

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
August 11, 2014**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, August 11th, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Chairwoman Susan Besser
 Mary Pearce
 Mike Hathaway
 Trisha Nesbitt (arrived at 5:18pm)
 Kate Reynolds
 Jim Roberts
 Mel Thompson

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Meghan Scholl, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Kristen Corn, Law Department
 Steve Haynes, Building and Neighborhood Services Department
 Catherine Powers, Planning & Sustainability Department

Chairwoman Besser called to order the August 11, 2014, Historic Zoning Commission meeting at 5:04 p.m.

1. Minutes: July 14, 2014

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any Commissioners whom had comment or a motion on the July 2014 minutes.

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve the July minutes as presented. Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous (6-0).

2. 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 other items or any emergency items that were not placed on the agenda that would like to be brought to their attention; there was no response.

3. Consideration of New Construction (Principal, Accessory) and Fencing at 135 Harlinsdale Ct.; Andy & Nicole Bailey, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 2 ½ story single-family residence with attached garage and detached garage at 135 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 3 Harlinsdale Manor). Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions, with conditions of approval being that any deviation from the overall height, foundation height, finished floor elevation, or siting of the structure as presented 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 and that the garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Preston Quirk stated his name as the applicant's architect and continued on with comment on the item. Mr. Quirk stated that this item was on last month's Design Review Committee agenda and showed about a dozen changes which were favorable. Mr. Quirk asked Ms. Hall about the other two conditions not mentioned previously when Ms. Hall spoke about the project, and asked if they were still in agreement with the conditions.

Ms. Hall went over the other conditions of the item:

1. 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.
2. A scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - finished floor elevation;
 - overall building height;
 - 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.

Mr. Quirk agreed and stated to the Commission that he was all set and ready to answer any questions.

Chairwoman Besser thanked Mr. Quirk and asked if there were any public citizens whom would like to comment on the item. There was no response.

Ms. Pearce asked the applicant whether the existing tree line would be removed with the fencing on the rear lot.

Mr. Quirk answered that they would like to maintain it as much as they can and that the left side does not have as many trees and they would like to work with that.

Ms. Pearce stated that she had a couple suggestions to share. Ms. Pearce stated that she was wondering if less is more to keep the character of the farm, such as not to use the stone piers on the fencing. Ms. Pearce stated that her second point was that there was a lot of roof on the house, so she wondered if the main part of the house could be metal roofing.

Ms. Reynolds asked where Ms. Pearce was referring to.

Ms. Pearce stated that where the door is is the section and that this would give it a more evolved, over-time look. Ms. Pearce stated that the applicant should keep the farm setting with the house.

Mr. Quirk noted that many other homes in the neighborhood have metal roofing.

Ms. Pearce asked if Mr. Quirk believed that was a good thing or a bad thing.

Mr. Quirk stated that he had no opinion on whether it is a good thing to have metal roofing. Mr. Quirk stated that the roof is currently a shingle roof and that the owners liked the look of that.

Discussion ensued about the metal roofing on the home and in the neighborhood.

Mr. Thompson stated that it is good to split things up between houses so that not everything in the neighborhood looks the same.

Mr. Hathaway added that the gable looks good and that it grabs attention.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4618 for the new construction (principal and accessory) and fencing with staff's comments with one modification to use a wood farm fence without stone posts, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated August 11, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded this motion; the motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

4. Consideration of Partial Demolition, Alterations, & Addition at 107 Everbright Ave.; Bob & Adele Bass, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition of a partially enclosed rear porch area on the residence. Ms. Hall stated that additionally, the applicants are requesting to place an enclosed addition at the rear of the structure. Ms. Hall stated that the conversion of an existing window opening into an entrance opening is proposed along the right elevation near the location of the proposed rear addition.

Ms. Hall added that staff recommends deferral of this application, and that staff respectfully requests that the applicants submit additional information by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review demolition requests. Ms. Hall stated that structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect and that such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state his name.

Mr. Bob Bass stated his name as the applicant and continued with comment on his application. Mr. Bass stated that he received a letter from his architect that reviewed his proposal.

Chairwoman Besser stated that they would allow the letter to be read to the Commission.

Ms. Nesbit arrived to the meeting at 5:18 p.m.

Mr. Bass read aloud his letter to the commission (see Exhibit A on Page 8).

Mr. Bass noted to the Commission after reading the letter from Tom Anderson, his architect, that he is wanting to put an addition on the only spot he can put it, where the porch is. Mr. Bass stated that he

cannot do any work with the existing porch because it all needs to be reworked. Mr. Bass stated he cannot use any of it unless he is able to take off a small section to redo it.

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

Ms. Pearce stated she was unsure if this was possible, but asked whether it was possible if they could pull the porch away from the principal structure to make an outbuilding out of it.

Mr. Bass stated that the structure is gone.

Ms. Pearce stated that the design is very responsive.

Ms. Hall stated that the recommendation is based on lack of information and that the Commission could consider the new information.

Chairwoman Besser noted to Mr. Bass that the commissioners typically do not accept new information at the meeting, but in the interest of time, they would allow this.

Ms. Pearce stated that they must give reason to go against the staff report given by Ms. Hall.

Ms. Corn stated that they only need to be clear on their reasons for going against the staff report.

Ms. Reynolds asked the existing home's square footage, the ground floor, and the square footage of the addition.

Mr. Bass stated that it was about 2,000 down, 12 up, and only taking off 300 feet of that.

Ms. Reynolds pointed out that some of the new windows do not line up with the existing on the left elevation.

Mr. Bass stated that this was not intentional and that the last time they submitted, he was instructed to drop the frieze line 4 ½ feet.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she believes they need to align.

Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Bass if he is finding that in the older section, the windows are lower than what codes will allow now.

Mr. Corn asked the Commissioners to direct their questions to the Chair due to technical difficulties.

Chairwoman Besser stated that it may be useful for the commissioners to state their name before statements or questions.

Ms. Pearce stated that, on the rear dormer, the glass looks like solid panes of glass. Ms. Pearce stated that she does not believe they would want the solid pane look.

Mr. Bass stated that there must have been a pattern picked up. Mr. Bass stated that this is a one-over-one house throughout.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any other comments or a motion.

Ms. Pearce asked if they should do demolition first.

Ms. Corn stated that it may be clearer for the record, although they are not required to, but it may be easier for the minutes.

Mr. Thompson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4640 for the partial demolition of the principal structure (specifically, the rear porch area), the conversion of the window opening into an entry opening at the back right elevation location, and the placement of the rear addition with staff's comments, in accordance with the Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated August 11, 2014.

Mr. Roberts seconded this motion.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he believed the side dormers on the rear addition are over-scaled on the roof and seem to be the same size as the dormers on the large roof on the front. Mr. Hathaway asked to modify the motion to have a single window dormer, rather than a double dormer, on the right and left sides on the addition only.

Mr. Hathaway then amended this amendment: if the dormer can be reduced in size to where if it still needs to be double windows, that is fine, as long as the roof of the dormer does not align with the main box of the house.

Ms. Pearce seconded this amendment. The vote carried unanimously for the amendment.

The overall motion with the amendment carried unanimously (7-0).

Chairwoman Besser stated that the fifth and sixth items have been removed from the agenda by request of the applicant or for reasons that other departments have not yet completed approvals.

5. Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 243 3rd Ave. S.; Jennifer Dowling Mackenzie, Applicant.

PULLED BY APPLICANT

6. Consideration of Alterations (Parking) at 210 Lewisburg Ave.; Bill Powell, Applicant.

PULLED BY STAFF

7. Consideration of Partial Demolition & Addition at 1004 Fair St.; Trey Vaughn, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition of a rear small enclosed area on the residence. Ms. Halls stated that the applicant notes that the addition proposed for removal was originally the location of a porch that was enclosed several years ago. Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting to place an enclosed addition at the rear of the structure within the footprint of the area proposed for demolition as well as extending rearward (toward the backyard) and toward the left elevation of the house.

Ms. Hall added that staff recommends deferral of the partial demolition of the rear enclosed area and the placement of the new rear addition and that staff respectfully requests that the applicants submit

additional information to substantiate the criteria by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review demolition requests.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to state their name and whether he would like to comment on the application.

Mr. Trey Vaughn stated his name as the applicant and continued with comment. Mr. Vaughn stated that the structure is 14x16 feet and 25 years ago, it was enclosed. Mr. Vaughn stated that the renovations will look the same, but will be further to the west. Mr. Vaughn stated that they ask to remove the addition to go back to its original look.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there was any information to help support their case.

Mr. Vaughn stated that there no more information.

Mr. Hathaway stated that it looks like it has been changed and does not look historic. Mr. Hathaway stated he did not like the larger original version and suggested they keep what is there to look as a passageway to a newer addition. Mr. Hathaway stated he did not support this project.

Ms. Pearce motion to defer this application to Design Review on Monday August 18th at 4:00 pm.

Mr. Thompson seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

8. Other Business.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there was any other business that ought to be discussed.

Ms. Pearce stated that the house at Ledgelawn, the one that faces West Main, appears taller than the old Funeral Home.

Ms. Nesbitt stated that she agreed with Ms. Pearce and that it does appear to be much larger.

Ms. Powers stated that the Planning Department and Building and Neighborhood Services have been emailing about the concern; Mr. Bridgewater would need more than “appears to be” because the applicant would be spending money to process this. Ms. Powers said that staff is looking for specifics in terms of what they need to be looking at.

Chairwoman Besser stated that she had been by the subdivision and that it did not seem to be taller than the old funeral home, but only larger with the gables. Ms. Besser stated that it may feel larger but not taller, as the massing is different.

Ms. Hall stated that she agreed with the Chairwoman in that it appears wider but not taller. Ms. Hall explained to the Commission that this matter is her responsibility and that she will relay information and partner with the Building and Neighborhood Services Department.

Ms. Pearce stated that there must be some way to know the progress for situations like these.

Ms. Hall stated that the Building and Neighborhood Services Department will be providing a new inspector whom will be involved with HZC projects.

Discussion ensued about clarifying the height of the LedgeLawn home and making specific requests to know processes of projects approved by the Historic Zoning Commission with the Building and Neighborhood Services Department.

Ms. Nesbitt stated that they seem to be struggling with this issue often even when the commission has been specific with height, as well as the foundation height. Ms. Nesbitt stated that they seem to continue to struggle.

Chairwoman Besser stated that Ms. Hall is always following up and is the messenger and watcher of their application projects. Ms. Besser stated that the front gable of the home gives the appearance of a taller design element; however, once it is clad, it will look different.

Mr. Hathaway agreed that the home appears to be taller when it is closer.

Ms. Hall stated that she would encourage everyone to inquire with comments.

Mr. Hathaway stated that the Commission should trust the staff to take care of these matters.

Ms. Harriett Harms, a public citizens, commented, stating that there is an optical illusion there which, as you get closer to the sidewalk, the home gets bigger than the old funeral home. Ms. Harms stated that she asked the applicant to push the home further back and stated that the developer stated that they would be unable to fit six homes in the subdivision. Ms. Harms stated that the funeral home should be the centerpiece of the subdivision.

Ms. Hall added that in the future, no demolition applications will be accepted without submittal of a structural report from an engineer or architect.

9. Adjourn.

Mr. Roberts motioned to adjourn; Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0). The August 11th Historic Zoning Commission meeting adjourned at 5:56 pm.

Exhibit A – From Item #4, Consideration of Partial Demolition, Alterations, & Addition at 107 Everbright Ave.; Bob & Adele Bass, Applicants.



Thomas L. Anderson Architect, Inc.

303 A South Main Street • Goodlettsville, TN 37072

Phone: 615.448.6848 * Cell 615-566-5450

tom@tlaa.com

August 11, 2014

Mr. Bob Bass
107 Everbright Avenue
Franklin, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Bass,

I have inspected the covered porch structure of your property located at 107 Everbright Avenue in Franklin Tennessee and found the following deficiencies.

1. The foundation show signs of settlement. It appears as though the concrete masonry units were laid as an underpinning without a proper foundation many years after the original porch was built.
2. Inadequate floor joist. The existing for joist are 2x6 and very close to the soil. The rim joist shows signs of decay.
3. The existing floor decking is out of level and showing signs of decay.
4. Inadequate roof structure. The roof structure is constructed with 2 x 4 rafters at 2 foot O/C. The minimum rafters size allowed is 2x6.

Corrective action is required for all of the items listed above. The proper course of action would be to completely raze this portion and rebuild.

If you should have questions feel free to contact me at the numbers listed above.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Anderson