

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
December 8, 2014**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, December 8, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Chairwoman Susan Besser
 Mary Pearce
 Kate Reynolds, left at 6:27
 Jim Roberts
 Mel Thompson
 Lisa Marquardt
 Mike Hathaway

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Kristen Corn, Law Department
 Steve Haynes, Building and Neighborhood Services Department
 Randy Tosh, Building and Neighborhood Services Department

Chairwoman Besser called to order the December 08, 2014, Historic Zoning Commission meeting at 5:02 p.m.

**Item 1:
Minutes: October 13, 2014**

Not available to review due to technical difficulties.

**Item 2:
November 10, 2014**

Not available to review due to technical difficulties.

**Item 3:
Election of 2015 Chair & Vice-Chair**

Mr. Hathaway nominated Ms. Susan Besser as Chair and Ms. Mary Pearce as Vice-Chair for 2015. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (7-0).

**Item 4:
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.**

No one requested to speak.

**Item 5:
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 6 be placed on the consent agenda.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this vote.

Mr. Roberts requested to know why Item 6 was on a Consent Agenda.

Ms. Hall stated she reviewed this item and that since it completely met the design guidelines, she felt it could be placed on consent. Ms. Hall stated if the commission wished, it could pull the item from consent.

Mr. Roberts moved item 6 be pulled from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the motion passed (7-0).

Item 6:

Consideration of Addition (Rear Porch) & Alterations (Rear Windows, Doors) at 428 Boyd Mill Ave.; Allison Mayhew, Don & Paige Holloway, Applicants.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a rear partially-screened porch at 428 Boyd Mill Ave. Ms. Hall stated the applicants are also requesting the removal of two rear elevation windows and their replacement with two single-light doors to access the proposed rear porch. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its November 21, 2014 meeting. Ms. Hall stated the following on the rear addition and alterations to window removal and door placement: Ms. Hall stated the proposed addition/screened porch is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

- The footprint of the proposed enclosed screened porch addition is 630 sq. ft., which is approximately 41% of the existing structure, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that the square footage of additions be limited to no more than half of the square footage of the original footprint.
- The proposed building lot coverage is approximately 4.6%, which is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.52, #2-4).
- The screened porch is at a rear elevation and will not be visible from the street. It appears to utilize minimal vertical and horizontal framing members to support the screening (p.74, #5, #7) and has been designed with simple square columns.
- The *Guidelines* recommend the placement of additions onto non-primary elevations and also recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building. (p. 52, #1-2). The proposed screened porch addition ties into the existing house in such a way as to allow the historic portion of the house to continue to read as a distinctive form on the building, as it incorporates insets into the design at the side elevations and creates shed form that is situated much lower than the existing
- The materials of the proposed addition (standing seam metal roofing, wood railings, wood floors, screening, limestone foundation to match existing, and poplar lattice) are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications have not been submitted for review.

Ms. Hall stated the following proposed alterations are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*:

- The proposed conversion of the existing window openings on the north/rear elevation of the existing structure into door openings is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the location proposed to be altered is not visible from the street (p.53, #1).

Ms. Hall stated staff recommends all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit and the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Holloway stated she felt the application was pretty self-explanatory.

Ms. Pearce stated she would like more detailing on the lattice.

Ms. Holloway stated it was poplar wood and that the pattern would be a vertical/horizontal shape.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5733 for the placement of the rear screened porch and the rear elevation window removal and door placement, with staff's comments, and with the modification the lattice be built with a frame and be brought back to staff for approval. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion passed (6-0).

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations (Entry Canopy) and Addition (Principal) at 230 Franklin Rd. (Bldgs. 11 & 5), Don Burke, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of the existing entry canopy on Bldg. 11 and the construction of a 14'-3.5", 824 sq. ft. enclosed storage shed addition onto Bldg. 5 at the Factory at Franklin. Ms. Hall noted the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its November 21, 2014 meeting. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed entry canopy alterations at Bldg. 11 and the proposed addition on Bldg. 5 with the following:

- As a condition of approval for consistency with the *Guidelines*, any proposed opening within the historic wall section of Bldg. 5 must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA. The *Guidelines* recommend against the removal of sections of historic walls to accommodate the addition unless significant structural deficiencies can be demonstrated (p.100, #4). Any proposed opening shape should allow the proposed addition to be removed without consequence to the historic materials of the existing building if so desired in the future (p.100, #4).
- The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans (including, but not limited to, height, square footage, materials, and placement) must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Burke explained this was their second design and explained they wanted windows for more light and used a contemporary appearance to differentiate from the original building. Mr. Burke stated they are proposing placing an opening in the existing masonry wall and explained.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4705 for the entry canopy alterations at Bldg. 11 and the addition on Bldg. 5 with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated December 8, 2014. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion passed (7-0).

Item 8:

Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 320 4th Ave. N.; Gerald J. Miller, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of a detached, prefabricated accessory structure at 320 4th Ave. N. and the property is located within the Floodway Fringe Overlay (FFO). Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed new construction (accessory) with the following:

- In keeping with the *Guidelines*, the prefabricated structure must be placed at the rear of the structure in an area that is not visible from vantages in front of the building. Staff recommends that placement of the structure near the existing parking area located at the immediate rear of the structure.
- 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.

Mr. Miller stated he planned to resubmit plans to the City with revised elevations to accommodate the floodways. Mr. Miller stated part of the plan was to relocate building and requested to know where it should be. Mr. Miller pointed out on the projected pictures where he could place it.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt requested to know what was located adjacent to this property.

Mr. Miller stated nothing but the cemetery, woods, and 3rd Avenue North.

Ms. Pearce stated she could not support this building and thinks a prefab building with a simple shed roof it would make all the difference.

Mr. Miller stated they were not opposed that idea.

Ms. Pearce stated she thinks a simple shed roof with neutral wood-inspired color.

Mr. Hathaway moved move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5734 for the new construction (accessory) with staff's comments, including moving the building north/east corner of the site and the revision of the shed construction to be gabled. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the motion passed with Ms. Marquardt abstaining (6-0).

Item 9:

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

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of a parking area near the driveway curb cut at 210 Lewisburg Ave. Ms. Hall stated the parking area consists of pavers and curb and is already installed. Ms. Hall explained a plan was later approved by the City of Franklin to meet Street Standards, but the existing conditions have not been modified to meet Street Standards per approved plan. Ms. Hal stated the applicant has included a hard copy of that plan within the application packet. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission at its November 10, 2014 meeting and the HZC denied the request and asked that the applicant to attend the November 21, 2014 Design Review Committee for additional discussion. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends **denial** of the **parking alterations** with the following:

1. The proposed parking area, as built currently and as approved to meet Street Standards, is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of parking areas in primary yards unless set back at least 50 feet from the street or sidewalk (p.73, #1).
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Powell stated he met with DRC and discussed softening up what was done there with using landscaping, plus making driveway [configuration] modifications to suit the City.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4642 as presented with the amendment that due to a unique condition that this allowance is allowed. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion with Ms. Marquardt abstaining. The motion passed (5-1).

Item 10:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction & Parking at 206 Franklin Rd.; Andy Ferguson, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved construction plans (April 14, 2014) for the residence yet to be constructed at 206 Franklin Rd. and the proposed alterations are as follows:

- The alteration of the covered breezeway area between the principal structure and the accessory structure into a screened porch, through a footprint expansion and heated enclosure of a portion of the area (previously 14'-8" wide covered/unenclosed porch, proposed at 21' wide covered with 12'-2" enclosed), altering the roof shape; and
- Several fenestration and door reconfigurations throughout the plan, as follows:
 - The conversion of a triple-set window on the rear house elevation to a double window;
 - The replacement of French doors on the rear house elevation to a double window;
 - The conversion a double window on the right elevation to a set of two single windows; &
 - The removal of a single window on the right elevation cross gable.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is also proposing the placement of a one-car parking pad/turn-around area directly in front of the principal structure and this portion of the application has not been reviewed by staff in light of the *Historic District Design Guidelines* at this time. Ms. Hall stated BNS could provide interpretations to municipal code to allow. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposed alterations at its November 21, 2014 meeting. Ms. Hall stated

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed alterations to the previously-approved construction (the expansion and partial enclosure of the covered breezeway and the door/window reconfigurations) with the following:

- 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.

Mr. Ferguson stated he was asking for a few changes from the previously approved plan from April. Mr. Ferguson reiterated what Ms. Hall stated previously.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce requested how long the entire house was from front to back.

Mr. Ferguson stated 100-feet and 30 feet 6-inches wide.

Ms. Pearce stated this feels like the shape of Westhaven.

Mr. Hathaway asked Ms. Pearce if she was worried about that look on the elevation presented.

Ms. Pearce stated yes.

Ms. Hall projected the previously-approved plans.

After discussion, Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5735 for the alterations to the previously-approved construction, specifically the expansion and partial enclosure of the covered breezeway, and the configuration of how that is done to keep it looking like a closed-in porch coming back to staff for comments and approval. Ms. Pearce added that they will be seeking to make this look as if the porch that is going to be built is closed-in in a way that you can still feel it was a porch. Ms. Pearce added that the approval with conditions is in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated December 8, 2014. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion carried (7-0).

Mr. Thompson moved the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions and contingencies upon the BNS approval a Certificate of Appropriateness for the parking for Project PL #5735 and in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated December 8, 2014. Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Ms. Pearce questioned if this parking was to be done in concrete.

Mr. Ferguson stated he was showing a brick border and the steps.

Ms. Pearce stated she could not support this material. Ms. Pearce stated that most are done in antique brick or where aggregate is pressed down.

Mr. Ferguson voiced his concern for cost.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the original motion to make the material pavers. Ms. Reynolds seconded the amendment.

With the main motion made and amended, the motion passed with Mr. Roberts voting no (6-1).

Item 11:

Consideration of Awnings & Canopy at 428 Main St.; David Drake, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of replacement window/door awning frames and canvas overlays at 428 Main St. Ms. Hall stated frames currently exist over the entrance door and the windows flanking either side of the door; the proposal is to replace these with new frames (painted white) and to replace their canvas overlays. Ms. Hall stated the applicant also proposes to place either a shed awning or flat canopy over the sidewalk area of the 5th Ave. N. façade of the building, which is intended to cover no window or door openings but to serve as shelter for the existing outdoor café seating. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its November 21, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall stated on the Windows/Door Awning Replacement Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed windows/door awning replacement with the following:

1. As a condition of approval, the awning frames must be designed to cover only the storefront display windows or door they serve and fit their openings for consistent with the *Guidelines*.
2. As a condition of approval, the new awning canvas overlays must not include business identifier signage for consistent with the *Guidelines*.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of relevant permits. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hall stated on the Building Façade Awning/Canopy Placement Staff recommends denial of the proposed building façade awning or canopy placement with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend that awning “should cover only the storefront display windows or transoms and fit their openings” (p.96, #4). As such, the proposed placement of an awning or canopy along a façade plane devoid of fenestration is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. Awnings and canopies are recommend for placement at storefronts only.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - An updated Outdoor Cafes Permit may be required for placement of the proposed fencing underneath the awning or canopy.
3. 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.

Mr. Tosh, with BNS, stated the awning along the side will have to be a minimum of 7 feet from the sidewalk to the lower portion of it. Mr. Tosh stated must be 12-inches from curb, stamped plans must be submitted by a professional designer, and that this is in the fire district where only 15-foot length is allowed. Mr. Tosh stated that the applicant is requesting a 30-foot length.

Mr. Drake stated they want to add a seating area with a canopy and keep consistency with the other three existing awnings.

Ms. Marge, a representative of Starbucks, stated they feel this would be an enhancement for our customers.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item.

Citizen Ms. Harriet Harms requested to know if there would be enough space for pedestrians with the addition of the awnings.

Ms. Hall explained it should meet all requirements.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if it would really provide shade.

Mr. Drake stated there would be different amount of shades throughout the day.

Mr. Hathaway stated he did not feel this application was the solution to the problem the applicants are trying to correct.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5736 for the replacement of the awnings over the entry door and flanking windows with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated December 8, 2014. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include the supports be a natural metal color. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the motion passed (7-0).

With the motion having been made and seconded, the original motion passed with amendment (7-0).

Mr. Thompson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to DRC for Project PL #5736 for the placement of the building façade awning or canopy, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated December 8, 2014. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion and suggested bringing pictures to DRC. The motion passed (7-0).

Item 12:

Consideration of Signage at 237 2nd Ave. N.; Robert C. Ashworth, Applicant.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item and left the room.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of business-identifier post-and-arm signage at 237 2nd Ave. S. Ms. Hall stated the post-and-arm is proposed to feature three hanging sign faces. Ms. Hall stated Staff determined that this proposal did not qualify for Administrative Review and has therefore forwarded the proposal to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed signage with the following

1. The applicant must submit a physical sample of the proposed HDU sign face material to the Preservation Planner and/or the HZC for consideration in light of the *Guidelines* to determination if the item qualifies for issuance of a COA.
2. Alternatively, the applicant may utilize metal, wood, or another material for the sign faces that is determined to be in keeping with the *Guidelines* by the Preservation Planner and/or the HZC.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a signage permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Alexander, a representative of Mr. Ashworth, stated in his research he found some years ago it was common to use redwood and it is very expensive and deteriorates. Mr. Alexander stated he has found the sign world has transitioned into high density urethane material that allows routing, sand blasting, etc. Mr. Alexander passed around the material to the commissioners.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce stated the material was impressive, but if the silver border was painted black it would look better and add a finial on top of the post to finish. Ms. Pearce stated the raised lettering was very elegant.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the concept for the post-and-arm signage with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated December 8, 2014, and approval be contingent on colors to coming back to staff for trim and lettering and that a Victorian style finial be attached to post as well. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion passed (7-0).

Item 13:

Consideration of Partial Demolition, Additions, & Alterations (Principal) at 158 Franklin Rd.; Steve Gilbert, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 158 Franklin Rd. Ms. Hall stated the proposed scope of work is as follows:

- Alterations to front porch trim work to restore it to its historic appearance;
- Replacement of the existing shingle roofing on the rear and side elevation portions of the house with standing seam metal roofing;
- Alterations to fenestration pattern at the rear of the structure through the expansion and removal of various window openings and through the placement of additional windows;
- Alteration of an existing window opening on the left elevation to return it to its historic appearance;
- The removal of a ca. 1920 porch from the rear of the house;
- The removal of a ca. 1920 bathroom addition from the rear of the house;
- The construction of a rear left wing addition onto the location of the existing rear porch proposed for demolition (measuring 220 sq. ft.); and
- The construction of an addition at the right elevation of the building (measuring 600 sq. ft.).

Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its October 20, 2014 meeting and the item appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission at its November 10, 2014 meeting, and the item was deferred to the November 21, 2014 DRC for additional discussion.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed

- alterations to the front porch;
- the roofing replacement;
- the placement of entirely new window openings with the rear elevation plane;
- the partial demolition of the building through the removal of the rear bathroom addition and rear porch;
- the right elevation addition; and
- the rear left wing addition

with the following:

Ms. Hall stated the proposed porch alterations are consistent with the *Guidelines* and the proposed architectural detailing is original to the building, as substantiated by historic documentation. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed porch materials prior to issuance of a COA.

Ms. Hall stated the proposed roofing material replacement is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of new window openings to the primary or readily visible secondary elevations.

Ms. Hall stated the proposed windows for placement on the rear elevation building plane only (not the courtyard side of the left wing) are new and will have no visibility from the street. Ms. Hall stated the alteration of the left wing window to match its historic appearance and the appearance of the adjacent windows as evident by the building materials is entirely appropriate.

Ms. Hall stated the rear bathroom addition does not appear to possess any architectural significance to the original portion of the residence. Ms. Hall stated the applicant and architect has provided a report that addresses several valid structural concerns specific to the porch structure, which is a criteria by which demolition may be considered. Ms. Hall stated the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit, and the areas must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.

Ms. Hall stated the right elevation addition is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, as it reads as a compatible yet clearly contemporary addition to the historic residence and it incorporates a painted shiplap siding hyphen inset into the design and is situated lower than the existing ridge line.

Ms. Hall stated the rear left wing addition may not be entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall explained there is no break in the roofline to help differentiate the addition from the historic structure, and with no documentation provided to determine how much of a wall inset is proposed to help differentiate the addition from the existing residence or to demonstrate how visible and meaningful the inset will be viewed from the street or public right-of-way, consistency with the *Guidelines* cannot be determined. Ms. Hall noted this is an important consideration, as the addition will have some visibility from the street.

Ms. Hall stated the following:

- As a condition of approval, the applicant must provide scaled drawings and sight lines to demonstrate both the depth of the inset of the addition at the plane of the historic portion and how it will be viewed from the street. The information must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA.
- Alternatively, as a condition of approval, the applicant must incorporate a roof break at the addition to differentiate the addition from the historic portion of the home. Scaled and revised drawings must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA.
- All windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a COA.

Ms. Hall stated 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 HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
- Unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the addition designs must include an 18” masonry base in accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance.
- Any deviation from the overall height, finished floor elevation, or siting of the additions 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.

Ms. Hall stated a scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:

- all approved building materials, including foundation material and lap reveal;
- the height of the additions’ masonry bases; and
- the overall height of the addition areas in relation to its existing residence.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends denial of the placement of entirely new window openings within the rear elevation plane with the following:

- The *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of original windows and historic window openings and also recommend against the enclosure, reduction, expansion, concealment, and obscuring of historic windows (p.86 & p.86, #1-2). The proposed alteration to the existing historic window configuration at the courtyard side of the left wing through what appears to be the modification of their openings is not consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Gilbert stated the intent of their package was to illustrate that he took the concerns regarding the right side addition and submitted what he considers a reasonable solution with all things considered. Mr. Gilbert stated they feel like they have a minimal connection to the existing house and it does not determinately effect the central form of the existing house. Mr. Gilbert stated this a big picture item. Mr. Gilbert stated this proposal makes the house livable, and the courtyard provides a wonderful outdoor living space. Mr. Gilbert stated as for the windows on the left side of courtyard, we would alter the height of the window sill, not the width. Mr. Gilbert stated in the illustrations we had the right and left side wings beside each to show the alignment of the existing wing of the house.

Mr. Hathaway stated he thinks the applicant listened to what was said at DRC on the right side addition and he is happy to see that improvement. Mr. Hathaway stated he has a concern on the length of the left side with uninterrupted roof and suggested a roof change.

Mr. Thompson stated he had an issue with the windows so they are so dramatically different.

Ms. Pearce stated she agreed with Mr. Thompson and Mr. Hathaway. Ms. Pearce stated it is our job as the Historic Zoning Commission to keep this property eligible for the National Register.

Chairwoman Besser stated it is contributing to the district and that is our major concern.

After some discussion Mr. Roberts moved the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer a COA for this item to the next Historic Zoning Commission meeting in January. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion passed (6-0).

**Item 14:
Other Business.**

Ms. Hall stated there are five items currently for DRC and possibly two more from tonight.

Item 15:
Adjourn

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Acting Secretary