

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
March 14, 2016**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, March 14, 2016, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Susan Besser
Jeff Carson
Mike Hathaway
Lisa Marquardt
Trisha Nesbitt
Jim Roberts
Mel Thompson
Rusty Womack (arrived at 5:11)
Mary Pearce (arrived at 5:11)

Staff Present: Joey Bryan, Planning & Sustainability Department
Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kristen Corn, Law Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department

Chairwoman Besser called to order the February 8, 2015, Historic Zoning Commission meeting at 5:00 p.m.

**Item 1:
Minutes: February 8, 2016**

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve the February meeting minutes as submitted. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

**Item 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.

No one wished to speak.

**Item 3:
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 4 be placed on the consent agenda.

Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Consent Agenda with Item 4. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and the motion passed 7-0.

Item 4:

Consideration of Fencing at 219 3rd Avenue South; Nikki Schmidt, Applicant.

Approved on Consent Agenda.

Item 5:

Consideration of Fencing at City Cemetery, located at northwest corner of 4th Avenue North and North Margin Street; Franklin Parks Department, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of a 224 ft. black vinyl-coated chain link fencing along the north side of City Cemetery to replacement an existing dilapidated section of chain link fencing (see Exhibit 1). Ms. Hall stated the intent is to replace the existing damaged fencing in kind—with the exception of the black vinyl coating—until new fencing is evaluated, budgeted, and approved for the entire site, as recommended by the City and Rest Haven Cemetery preservation and maintenance plan. Ms. Hall explained the proposed alteration is subject to approval by the Tennessee Historical Commission (THC) due to the presence of a preservation agreement on the site as part of a grant the City received for the development of a preservation and maintenance plan for the site. Ms. Hall stated Staff has sent the proposed plan to Mr. Louis Jackson, a THC Historic Preservation Specialist, who subsequently approved the proposal. Ms. Hall stated Mr. Jackson noted that proposed replacement is an “improvement” and that “replacing the existing fence with a similar one...will not affect the National Register listing of the property.” Ms. Hall stated the proposal is contingent on Historic Zoning Commission approval. Ms. Hall stated the design of the proposed fence is consistent with the intent of the applicable Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

1. The design and material of the proposed replacement fencing section (4’ black vinyl-coated chain link with 1 5/8” line porch and 1 3/8” top and bottom rails) is consistent with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The use of chain link is largely an in-kind replacement, though the use of black vinyl coating helps soften the appearance of the new fence.
2. The height of the proposed replacement fencing section (4’) is appropriate, as it is consistent with the height of the existing fence.
3. The placement of the proposed fence (along the north boundary, to replace a 224 ft. dilapidated section) is consistent with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The fence may be removed in the future without any adverse impact to the historic materials in the cemetery.
4. If approved for issuance of a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Walker stated he felt Ms. Hall covered everything.

Mr. Hathaway moved for approval as submitted. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion and the motion passed 7-0.

Item 6:

Consideration of Signage at 239 Franklin Road (Harlinsdale Farm); Franklin Parks Department, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 10 ft. tall monument-style sign at the entrance of Harlinsdale Farm and the applicant has presented five options, as follows:

- **Option 1**—stacked stone with applied green sign panels and painted brick base;
- **Option 2**—stacked stone with applied green sign panels and stone base;
- **Option 3**—stacked stone with applied black sign panels and stone base;
- **Option 4**—stacked stone with applied black sign panels (including horse emblem) and stone base; and
- **Option 5**—stacked stone with wood center/integrated sign panel, applied aluminum lettering, black sand-carved panels, and stone base (wood may be natural or painted)

Ms. Hall stated currently, the *Historic District Design Guidelines* are only specific to signage within residential and commercial areas and as such, the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are the most appropriate standards by which to review signage proposed within civic/institutional areas. Ms. Hall stated Lisa Clayton and Kevin Lindsey of the Franklin Parks Department discussed the proposal with the Design Review Committee meeting at its December 21, 2015 meeting. Ms. Hall stated the design of the proposed sign is consistent with the intent of the applicable Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

1. The design and material of all options of the proposed sign are consistent with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The use of stone, wood, and/or brick is appropriate.
 - a. The use of Option 5 (stacked stone with wood center/integrated sign panel, applied aluminum lettering, black sand-carved panels, and stone base) appears to be more consistent with equestrian farm signage in other areas.
2. The placement of the proposed sign is appropriate and with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The sign may be removed in the future without any adverse impact to the cultural landscape or historic resources at the site.
3. If approved for issuance of a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Walker stated the Parks Department likes options 3 & 5.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve Option 5 as submitted. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Ms. Hall showed Options 3 & 5 on the projector screen.

Ms. Nesbitt stated she liked Option 3.

Ms. Marquardt stated she liked Option 3, but liked the green background from Option 2.

Ms. Pearce stated her concern is with the height.

Mr. Walker explained the sign is in a large open space and sits down from the road.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Womack moved to defer this item to the next DRC for further discussion. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

Item 7:

Consideration of Awnings, Signage, & Alterations (Façade) at 412 Main St; Rebecca & Jondie Davis, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the building at 412 Main St., as follows:

1. The removal of existing balloon awnings at the upper and lower levels of the building and the placement of black open-ended shed awnings at the upper level only;
2. The placement of fascia wall signage and projecting arm signage;
3. The in-kind repair and replacement of wood trim elements on the storefront;
4. The alteration of the façade through the expansion of the fascia board at the top of the storefront from 9 inches to 15 inches in height; and
5. The replacement of the existing molding at the top of the storefront to replicate the existing molding above the window and door frames.

Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **approve with conditions** the proposed **awnings, façade alterations, and wall signage** with the following:

- For consistency with the *Guidelines*, the awnings must be sized to fit the upper-level window openings only.
- The design and placement of the proposed wall signage is consistent with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed façade alterations are consistent with the *Guidelines*.
- The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a sign permit.
- Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **defer review** of the proposed **projecting arm signage** with the following:

- Due to insufficient sign specification information, it is recommended that the applicant submit an application to the Preservation Planner for consideration of administrative approval of the proposed projecting arm signage. The application must consist of a rendering of exactly how the sign is proposed to look.

Mr. & Ms. Davis stated they did not have anything to add.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6063 for the placement of the upper-level awnings with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

Mr. Hathaway moved to amend the motion to include the siding alterations and wall signage as proposed. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the amendment passed.

With the main motion having been made and amended the motion passed.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6063 for the proposed projecting arm signage with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016 back to staff for review and approval. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Fencing and Alterations at 210 Franklin Road; Howard Switzer, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of the principal structure's 6" CMU foundation. Ms. Hall stated the applicant states that the foundation is inadequate to support the house, as the foundation is on a 2-3" concrete pad, the mortar is either cracked or non-existent in many locations, and a pier has collapsed, causing a girder to crack. Ms. Hall stated the proposed foundation replacement consists of new CMU with a brick veneer to match that on the porch piers and the brick chimney. Ms. Hall stated the applicant is also proposing to extend existing 6" wood privacy fencing to enclose the terrace area at the left side of the house. Additionally, a 4" wood fence and gate are proposed at the driveway location at the right side of the house. Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **deny** the proposed **foundation alteration** with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend against the application of "artificial materials such as stone veneers, aluminum, or vinyl siding or otherwise [obscuring] historic foundations" (p.59, #2).
2. If the Historic Zoning Commission finds that replacement of the foundation in kind is appropriate, the *Guidelines* support the painting of the entire foundation with a uniform color or the use of a stucco wash.
3. If 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 to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **approve with conditions** the proposed **fencing installation** with the following:

1. The proposed side yard privacy fencing and driveway fencing/gate are consistent with the *Guidelines*.
 - a. As a condition of approval, both fences must be recessed at least 20' from the primary plane of the house.
 - b. In accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, the "finished" side of the fencing must face outward toward the adjacent properties or public right-of-way. The fence may also be designed to be "finished" on both sides.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Switzer stated he was aware of the brick veneer not meeting the guidelines, but said he would ask anyway. Mr. Switzer stated the fencing is good with simple hand operated gate.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Mr. Womack moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6064 for the parging of the CMU blocks replacement with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt requested clarification on the motion and does not require the applicant to come back for approval if they skip the brick and painting.

Mr. Womack stated it would be a stucco type finish put over the CMU block.

With the motion having been made it passed 9-0.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6064 for the proposed fencing with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce requested to know what the posts would look like.

Mr. Switzer stated there be 6 x 6 wooden posts painted white.

Discussion ensued.

With the main motion having been made the motion passed 9-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of Alterations (Entrance, Window Replacement) at 348 3rd Ave. S; Howard Switzer, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the alteration of a secondary entrance on the front elevation of the residence located at 348 3rd Ave. S. Ms. Hall stated the proposed alteration involves the restoration of the existing door and readjusting the hinges to the outside so the interior can be walled and the applicant is also proposing to install a stained glass or obscured glass back panel to the door that will be backlit at night. Ms. Hall stated additionally, the applicant is requesting approval for the alteration of the window openings and the replacement of windows on the north (right) side of the house and the window openings and replacements are proposed to match those along the south (left) side of the house that feature shutters. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission to request this scope of work, along with other items, at its February 8, 2016 meeting. Ms. Hall stated the secondary entrance alteration and window replacement requests were both deferred for additional information and discussion.

1. It is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer the proposed entrance alterations with the following:
 - The *Guidelines* recommend against the installation of doors with ornate designs (p.53, #8). While the door is proposed to remain, it is proposed to be altered through the removal and replacement of its glass. The applicant, however, has not submitted design specifications of the proposed new panel. As such, there is insufficient information to determine if the proposed panel is consistent with the *Guidelines*.
2. It is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed window alterations with the following:
 - The applicant is proposing to alter the existing window openings on the north (right) elevation to match those on the south (left) elevation. The *Guidelines* recommend to preserve and maintain original window openings and to not reduce or expand original window openings. (p.86, #1).
 - If approved by the Historic Zoning Commission, all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension. New shutters must be wood in

material and appear operable. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Switzer stated the owner wants to be able to shudder all the windows and the door glass will be a simple obscure random pattern that looks like water running down the glass.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Mr. Carson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6065 for the entrance alterations to the next DRC meeting and in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Ms. Nesbitt seconded the motion for discussion.

Ms. Marquardt requested a sample be brought to the DRC meeting.

With motion having been the motion passed 9-0.

Ms. Nesbitt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6065 for the window alterations in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated due to the circumstances of neglect associated with this house she did not feel it would do any harm to replace the windows.

Mr. Womack stated due to this side of the house and the condition he did not feel it would do any harm to replace the windows.

Mr. Roberts stated he agreed.

The motion of denial failed 0-9.

Ms. Nesbitt moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6065 for the window alterations as proposed. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

Item 10:

Consideration of Alterations (Architectural Features, Entrance, Porch, Shutters, Awning, Roofing) at 417 Boyd Mill Ave.; Spencer Blake & Lauren Rainey Tenney. Applicants.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 417 Boyd Mill Avenue and the proposed scope of work is as follows:

1. It is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **approve with conditions** the **proposed shutters, awning alterations, and porch roof alterations with the following:**
 - a) The applicant must select either a new awning material or a new set of shutters where both are proposed for the same window opening. The utilization of both window awnings and shutters is not prevalent within the historic districts. As such, the windows should utilize only one of the proposed features.
 - b) If awnings are selected, the applicant must use the black canvas for the new awning material. The black canvas cloth material is more in keeping with the *Guidelines* since this style and

- age of home would typically feature canvas cloth awnings rather than metal. Metal awnings were historically prevalent on later mid-century homes.
- c) If shutters are selected, they need to be made out of wood and appear operable (p.86, #6).
 - d) Should the awning frames need to be replaced, specifications need to be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to installation.
 - e) The approved roofing material alteration is limited to the front porch roofline only as it is a lower-sloped, less-visible portion of the roof where standing seam metal is historically appropriate. It is appropriate for the porch roofing material to be metal, as proposed, since it is a lower pitch than the main roof form. Historically, the main roof form would typically be one roofing material, and a change from asphalt shingles to standing seam metal on the gable form alone would not be appropriate or consistent with the other structures within the historic district.
 - f) 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 approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
2. It is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **defer the proposed replacement of the transom window** with the following:
- The *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of original entry elements, such as transoms (p. 53, #3). The applicant has not submitted sufficient information to determine the age or condition of the existing transom window or the specifications for the proposed new window.
3. It is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **deny the proposed architectural feature alterations, porch alterations, and gable roof alterations** with the following:
- a) The proposed alterations through the addition of architectural features is **not consistent** with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend against adding architectural features (p.46).
 - b) The proposed addition of porch railing is **not consistent** with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend to “not install porch railings where railings were not historically present unless required by safety or access reasons” (p.75, #14).
 - c) The proposed alterations to the roofing materials on the front gable is **not consistent** with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that replacement materials should match the existing historic materials (p.78, #3). Historically, the main roof form would typically be one roofing material, and a change from asphalt shingles to standing seam metal on the gable form alone would not be appropriate or consistent with the other structures within the historic district.

Mr. Tenney stated he had no comments to add, but was available to answer any questions.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Mr. Thompson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6066 for the shutter alterations, awning alterations, and porch roof alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt requested clarification concerning the awnings and shutters whether staff recommended both or just one or the other.

Mr. Bryan stated one or the other, not both.

Mr. Thompson stated he wanted to make sure all the recommendations are followed.

With the motion having been made for shutter alterations, awning alterations, and porch roof alterations with staff's comments the motion passed 9-0.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6066 for the transom window replacement until the applicant attends the March 21, 2016 Design Review Committee to discuss. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

Mr. Womack moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6066 for the architectural features alterations, porch alterations, and front gable roof alterations, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Ms. Nesbitt seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated it is the goal of HZC to recommend modifications to projects in keeping with the Department of Interior's guidelines and the goal is to keep the historic fabric of buildings intact.

Discussion ensued.

With the motion having been made and seconded the motion passed 9-0.

Item 11:

Consideration of Alterations (Entry Canopies) at 230 Franklin Rd.; Don Burke, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of the existing entry structural canopies at Building 13 and Building 8 at the Factory at Franklin. Ms. Hall projected pictures for the commission to review. Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed entry canopy alterations at Bldgs. 13 and 8 with the following:

1. The applicant must utilize Option B for Building 8, as the design for Option B is more consistent with the *Guidelines*, which state that "awning should cover only the storefront display windows or transoms and fit within their openings" (p. 96, #4).
2. 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 approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Burke stated cost saving measures lead to the choice of awnings. Mr. Burke stated he included an option B, but the owners would prefer the gabled option for building 8.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6067 for the entry canopy alterations at Bldgs. 13 and 8 with staff's comments with the exception of building 8 using option A. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued.

With the motion having been made and seconded the motion passed 9-0.

Item 12:

Consideration of Alterations (Pergola, Patio Wall) at 1028 Benelli Park Ct.; Bhen Reed, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a patio wall/grill station with an outdoor fireplace between the driveway and the residence located at 1028 Benelli Park Ct. Due to the grade difference between the garage and the main portion of the house, the property owner has already installed a low stepped-stone retaining wall at the project location. Ms. Hall stated the applicant is proposing to add an 8' tall wooden screen of stained louvered shutters within a frame of cedar posts to the retaining wall. Ms. Hall stated a 15' tall brick fireplace with limestone caps and a clay chimney is also proposed for construction. Ms. Hall stated the brick is proposed to match the previously-approved brick for the principal structure and the applicant is also requesting approval for the construction of a wooden pergola at the left elevation of the residence that will measure approximately 9' in tall. Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approval with conditions the proposed patio wall and pergola with the following:

1. Due to the limited visibility of the proposed patio wall, especially in light of the pending construction at Lot 8, the proposed patio wall is appropriate.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Reed stated Ms. Hall covered everything and explained he was not trying to be deceptive about the wall at DRC and explained he could not see the wall when he took the picture.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6068 for the addition of a patio wall and pergola with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include on the patio fireplace come down straight and flat with no inset details. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion and the motion passed.

With the motion having been made and amended the motion passed 9-0.

Item 13:

Consideration of New Construction at 126 Harlinsdale Ct.; Chris Goldbeck & Preston Shea, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 2-story single-family residence with attached two-bay garage at 126 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 5 Harlinsdale Manor). Ms. Hall stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed **new construction of the principal and accessory structures** with the following:

1. The proposed optional porte cochere is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, and the principal structure is recommended for approval (with conditions outlined in this report) without the attached porte cochere. The *Guidelines* recommend that "new construction is designed to be compatible in height, massing, scale, size, proportions, and architectural features with adjacent structures and that new construction should be consistent with the context of the surrounding neighborhood (p.62, #2 & #5). Porte cocheres are not architectural features that are present on any of the principal structures on the street. Further, porte cocheres are not typical of other

structures with the historic district that are of a similar architectural style as that proposed at the subject property.

2. For consistency with the *Guidelines*, porch materials must be wood.
3. A sample of the proposed stone veneer must be presented to the Historic Zoning Commission at a later date for determination of its appropriateness.
4. 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 building permit.
5. Any deviation from the overall height, foundation height, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to construction.
6. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - The pool deck may be required to be relocated out of the side yard setback in order to meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department.
 - 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 or proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
7. A scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - 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. Shea stated they were onboard with Ms. Hall's summary and noted they made changes from DRC.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment and no one requested to comment.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6069 for the proposed new construction of the principal and accessory structures with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated March 14, 2016. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued on a few clarifications with Ms. Hall projecting photos.

Mr. Thompson moved to amend the motion to include the fencing be brought back to Ms. Hall for approval. Ms. Pearce seconded the amendment and the amendment passed unanimously 9-0.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include the architect come back to staff with a modified chimney that is narrower or make it come in at top to be more consistent as a traditional shape. Mr. Womack seconded the amendment and the amendment passed unanimously 9-0.

With the main motion having been made and amended twice the motion passed 9-0.

Item 14:

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

- 1. Signage at 345 Main St.; Mary Morgan Gentry, Applicant.**
- 2. Awnings & Signage at 140 4th Ave. S.; Mel Thompson, Applicant.**
- 3. Signage at 404 Bridge St.; Matt Daniel, Applicant.**

Item 15

Other Business.

Ms. Hall thanked everyone for coming out to the public meeting for the Design Guidelines updates.

Ms. Pearce stated we should start asking what the grade is going to be or if there is any change to a grade it must come back to this commission for review.

Ms. Hall stated she agreed.

Item 16:

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Acting Secretary