

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

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

Members Present: Chairwoman Susan Besser
 Mary Pearce
 Rusty Womack
 Trisha Nesbitt
 Kate Reynolds
 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
 Carl Baughman, Engineering Department

Chairwoman Besser called to order the October 13, 2014, Historic Zoning Commission meeting at 5:05 p.m.

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

Not available to review due to technical difficulties with recording device.

**Item 2:
Consideration of 2015 Historic Zoning Commission & Design Review Committee Meeting Dates and Application Deadlines**

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the 2015 meeting dates and application deadlines schedule staff presented. Ms. Nesbitt seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously (9-0).

**Item 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.

There was no Citizen Comments made.

**Item 4:
Consideration of Alterations (Entry Porch Addition) at 1000 Buckworth Ave.; Jake & Luke Herring, Applicants.**

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of a 5 ½' x 9 ½' entry porch onto the front elevation of the residence at 1000 Buckworth Ave. at an existing brick stoop. Ms. Hall stated the design is proposed to incorporate the existing 8" half columns flanking either side of the entrance door. Ms. Hall stated the residence dates to 1968 (according to Williamson County Property Assessor Data) and is therefore not contributing in age to the Boyd Mill Avenue Historic District. Ms. Hall stated the applicants have included three options for consideration which all options include the use of wood roof trim incorporating a dentil trim along the top edge to match the existing soffits and a bead board ceiling.

- Option #1 depicts two square 8" columns on either side of the porch.
- Option #2 depicts one 10" column on either side of the porch.
- Option #3 depicts one 12" column on either side of the porch.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission at its October 13, 2014 meeting, and the Historic Zoning Commission deferred the item to the October 20, 2014 Design Review Committee meeting for additional discussion. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the alterations (porch addition) with the following:

- In the case of proposed alterations to noncontributing buildings, the alterations are reviewed in light of the *Guidelines* specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding contributing buildings. The district possesses many later Colonial Revival style examples, one with a similar, architecturally appropriate entry porch.
- Staff previously recommended that the paired columns on either side of the entry porch in Option #1 (the only option previously presented) be simplified to single columns on either side so as to simplify the design and provide more consistency with similar styled and aged homes in the district. The applicant has since provided additional information, noting that the existing half columns flanking the entrance on the house are 8" in width. As such, the Option #1 design, which incorporates paired 8" columns, is scaled appropriately to the existing architectural features on the house.
- 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.

Mr. Herring stated they had started out with 8-inch columns and were requested to do drawing showing a single 10-inch column and a single 12-inch column. Mr. Herring stated they would prefer to do a pair of 8-inch columns.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

Mr. Herring stated the homeowner wanted to provide an additional photo showing a double column design similar to theirs.

Mr. Waldrop passed around pictures.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4677 for the placement of the entry porch addition (specifically Option #1) with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 10, 2014. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Mr. Hathaway moved to amend the motion to include proper alignment of the beam above the columns will align with the shaft of the columns as is appropriate to the historical character. Ms. Pearce seconded the amendment, and the amendment passed (9-0).

With the main motion having been made and seconded, the motion passed with the amendment (9-0).

Item 5:

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. Hall stated the applicant has included a hard copy of that plan within the application packet. 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 the way house sits, there are not a lot of places to park, and he thought he had created an appropriate place to park.

Mr. Baughman stated this brought to our attention back in the mid-summer, and the City saw there was work going on inside the right of way. Mr. Baughman stated it did not meet Street Standards. Mr. Baughman stated he received a plan that was approved on October 16th and there has been no modifications done on site as of yet.

Ms. Pearce requested to know the differences.

Mr. Baughman explained the plan that was included in the commissioner's packet. Mr. Baughman stated explained that the commission can look at the lines of the right of way and see a dash circular arch that represents the existing edge of the brick work and that this was the segment requested to be removed and reconfigured as shown in the solid line.

Mr. Roberts requested to know what was being accomplished by having this removed.

Mr. Baughman stated they would be accomplishing internal vehicular movement from occurring so close to the travel way of Lewisburg Avenue and use the right of way boundary as the closest encroachment to the street so there will be a true driveway apron for entering and exiting rather than internal movement so close to the street.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

After some discussion among Mr. Womack, Ms. Nesbitt, and Ms. Reynolds concerning setting a precedence, Mr. Thompson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4642 for the parking alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 10, 2014. Ms. Nesbitt seconded the motion, and the motion passed (9-0).

Item 6:

Consideration of Alterations (Entry Canopy) at 150 Franklin Rd.; John Abernathy & John Abbott, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated he applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of an entry canopy at a secondary elevation of a modern addition of the building at 150 Franklin Rd. (Battle Ground Academy). Ms. Hall stated the entry canopy is to replace a previous non-historic one that has already been removed recently by Battle Ground Academy. Ms. Hall noted the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its October 20, 2014 meeting. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the alterations (entry canopy) with the following:

1. 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.

Mr. Abernathy stated he agreed with staff comments and had no comments.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4703 for the replacement of the secondary elevation entry canopy with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 10, 2014. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the motion passed (9-0).

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations (Light Fixture) at 723 Fair St.; Tony & Lynne McAlister, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of an existing light fixture hanging at the front porch with an 18" copper and glass gas lantern.

Staff recommends **approval** of the **alterations (light fixture)** with the following:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. The proposed lighting may also qualify for a gas line permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. A building permit will be required for the installation of the gas lamp.

Ms. McAlister stated they would try to get a light without a yoke.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

Ms. Marquardt moved move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4704 for the placement of the light fixture with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 10, 2014. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion passed (9-0).

Item 8:

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

This Item was pulled from the agenda at the applicant's request.

Item 9:

Consideration of New Construction (Principal & Accessory) at 126 Harlinsdale Ct.; Doug & Tamela Swanson, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 2-story single-family residence with porte-cochere and detached garage at 126 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 5 Harlinsdale Manor). Ms. Hall stated the item appeared before the Design Review Committee at its October 20, 2014 meeting. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends denial of the proposed new construction (principal and accessory structures) with the following:

1. The total building coverage on the lot is approximately 37.1%, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35% in specified residential zoning districts (including R-2, the zoning of this particular lot), as measured by building footprint. Staff recommends that the applicants modify the footprint of the proposed building(s) to meet the recommendation of the *Guidelines* then return to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness at a later date.
2. If issued a COA:
 - Staff recommends that the lap siding exposure be limited to no more than 5” on the principal structure so as to be more consistent with historic lap siding exposure.
 - As a condition of approval, any deviation from the overall height (34’-9”), 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.
 - As a condition of approval, garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - As a condition of approval, metal roofing specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project’s corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
 - A scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - finished floor elevation;
 - overall building height for both structures (principal and accessory);
 - 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.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants did provide a letter this morning and that she has placed a copy at each commissioner’s chair.

Mr. Quirk, the applicants’ architect, stated they were over by about 340 sq. ft. on lot coverage and that the owners like the house the way it is, but if they have to reduce it by the 340 sq. ft., they would take off the porte-cochere and reduce the depth of the front porch. Mr. Quirk stated the porte-cochere is pretty much

an open structure and another point is these lots have an extensive flood plain are behind them and makes the lots look deeper.

Mr. Swanson stated this lot has adjacent to the right a dry creek bed and tree line which would provide a buffer for the other lot.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

Ms. Marquardt stated she does not see any other homes in the area with a porte-cochere and that this makes this request inconsistent with the other homes.

Mr. Swanson stated he wanted this home to be more authentic and historical.

Chairwoman Besser stated you typically do not see porte-cochere's on Queen Anne homes.

Mr. Thompson stated he has seen some with flat roofs in Indiana.

Ms. Pearce stated she has seen one on Everbright at Headmaster's home that the commission approved. Ms. Pearce stated you do not want the house to have a "cookie cutter" feeling and she does not have a problem with it. Ms. Pearce stated she missed the band going around the garage at DRC and would defer to the architects on the commission.

Mr. Hathaway stated he was not concerned as much with the porte-cochere as with the garage's scale to the main house. Mr. Hathaway stated the band would be okay, but the scale is not appropriate.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the house portion of the application as submitted with staff comments, but does not include the garage. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Mr. Womack questioned the lot coverage.

Ms. Pearce stated due to how the lot sits it looks bigger than what it is and it is not a profound amount of extra coverage.

Mr. Quirk stated they wanted the garage to look like a barn-like structure to fit into the surrounding setting.

Ms. Reynolds stated she wanted to clarify what she would be voting on and why. Ms. Reynolds stated she is for the house since the garage is not included and she would have an issue when the garage comes before the commission.

Ms. Nesbitt stated she does not see how we can vote on the house and not the garage.

Ms. Pearce stated when the garage comes forward it must be in keeping with house or it would not be approved.

With the motion having been made a vote was taken with 5 voting yes and 4 voting no, the motion passed.

Mr. Hathaway moved to deny the approval of the garage and requested that it come back to DRC. Mr. Womack seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (9-0).

Item 10:

Consideration of Addition and Deck at 1302 Adams St.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of a rear addition and deck onto the corner lot residence at 1302 Adams St. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its September 15, 2014 meeting and this item was deferred at the October 13, 2014 Historic Zoning Commission meeting due to lack of applicant attendance. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends denial of the addition and deck with the following:

1. The footprint of the proposed enclosed addition is 900 sq. ft., which equates to approximately 61.2% of the existing structure and is not 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 addition exceeds the *Guidelines* recommendation by 11.2%. Staff recommends that the applicant modify the size of the proposed addition then return to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness at a later date.
2. The deck is proposed to be situated off the rear of the proposed addition. Since the addition is not recommended for approval by staff at this time, the deck cannot be recommended for approval for this reason.
3. The use of composite siding to grade on the garage portion of the addition is not entirely consistent with the existing structure's materials and details as recommended by the *Guidelines* (p.52, #2).
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 must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
 - a. If issued a COA, a scaled set of elevations notating the height of the existing building eave and ridge lines, the height of the addition ridge lines, and all approved building materials must be submitted to the Preservation Planner 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 COA.
 - o If issued a COA, staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed deck stairs.
 - o If issued a COA, garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - o If issued a COA, unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, addition design must be altered to include an 18" masonry base at all locations in accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, and revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Coffey stated there is an accessory structure on the site that we are saving and that in the design process thought could go, but decided to save. Mr. Coffey stated to save the structure, we are pushed with bumping up over the 50%. Mr. Coffey stated with the garage he feels in this case it would be more historical to drop the foundation of the garage and put on a slab and do the siding near grade.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

Ms. Pearce stated she was concerned with the garage size. Ms. Pearce requested to know if the garage was 22ft. long.

Mr. Coffey stated yes this would add storage space.

Ms. Pearce stated she would like to see the side length shortened due to front yard exposure.

Mr. Coffey stated this side is the only side to add to without taking up the whole yard. Mr. Coffey stated he attempted to break up the scale with a gable and shed.

Mr. Thompson stated that about 6ft. would need to be removed to reduce.

Mr. Hathaway stated the 50% is just a number for a guideline to keep excessiveness from occurring. Mr. Hathaway stated the challenge is how small the house is and that he has created a nice story to the house.

Mr. Roberts stated he has concern for the consumption of the whole lot with the addition.

After further discussion, Mr. Hathaway moved to approve without staff comments due to the 11.2% is acceptable overage due to the scale of the project and the way the applicant has broken down the design into a more manageable piece that still preserves the original intent of the house. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to add an amendment for any changes to come back to staff for approval. Mr. Hathaway seconded the amendment, and the amendment passed with 6 voting yes and 3 (Mr. Thompson, Ms. Nesbitt, and Mr. Roberts) voting no.

With the main motion having been made and amended, the motion passed with 6 voting yes and 3 (Mr. Thompson, Ms. Nesbitt, and Mr. Roberts) voting no.

Item 11:

Consideration of Partial Demolition (Principal), Addition (Principal), Demolition (Accessory), & New Construction (Accessory) at 235 3rd Ave. S.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 235 3rd Ave. S. The proposed scope of work is as follows:

- Partial demolition of the principal structure through the proposed removal of a rear addition (there are currently two rear additions; the one proposed for removal is the smaller of the two, which measures 128 sq. ft.);
- The construction of a 876 sq. ft. rear addition on the principal structure;
- The demolition of the accessory structure garage (previously approved for demolition by the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission at its December 12, 2011 meeting); and
- The construction of a 776 sq. ft. accessory structure garage.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its October 20, 2014 meeting. Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed partial demolition of the principal structure (specifically, the 128 sq. ft. rear addition) with the following:

1. The rear addition is not historic and does not appear to possess any architectural or historical significance to the original portion of the residence.
2. The application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit, and the buildings must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends denial of the proposed addition to the principal structure with the following:

1. The footprint of the proposed enclosed addition is 876 sq. ft., which equates to approximately 78.6% of the original structure (which discounts the two rear additions, one of which is to remain) and is not 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 addition exceeds the *Guidelines* recommendation by 28.6%. Staff recommends that the applicant modify the size of the proposed addition then return to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness at a later date.
2. If the project is issued a COA:
 - The applicant must submit left elevation and rear elevation drawings to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - 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 HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
 - A scaled set of elevations, site plan, and demolition plan notating all approved building materials, including foundation material and lap reveal must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends deferral of the proposed demolition of the accessory structure with the following:

1. The structural engineer's report submitted to substantiate the demolition request dates to October 2011 and states that "the structure is currently stable and not imminently unsafe." Further, it appears that the garage may have existed by 1940, per the September 1928/April 1940 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the subject property (see Exhibit 1).
2. Staff respectfully requests that the applicant submit additional or updated information to substantiate the criteria by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review demolition requests. Demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met (p.50):
 - If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character (loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues);
 - If the denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the Historic Zoning Commission (please refer to the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist as provided. The HZC will use this checklist to assist with the review of economic hardship claims);
 - If the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure of building;
 - If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.
3. If issued a COA, the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit, and the building must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends deferral of the proposed construction of the accessory structure with the following:

1. Pursuant to the requirements of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, residential lots shall be limited to a maximum of one accessory structure. Either relocation (off-site) or demolition of the existing accessory structure must take place prior to consideration of the construction of a new accessory structure.
2. If the project is issued a COA:
 - Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed foundation material prior to issuance of a COA.
 - Unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the addition design (specifically, the hyphen area sided with cementitious siding) must be altered to include an 18" masonry base in accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance. Revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.
 - Staff recommends that any deviation from the overall height (21'-0"), 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.
 - The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - i. A property survey may be required to confirm if the siting of the garage meets the side setback requirements for the property.
 - ii. 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.
 - iii. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
 - A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - i. all approved building materials of the accessory structure, including foundation material and lap reveal;
 - ii. the overall height of the accessory structure in relation to its principal structure;
 - iii. the finished floor elevation of the accessory structure in relation to its principal structure.

Mr. Coffey stated the accessory structure is beyond repair and this structure doesn't really have any character to it or compliment the house. Mr. Coffey stated on the percentages, he has three on the page and if he used the existing footprint he would be adding 36.3%, if he takes off the old kitchen addition and count the master bed and bathroom addition they would keep would be 45.3% and the 78.6 number is the technical number he would go back out the master bedroom addition and back out the kitchen addition and add back in the number of the square footage on top of that this is why it goes up to 78.6 %. Mr. Coffey explained the changes from previously. Mr. Coffey showed pictures.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if anyone from the audience would like to speak, and no one did.

Ms. Pearce stated she feels like the 45% is really more realistic to what is being added. Ms. Pearce stated they did say at DRC to consider brick instead of stone and the addition will be tucked behind the house and the garage is so far back that the scale would be appropriate.

Ms. Nesbitt stated this was a deep lot.

Ms. Pearce stated there should be documentation done before demolition.

Mr. Thompson stated the engineer made several strong points on structural issues.

Mr. Roberts moved move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4707 for the partial demolition of the principal structure (specifically, the 128 sq. ft. rear addition area) with staff's comments, as well as the demolition of the accessory structure with staff comments in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 10, 2014. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (9-0).

Mr. Womack moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4707 for the rear addition to the principal structure in addition to the construction of the accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 10, 2014.

Chairwoman requested Mr. Womack state why he made this motion.

Mr. Womack stated it is allowable due to the context of the lot, the scale and proportions are less intrusive than the previous project approved here and the addition cannot be seen from the street.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion passed (9-0).

Item 12:

Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 418 Boyd Mill Ave.; Howard Switzer, Applicant.

This item was pulled by Staff due to lack of approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Item 13:

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

Mr. Christopher Hopkins, neighbor of Mr. Gilbert, spoke in favor of this item earlier in the meeting.

The applicant past out additional information Ms. Hall had not seen.

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

- Alterations to the front porch trim work to restore it to its historic appearance per historic photography;
- Replacement of the existing shingle roofing on the rear and side elevation portions of the house with standing seam metal roofing;
- Alterations to the fenestration pattern at the rear of the structure through the expansion and removal of various window openings and through the placement of additional windows;
- Replacement of an existing window on the left elevation;
- 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 addition onto the location of the existing rear porch proposed for demolition (measuring XYZ sq. ft.); and

- The construction of a side elevation addition at the right elevation of the building (measuring XYZ sq. ft.).

Ms. Hall noted the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its October 20, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed alterations to porch, the proposed rear elevation plane roofing replacement, the proposed placement of entirely new window openings with the rear elevation plane, and the proposed partial demolition of the building through the removal of the rear bathroom addition with the following:

- The proposed porch alterations are consistent with the *Guidelines*. The proposed architectural detailing is original to the building, as substantiated by historic documentation. 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.
- The *Guidelines* recommend that roofing sections on main and other visible elevations remain unaltered (p.78). While the rear elevation building plane area proposed for replacement with standing seam metal is not visible from the street. Standing seam metal is supported as a roofing metal by the *Guidelines* (p.78, #8).
- The *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of new window openings to the primary or readily visible secondary elevations (p.86, #3). The proposed windows for placement on the rear elevation building plane are new and will have no visibility from the street.
- The rear bathroom addition does not appear to possess any architectural significance to the original portion of the residence. The application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit, and the building must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.
- 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.
- 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 HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends deferral of the proposed partial demolition of the building through the removal of the rear porch at the left elevation wing and the proposed construction of the additions with the following:

- Staff respectfully requests that the applicant submit additional or updated information to substantiate the criteria by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review demolition requests. Demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met (p.50):
 - If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character (loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues);
 - If the denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the Historic Zoning Commission (please refer to the

Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist as provided. The HZC will use this checklist to assist with the review of economic hardship claims);

- If the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure of building;
- If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.
- Based on the lack of specific data provided by the applicant, staff cannot determine if the proposed side/right elevation addition and the left elevation wing addition combined equate to more than 50% of the original building minus the areas proposed for demolition. The *Guidelines* recommend limiting the square footage of additions to no more than half of the square footage of the footprint of the original building (p. 52, #3). Staff respectfully requests that the applicant submit additional information to substantiate addition requests so that the requests can be reviewed in light of the *Guidelines*.
- Further, due to the location of the proposed left elevation wing addition, consideration of the proposed left elevation wing addition cannot take place until the applicants submit additional information to substantiate the criteria by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review the partial demolition request for the rear porch.
- If the partial demolition request is issued a COA, the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit, and the rear porch must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.
- If the proposed addition requests are issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness.
 - 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 design 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 addition 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.
- 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 of the accessory structure, including foundation material and lap reveal;
 - the height of the addition(s)' masonry base; and
 - the overall height of the addition(s) in relation to its existing residence.

Ms. Hall stated Staff recommends denial of the proposed left elevation wing roofing replacement and the placement of entirely new window openings within the rear elevation plane with the following:

- The *Guidelines* recommend that roofing sections on main and other visible elevations remain unaltered (p.78). The left elevation wing is visible from Franklin Road. If the

- applicant can provide information to substantiate the original roofing material as metal, staff recommends that the applicant submit the information for consideration.
- 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 *Guidelines* further recommend against the placement of new window openings to the primary or readily visible secondary elevations (p.86, #3).
 - If the project is issued a COA, 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 HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. McCall, the property owner, introduced herself and gave a brief history on the house, stating she grew up in the house.

Mr. Gilbert stated they passed out additional information to try and help with this application. Mr. Gilbert stated the photograph shows a picture of the original porch and they plan on restoring it back to the picture. Mr. Gilbert stated they were proposing to go back with a standing seam metal roof and explained there are currently two different styles of metal shingles on the house. Mr. Gilbert stated the existing rear addition is not a contributing element to the house and the removal would have any impact on the house.

Chairwoman Besser stopped here and suggested discussing the porch first.

Mr. Womack requested to discuss the DRC comments and direction.

Ms. Pearce stated the main concern was the addition on right side did not meet the guidelines and suggested this be re-thought. Ms. Pearce stated that the addition proposed near the lean-to porch, the addition that comes out would have the window section demolished and that there was discussion on the DRC date. Ms. Pearce stated there were concerns about the approach of doing a courtyard that brings one addition to the side and that the windows are very contemporary-looking. Ms. Pearce stated that the McCall house is considered one of the little heartbeats coming into Franklin. Ms. Pearce stated this has a gallery look.

Mr. Womack stated it has a museum look.

Ms. Pearce stated there has not been any substantial changes to the plan since DRC comments were made.

Mr. Gilbert agreed that there have not been.

Discussion ensued on the historic pump and well.

Mr. Thompson stated there were two big issues at DRC, and that those were the location of the addition on the right being too close to front and if it could it be moved further back to be not be seen from road, and the discussion on the windows. Mr. Thompson stated these seem to be the same plans discussed at DRC.

Mr. Gilbert stated that is correct and that he did not ignore your comments but that there are certain criteria he has to deal with.

After discussion, Mr. Thompson moved to defer this item to the November 17, 2014 DRC meeting. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (9-0).

Item 14:

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

- **Fencing at 215 5th Ave. S.; Howard Switzer, Applicant.**
- **Sandwich Board Signage at 410 Main St.; Michael & Julie Walton, Applicants.**
- **Signage at 220 Bridge St.; Jason Allen & Nick Shelton, Applicants.**

Item 13:

Other Business.

Ms. Hall stated staff is looking to set up a special meeting to look at the Harpeth Square submittal to FMPC and stated she would send out an email.

Ms. Pearce stated she may have some tickets for the HZC for the guitar and pen show Mr. Robert Hicks is doing on Thursday and to email her if you would like a ticket.

Item 14:

Adjourn

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Acting Secretary