on the breezeway columns similar to the front columns.

Mr. Rudd answered that there is some, but not like the detail on the front columns. Mr. Rudd then mentioned that the accessory structure height was 20'-1", a total of 9 feet lower than the main structure.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens that would like to comment on this project; there was no response.

Ms. Reynolds then moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions Project PL-#4558 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations to the previously-approved construction with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion and the vote passed unanimously (6-0).

10. Consideration of Addition and Alterations (Roofline, Fenestration, Door, Siding) at 315 4th Ave. S.; Chad & Kelly Dannenfelser, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the following application has three sections, which she will go over one at a time. Ms. Hall started with the description of the whole application, then moved on to each individual section, including addition/alterations to the roofline, the alterations of fenestration (window openings), and the door and siding alterations: Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of a rear addition with covered screened porch at the residence located at 315 4th Ave S. Further, the applicants are seeking to alter the rooflines along the left and right side elevation and the location of the proposed rear addition. The existing left side and rear elevations have flat roof sections that the applicant's state have caused structural girder issues due to the weight of the separate roofs that have been added to the structure over time.

Ms. Hall added that the applicants are requesting consideration of the following exterior alterations:

- Alteration of fenestration pattern on left side elevation through the replacement of non-historic windows;
- Removal of existing shutters from residence;
- Window replacement and opening alteration on the right side elevation;
- Possible removal of existing vinyl and aluminum siding on the entire existing structure;
- Replacement of the existing front door with a single-light-and wood door; and
- Front entrance transom restoration (currently masked by wood panel).

One of the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its April 21, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall continued on about the first section of the application: addition and alterations of the roofline. This portion of the proposal is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. As for the location, height, scale and roof shape, the size of the proposed rear addition and screened porch (740 SF including porch) is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that enclosed additions not exceed 50% of

the footprint square footage of the original building. Ms. Hall mentioned that the residence's last addition (measuring approximately 342 SF) is not historic (as it dates to the 1970s) and is therefore not included within the original residence's building footprint. The non-historic addition accounts for 14.7% of the original building footprint (as based on a 2,668 sq. ft. existing building footprint derived from Williamson County Property Assessor data and calculation of original footprint being 2,326 sq. ft.). The remaining additions appear to date to the 1950s or earlier. The proposed rear addition and screened porch measures 31.8% of the original footprint of the residence (as based on calculation of original footprint being 2,326 sq. ft.). The existing non-historic addition, combined with the proposed rear addition, measures 46.5% of the original footprint, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall stated that the total building coverage is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The building coverage proposed by the existing building and the proposed addition, including the existing outbuilding, is approximately 24.2%. The placement of the proposed rear addition and screened porch are 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 addition is proposed to be recessed from the plane of the left elevation façade.

Ms. Hall noted that the proposed side elevation roofline alterations tie into the proposed addition, so the two components must be reviewed together. The proposed side elevation roofline alterations with rear addition/screened porch are not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. The bulk of the addition and reworked roofline areas are proposed at a height of 17'-6", which is lower the overall height at the highest roof ridge at the front section of the residence, which measures 20'-7". The front elevation view shed appears unchanged with the exception of the roofline shape of an existing section of the right elevation that extends out from the main plane of the façade (shape change from shed to hip). The *Guidelines* recommend that applicants retain historic roof shape and do not recommend the placement of dormers or other additions on main or other visible elevations. The proposal includes the alterations of rooflines to affect the left side (visible) and right side (far less visible) elevations. The alterations are limited to a portion of the 1950s addition area (historic) and 1970s addition area (non-historic).

Ms. Hall continued stating that the materials of the proposed addition/screened porch area and roofline-altered areas (windows, possible cultured stone chimney, hardi-plank lap siding, smooth cinder block foundation to be painted black, dimensional asphalt shingle roofing) are mostly 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, 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, staff requests clarification on the material of the framing proposed for use for the fiberglass screening. For consistency with the *Guidelines* for porch enclosure and new construction, staff recommends the use of wooden frames. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the eave details must be similar to that of the main house.

Ms. Hall continued on about the proportion and rhythm of openings: the proportion and rhythm of window openings on the proposed addition and screened porch area are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. The applicants have proposed a pair of closed shutter on the left side of the rear addition so as to emulate windows. The house currently has shutters on some windows, but the applicants are proposing to remove them. The treatment is proposed near the rear of the house, recessed from the plane of the main left elevation façade, and with limited visibility from the street. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, the shutters should be wood and appear operable from consistency with the *Guidelines*.

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 approved 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 addition areas. Ms. Hall also mentioned that the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name and proceed with their comments.

Mr. and Mrs. Brad and Kelly Dannenfesler stated their names as the applicants. Mrs. Dannenfesler continued that the fixed roofing system has many layers including a flat roof, which is over the non-historic section of the house. They would also like to add on to the back, but they would like to do both projects at one time. This project was addressed at the Design Review meeting with height and hipped roof, and window placement comments. The gutter was added to break up the existing footprint on the left elevation.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any public citizens who wished to comment or question this application. There was no response.

Mr. Hathaway asked about the left elevation, where it shows a window over the shower but it's not on the plans.

Mrs. Dannenfesler stated that the proposed windows will go along with the other windows on the house. The kitchen will be made into a bedroom, where they may move two windows closer together.

Mr. Hathaway asked about the right elevation with the screened in porch, whether the white brick was a chimney.

Mrs. Dannenfesler answered yes, but that they will not get to that part yet.

Ms. Pearce stated that she's looked at the project as well as other previously approved projects, and that Myles Manor had a similar project with double windows, which were boxed out with a shed roof. Detailing would help break up monotony on the left side.

Mr. Womack stated that that would be more of a bay window, a bump out.

Ms. Pearce stated that that would keep with the age of the house.

Mr. Dannenfesler asked how far the window would be bumped out.

Mr. Womack answered 18 inches would be okay, and could allow a window seat.

Ms. Pearce added that the DRC issues were addressed.

Ms. Reynolds mentioned the right elevations, where the addition starts, it goes against the *Guidelines* where there's no break.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether Ms. Reynolds was saying she does not see where the original structure and the addition starts.

Mrs. Dannenfelsler answered that the right elevation is not visible to the street, but only to the one neighbor. The fenestration façade jumps out two feet with the added window.

Mr. Sheridan asked whether the roofline denotes anything, whether it would it create the break.

Ms. Reynolds stated that half of it is new, the other half is old, and that no one will be able to tell in 10 years.

Chairwoman Besser added that there must be a break.

Ms. Pearce asked if the break must be out, and not in.

Ms. Reynolds confirmed that the break must be out.

Mr. Hathaway stated that they are going by the guidelines, but sometimes they may not be appropriate for some structures.

Chairwoman Besser asked the Commissioners to address their decision specifically since these recommendations are going against the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Hathaway moved, considering the roofline, to approve the application as presented, including the right elevation with no offset between the existing and the new addition, with consistency with content but not the letter.

Mr. Sheridan seconded the motion. Ms. Pearce commented that, just for the record, this proposal goes against the *Guidelines* because of the roof and house were in such a condition to need improvement.

The vote was approved unanimously (6-0).

Ms. Hall continued on the second section of the application: the alterations (fenestration). The proposed alterations for the fenestration are not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic window openings and advise against the enclosure, reduction, expansion, concealment, or obscuring of historic windows. Further, the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of new window openings to the primary or readily visible secondary elevations.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are proposing to alter three existing openings on the visible left elevation—one proposed to be expanded in place to match the size and height of the historic windows to the right of it, and the other two shifted in location and changed in size to match the size and height of the historic windows. The applicants are proposing to restore the original height of two windows at the center area of the right elevation. This elevation is not readily visible. If issued a COA, as a condition of approval, all replacement 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.

Mrs. Dannenfelsler stated that she would wait for any questions that the Commissioners may have.

Chairwoman Besser stated what they'd previously talked about, with the double window coming out instead of in.

Mr. Womack asked if it was being shown over the tub.

Mrs. Dannenfelsler confirmed that then it would end up coming up higher above the tub, and also that they would keep the windows where they are.

Ms. Pearce recommended leaving the windows where they are, given the situation.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there was a motion, but also reminded the Commission that this also goes against the *Guidelines*. Also, to clarify how bathroom window would be extended.

Mrs. Dannenfelsler said that they would keep the windows the same size if it was recommended by code.

Mr. Womack recommended they stay consistent.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the Dannenfelsler project on 4th Avenue South for the changes to the windows and maintaining of the windows as presented on the exterior. Also, with anything changing to come back to staff for approval. The motion is made because the historic windows are being maintained and the windows that are being replaced are more in-keeping of the historic character of the home, unlike the existing windows due to insensitive additions in the past.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion; the vote passed unanimously (6-0).

Ms. Hall then continued on with the third section of the application: the alterations of the door and siding. The proposed alterations to the entrance and the siding are consistent with the *Guidelines*. The existing entrance door appears to be a modern door (see Exhibit 2). The replacement of non-historic entrance doors is appropriate, and the *Guidelines* recommend the use designs appropriate for the building's style and age for replacement doors. The proposed single-light-and-wood door is appropriate. The restoration of the transom through the removal of the wooden panel and the placement of glass is appropriate.

Ms. Hall added that if issued a COA, as a condition of approval, use clear glass in replacement panes on the primary and readily visible secondary elevations for consistency with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* support the removal of synthetic siding. In accordance with the *Guidelines*, should historic exterior wood siding require repair or replacement, the resulting materials, profiles, and designs should match the historic configuration. The applicants should contact the Preservation Planner to determine if additional work requires issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairwoman Besser asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Mrs. Dannenfelsler stated that the door they have to replace the existing door is a great historic door that they had found on Adams Street.

Chairwoman Besser added that this door is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Sheridan moved to approve the operations of the entrance and siding as submitted on project #PL4559. Mr. Womack seconded the motion; the vote passed unanimously (6-0).

The Commission decided to take a quick, 5 minute break. The recorder was turned off between 6:36 pm and 6:42 pm. Once the meeting resumed, Chairwoman Besser stated that the applicant has requested for items 11 and 12 to be flip-flopped, so that item 12 goes first and item 11 goes second.

11. Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 113 Cottage Ln.; Bristol Development Group, Applicant.

Mr. Sheridan recused himself from this item.

Ms. Hall started the items with item 12, the alterations to the previously-approved construction at 113 Cottage Lane. Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the 2-story single-family residence and attached accessory structure at 113 Cottage Ln. previously approved by the Historic Zoning Commission at its December 10, 2012 meeting and subsequently approved for alterations by the Historic Zoning Commission at its March 10, 2014 meeting. As the applicant explains within the narrative, the approved elevation sets for 113 Cottage Ln. and 103 Cottage Ln. were switched by mistake, causing construction of non-corresponding plans on these two sites. The applicant is requesting that the previously-approved 103 Cottage Ln. elevations (approved originally by the HZC at its December 10, 2012 meeting and again for a replacement elevation set at its March 11, 2013 meeting) be approved for the 113 Cottage Ln. site. The construction appears to be mostly complete. The elevations changes include modification of overall height from 31'-4" to 32'-4".

Ms. Hall mentioned that the applicant has include the previously-approved elevations for the subject property as well as the proposed set of elevations. Staff has included exhibits that illustrate the site plan for the Vandalia PUD as well as the approved front elevations of the adjacent buildings to the subject property—112 Cottage Ln., 114 Cottage Ln., and 115 Cottage Ln.

Ms. Hall stated that the design of the proposal is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, which the staff recommended approval with conditions. The proposed elevation set for 113 Cottage Ln. has already been approved by the Historic Zoning Commission, and the site has been issued a building permit by the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. As such, staff's primary review of the application is focused on determining if the proposed elevation set is very similar to or the likeness of the approved (and constructed) elevation sets adjacent to the subject property. While the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction be compatible with the massing, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction be compatible in height, scale, and proportions with adjacent structures, it is not intended for like elevations to exist adjacent to one another within a historic district. The individual elevations for the Vandalia PUD were originally considered and approved with like elevations spaced out among the site accordingly.

Ms. Hall stated that exhibit 1 illustrates the site plan for the development and its property addresses. Adjacent property addresses—112 Cottage Ln., 114 Cottage Ln., and 115 Cottage Ln.—are included as Exhibits 2, 3, and 4, respectively. An on-site photograph of the subject property is included as Exhibit 5. 115 Cottage Ln., while similar to the proposed elevation set for 113 Cottage Ln., exhibits a "recessed" double porch (the porch is recessed behind the plane of the front façade), while 113 Cottage Ln., as proposed, and features a double porch that extends outward from the plane of its front façade. Further, 115 Cottage Ln. features a gabled and extension on the front façade, and the 113 Cottage Ln. proposal is designed so the front elevation is under one large gable.

Ms. Hall stated that staff has determined that the approved elevations on these sites are differentiate enough from the proposed elevation set for 113 Cottage Ln. so as to avoid any like elevations being situated adjacent to one another. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a revised building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Brian Jaccobs stated his name as the applicant and continued with the proposal. Mr. Jaccobs stated that because the homes are framed so quickly, they were able to realize recently that homes 103 Cottage

and 113 Cottage were mixed up. Both homes are virtually done, and the applicant stated that he does not believe the mix up degrades the look at all of the neighborhood.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any questions from the public. There was no response; Mr. Hathaway then asked if it would be appropriate to address both of the applications together rather than separate. Ms. Hall answered that the applications can be combined, but they must have two separate votes.

Ms. Reynolds made the motion to move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions Project PL-#4560 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations to the principal structure and attached accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion; the vote passed unanimously (6-0).

Ms. Pearce added that there has been a lot of negative feedback for approving the Vandalia homes and added that paint color is critical especially if elevations are changed.

Mr. Jacobs stated he believes that the paint colors that they had chosen are relatively natural, earth toned.

Ms. Pearce stated she would be happy to review colors for them in the future.

12. Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 103 Cottage Ln.; Bristol Development Group, Applicant.

Mr. Sheridan recused himself from this item.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the 2-story single-family residence and attached accessory structure at 103 Cottage Ln. previously approved by the Historic Zoning Commission at its December 10, 2012 meeting and again for a replacement elevation set at its March 11, 2013 meeting. As the applicant explains within the narrative, the approved elevation sets for 103 Cottage Ln. and 113 Cottage Ln. were switched by mistake, causing construction of non-corresponding plans on these two sites. The applicant is requesting that the previously-approved 113 Cottage Ln. elevations (approved originally on December 12, 2012 by the HZC then approved again for modifications by the HZC at its March 10, 2014 meeting) be approved for the 103 Cottage Ln. site. The construction appears to be mostly complete. The elevations changes include modification of overall height from 33'-0" to 31'-4" and the inclusion of a 2'-1" brick foundation from grade as shown on the proposed front elevation.

Ms. Hall added that the applicant has include the previously-approved elevations for the subject property as well as the proposed set of elevations. Staff has included exhibits that illustrate the site plan for the Vandalia PUD as well as the approved front elevations of the adjacent buildings to the subject property—101 Cottage Ln., 102 Cottage Ln., and 104 Cottage Ln.

Ms. Hall stated that the design of the proposal is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, in which staff recommends approval with conditions. The proposed elevation set for 103 Cottage Ln. has already been approved by the Historic Zoning Commission, and the site has been issued a building permit by the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. As such, staff's primary review of the application is focused on determining if the proposed elevation set is very similar to or the likeness of the approved (and constructed) elevation sets adjacent to the subject property. While the *Guidelines* recommend that new

construction be compatible with the massing, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction be compatible in height, scale, and proportions with adjacent structures, it is not intended for like elevations to exist adjacent to one another within a historic district. The individual elevations for the Vandalia PUD were originally considered and approved with like elevations spaced out among the site accordingly.

Ms. Hall stated that exhibit 1 illustrates the site plan for the development and its property addresses. Adjacent property addresses—101 Cottage Ln., 102 Cottage Ln., and 104 Cottage Ln.—are included as Exhibits 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Staff has determined that the approved elevations on these sites are differentiate enough from the proposed elevation set for 103 Cottage Ln. so as to avoid any like elevations being situated adjacent to one another. The foundation height alterations are in compliance with Building & Neighborhood Services Department requirements and are consistent with the foundation heights of the other structures constructed within the Vandalia PUD.

Ms. Hall noted that the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a revised building permit. Also, any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there were any public citizens who would like to comment on this application. There was no response.

Mr. Womack made a motion to move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions Project PL-#4561 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations to the principal structure and attached accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 12, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded this motion. The vote passed unanimously (5-0).

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

- Awnings & Signage at 428 Main St.; Matt Klimek, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the Administrative Review item for the awnings and signage at 428 Main Street is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of canvas overlays onto two existing awning frames. One awning frame is located on the front façade while the other is located at the rear elevation. Both canvas overlays are proposed to feature business-identifier signage. The applicant is also proposing to install business-identifier hanging signs from the existing awning frames.

Ms. Hall mentioned to the Commissioners that if they had any questions for the Preservation Planner about this Administrative Review, she would be happy to answer any questions.

14. Other Business

Other business included subjects such as the trolley tour that will include a visit to the Vandalia site; Ms. Pearce talked about the annual Heritage Foundation event; the banners for the 150th Anniversary of the Battle of Franklin will be going up within the next 2-3 weeks; and the new Commissioner will be Mr. Mel Thompson, a realtor whom renovated the McEwen House.

15. Adjourn.

Chairwoman Besser made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 7:00pm with a unanimous vote (5-0).