

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
April 9, 2018**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, April 9, 2018, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley
Jeff Carson (arrived after Item #4)
Jim Roberts
Mary Pearce
Ken Scalf
Lisa Marquardt
Rusty Womack

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Joey Bryan, Planning & Sustainability Department
James Svoboda, Planning & Sustainability Department
Tiffani Pope, Law Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Vice - Chairwoman Pearce called the April 9, 2018 meeting to order at 5 pm.

**Item 2:
Minutes: March 12, 2018**

Ms. Rose stated the March 2018 minutes will be added to the May agenda for consideration.

**Item 3:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated the next DRC will be April 16th at 5 pm with 5 items. Ms. Rose stated the survey report for the Downtown Franklin update is finalized and has been sent to the National Park Service for consideration.

**Item 4:
Consideration of Requests to place non-agenda emergency items on the agenda.**

Mr. Ron Shuff requested the commission add to the agenda consideration of work at 223 Bridge St.

Mr. Roberts moved to have item the heard. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion passed 6-0.

**Item 5:
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 6:

Consideration of Demolition & New Construction (Carter House Visitor Center) at W. Fowlkes St. (078G-G00901); Baird Dixon, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of the Carter House Visitors Center at W. Fowlkes St. (078G-G00901) and its replacement with a new Visitors Center. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its March 19, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the existing Visitors Center building is non-historic because it was constructed ca. 1981 and is not contributing to the historical or architectural character of the Carter House State Historic Site. Ms. Rose stated it is a one-story frame building with a predominantly hipped roof shape. Ms. Rose stated as a non-contributing building to the site, it is not determined to add value to the National Historic Landmark. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed demolition of the principal structure with the following:

1. The existing structure is not determined to add to the historic or architectural value for the period of significance defined for the Carter House Historic Site, and because of this, its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character.
2. The building shall be satisfactorily documented with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.
3. The application shall meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Rose stated the Secretary of Interior's (SOI) Standards for Rehabilitation serve as the most valuable guidance in considering this request. Ms. Rose stated the SOI Standards state that "new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property" and that "new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment." Further, the SOI Standards state that "new additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired." Ms. Rose stated the location of the proposed building is much closer to the street than the current building. Ms. Rose stated this location allows the applicant to take advantage of the downward slope in topography by presenting a one-story scale and 24' height toward the Carter House. Ms. Rose stated its height, scale, massing, and siting all serve to differentiate the new building while respecting the same defining features of the Carter House. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the use of natural wood board-and-batten siding, wood window and door casings, fascia board, etc. with flat profiles in keeping with the simple detailing of traditional outbuildings. Ms. Rose stated the roofing material is proposed to consist of a metal 5V crimp profile, and the gutters and downspouts are proposed to be half round and round profiles, respectively. Ms. Rose stated the windows are proposed to be wood with either a true divided-light or simulated divided-light dimension. Ms. Rose stated the doors are proposed to be of a single-light glass-and-wood style, with wood barn-style doors flanking them. Ms. Rose stated that while the SOI Standards do not speak as

specifically about materials, the proposed materials are compatible with that of historic outbuildings and follow the general recommendations of the *Guidelines* for residential infill accessory structures. Ms. Rose stated the it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the new construction with the following:

1. As recommended by the *Guidelines*, all building utilities should be located in such a manner that placement and screening (through landscaping or fencing) limit their view to the public (p.128).
2. The application shall meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Any alterations to the approved plans must be submitted to the Historic Zoning Commission or the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to work commencing.

Mr. Baird Dixon stated he had no additional comments.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL#6669 for the demolition in accordance with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Mr. Womack seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL#6669 for the new construction in accordance with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Dan Brown, the State Sites Coordinator with the Tennessee Historical Commission, commented on the state's involvement with the plan and thanked the commission and staff for its assistance.

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations (Screened Porch Enclosure) & Addition at 219 3rd Ave. S.; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 150sq. ft. addition to the right elevation of the building located at 219 3rd Ave. S. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant is also proposing to enclose an existing rear screened porch. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its March 19, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated that it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed addition and screened porch enclosure with the following:

1. The windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. Construction drawings depicting the scope of work—including any proposed demolition of the screened porch—must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. 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 HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Coffey stated he had no comments.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce requested a photo of the house be projected for everyone to see.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no requested to speak.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6670 for the addition and screened porch enclosure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Fencing at 419 Boyd Mill Ave.; Tipton Fowlkes, Applicant.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of primary yard fencing at 419 Boyd Mill Avenue. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing a wooden picket-style fence 32" in height that runs along the front and side property lines between the driveway and the adjacent property. Mr. Bryan stated the fencing ties back into the left elevation of the principal structure approximately 16' from the front plane of the building. Mr. Bryan stated the fencing also parallels the interior side of the driveway from the front property line and ties into the house at the front right corner of the building. Mr. Bryan stated the proposed fencing features three gates—one on the front property line, one on the left side, and one on the right side, and that all gates are proposed to be constructed of wood and swing inwardly. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed fencing with the following:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Bryan stated that as a project consideration, primary fences in residential lots did not typically connect at the front corners of buildings. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant should consider extending the section of fencing a few feet inward from the front plane of the house for a fencing layout that is more commonly found in the historic districts.

The site plan was projected for everyone to see.

Mr. Fowlkes stated he would like clarification on what the commission deemed appropriate for moving the fence post back to the rear of the property line. Mr. Fowlkes stated the owner was fine with that.

Mr. Bryan stated about 5 feet.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6671 for the fencing conditioned the post is moved 5 feet toward the rear of the property and with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of Demolition & Alterations to Previously-Approved New Construction at 725 W. Main St.; Matthew K. Taylor, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the reconsideration of demolition of the ten-unit apartment building located at 725 W. Main St. Ms. Rose stated the demolition request was previously approved by the Historic Zoning Commission at its May 9, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project's corresponding Certificates of Appropriateness has since expired, and therefore, the applicant is requesting consideration for re-approval. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also requesting that the Historic Zoning Commission consider approval for new construction at 725 W. Main St. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to construct a two-story, ten-unit building at the subject property, with a depth of 350 feet. Ms. Rose stated a parking garage is proposed to be constructed below grade to accommodate the units. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved this request at its May 9, 2016 and September 12, 2016 meetings, but since the project's corresponding Certificates of Appropriateness has expired, the applicant is requesting consideration for re-approval. Ms. Rose stated as part of the new submission, however, the applicant is requesting alterations to the previous plan, listed as follows:

1. The use of unpainted brick as opposed to the previously-approved painted brick;
2. The use of a single-level front porch as opposed to the previously-approved concept (see Exhibit 1 for previously-approved rendering);
3. The slight alteration of side elevation projections and fenestration shapes (see Exhibits 2 and 3 for the previously-approved left and right elevations, respectively); and
4. The alteration of the side elevations through the use of unpainted brick and Arriscraft as the primary materials and the introduction of cementitious siding as a minor material on the left elevation.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its March 19, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the building is non-historic because it was constructed ca. 1974 and is not contributing to the architectural character of the Hincheyville Historic District. Ms. Rose stated it is a two-story, U-shaped brick building with a mansard-type roof. As a non-contributing building to the Hincheyville Historic District, Ms. Rose stated that it is not determined to add to the historic or architectural value for the period of significance defined for the historic district. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the use of predominantly masonry building materials, specifically unpainted brick with a white Arriscraft building stone foundation. Ms. Rose stated cast stone and Azek (PCV trim) are also proposed as material accents. Ms. Rose stated Arriscraft stone is not a predominant building material within the historic district. Ms. Rose stated that its use was proposed previously as a minor material with minimal to no visibility from the street; the proposed alterations, however, request that the material serve as the foundation material. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one match historic masonry in width of mortar joints, size and scale, color, and texture, so its use may be appropriate if it has the appearance of natural stone that is used in the historic district (p.68, #32). Standing seam metal roofing is supported by the *Guidelines* (p.64, #30). Ms. Rose stated Azek trim, as a PVC material, is not a predominant material within the historic district, however; the use of cementitious paneling or similar materials is more in keeping with materials approved for infill buildings. Ms. Rose stated the alterations to the side elevations simplify the design by removing a chimney (right elevation) and removing significant portions of cast stone. Ms. Rose stated the use of unpainted brick is appropriate; the *Guidelines* suggest that new masonry match historic masonry in width of mortar joints, size and scale, color, and texture (p.68, #32). Ms. Rose stated the simplification of fenestration through the removal of oval windows and use of rectangle shapes is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that porches be designed in keeping with the configuration and placement with neighborhood buildings. Ms. Rose stated the use of a one-story porch scale is more in keeping with the design of the neighboring buildings. The *Guidelines* also recommend that porches be designed with depths of at least six feet and feature simple columns and balusters. Ms. Rose stated the front porch is proposed to be of more than sufficient depth and that the columns have been simplified in diameter. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that infill construction maintain the rhythm and spacing of window and door openings of

adjacent structures (p.63, #13) and that new windows be wood in material and of a historic profile and dimension (p.86, #4-5). Ms. Rose stated the proposed building features a regular fenestration pattern that is in keeping with the character of the historic district. Ms. Rose stated exact window specifications have not been provided. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed demolition with the following:

1. The existing structure is not determined to add to the historic or architectural value for the period of significance defined for the Hincheyville Historic District, and because of this, its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character.
2. The building shall be satisfactorily documented with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.
3. The application shall meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. Unless otherwise approved by the Historic Zoning Commission upon inspection of a sample of the Arriscraft material, the applicant shall utilize a natural stone for the building foundation that has similar textural and color qualities as that found predominantly in the historic district.
2. Unless otherwise approved by the Historic Zoning Commission upon inspection of a sample of the Azek material, the applicant shall utilize a wood, cementitious material, or similar material that is in keeping with materials found predominantly in the historic district.
3. A sample of the brick proposed for use must be submitted to the Historic Zoning Commission or the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The application shall meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Any alterations to the approved plans must be submitted to the Historic Zoning Commission or the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to work commencing.

Mr. Taylor stated they have brought samples for the commission to see and proceeded to show the samples.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL#6672 for the demolition of the principal structure in accordance with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Mr. Carson seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

It was noted this was not a contributing structure to the neighborhood.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL#6672 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction in accordance with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt requested to know if staff could approve the proposed materials upon review.

Ms. Rose stated she must recommend denial of the product due to the *Guidelines* recommendation.

Mr. Scalf moved for an amendment that the material requested by the applicant be approved since it is an infill project. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce moved to the motion to include the foundation material go to staff for approval with the color of "Magnolia." Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

The amendments were approved 7-0.

With the main motion having been made and amended, the motion passed 7-0.

Item 10:

Consideration of Alterations (Siding, Porch, Architectural Features) at 724 Fair St.; Old Hillsboro Building Company, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 724 Fair St., as follows:

1. The replacement of approximately 20 percent of the wood siding on the building additions;
2. The alteration of the front porch columns through the removal of approximately 6-8" of the base of each column and the installation of tapered plinths and rings; and
3. The removal of the rowlock brick course over each of the two windows underneath the front porch and their replacement with timber lintels.

Ms. Rose stated that she and Randall Tosh met with the applicant on-site to discuss the proposal on March 22, 2018. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed siding replacement with the following:

1. In accordance with the *Guidelines*, the replacement must be minimized to areas so severely damaged that replacement is the only option. If only a small area of siding is deteriorated, repair or replace only the damaged section rather than the entire board. Replacement material must match the existing in materials, profiles, and designs (p.94, #4-5).
2. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission or Preservation Planner for review and approval.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed porch column alterations with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of original porch elements such as columns and state that one may repair deteriorated porch elements as needed and with materials that match the original (p.78, #2-3). While the repair of the columns is necessitated in order to preserve them, the proposed treatment alters the design and appearance of the columns.
2. If issued a COA, the applicant must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any proposed changes to the approved plan must be submitted to the Historic Zoning Commission or the Preservation Planner prior to work commencing.

Ms. Rose stated the it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer the proposed window header alterations with the following:

1. The applicant is proposing to remove the rowlock brick course over each window underneath the front porch and replace them with a timber lintel that would match that over the front entrance in

order to correct significant damage and structural instability. While the *Guidelines* recommend that historical architectural features may be preserved and maintained and that new architectural features not be added (p.48, #1), the applicant has indicated that the alteration is proposed in order to correct significant damage and structural instability. Damage is evident from photographic documentation and visual inspection. As an 1830 building, it is extremely important to partake in maintenance to secure the structural viability of the building. Little information has been provided to demonstrate how the proposed timber lintels would look, however. It is requested that the applicant provide more information about why the alteration is proposed in lieu of rowlock brick replacement and how the damage may be addressed in alternative manners that lessens impact to the building's style and historic character.

2. If issued a COA, the applicant must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any proposed changes to the approved plan must be submitted to the Historic Zoning Commission or the Preservation Planner prior to work commencing.

Ms. Rose projected photos of this site.

Mr. Eddie Miles of Old Hillsboro Building Company explained they were happy to do what is requested and requested that photos be projected. Mr. Miles pointed out the front door lintel and explained he was worried about the mortar joint repair being unsightly. Mr. Miles stated the owner does not have the money to do new columns and explained. Mr. Miles stated there are just aesthetic issues.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6673 for the siding replacement with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6673 for the proposed porch column alterations, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report dated April 9, 2018. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued on the age of the columns.

Mr. Womack moved to amend the motion to include as an option to replace the columns with more appropriate square columns in scale with the house with staff approval. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion, and the amendment passed 7-0.

With the motion having been amended, the motion carried 7-0.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Womack moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6673 for repairing the break and adding a metal lintel with a drip line

and in accordance with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 9, 2018. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Item 11:

Consideration of Preliminary Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction at Splendor Ridge Subdivision, located at 151 Franklin Rd.; Mike Hathaway, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Preliminary Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of 19 single-family dwellings at Splendor Ridge Subdivision, located at 151 Franklin Rd., behind Riverview, a National Register-listed historic property. Ms. Rose stated a preliminary plat was approved for the subdivision last year, and the project is currently being considered by the City's Departmental Review Team for site plan consideration. Ms. Rose stated a Preliminary COA is required to be issued prior to site plan approval. Ms. Rose stated this Preliminary COA application seeks to approve the most fundamental elements of building design—height, scale, massing, and setbacks. Ms. Rose stated it is important that the Historic Zoning Commission consider these elements prior to finalize of a site plan, as site considerations such as grading, topographical features, and building placement have potential to affect these elements. Ms. Rose stated height, scale, massing, and setbacks are pivotal considerations to historic zoning design review. Ms. Rose stated typical architectural styles and detailing have been submitted for consideration as well; all individual buildings will require their own respective COAs for full infill building review, however, prior to issuance of building permits. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its March 19, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of the Preliminary COA with the following:

1. The proposed building scales on the river side—at 2 ½ and 3 stories—are not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The proposed building heights are not entirely consistent with the intent of the *Guidelines*, as the applicant is proposing to use a 4' retaining wall at the newly-created street that will affect the overall perceived height. The alteration of the topography creates a situation in which the buildings are situated 4' above the new road with a 15' front yard setback. Because of this, compatibility may be better achieved through the proposed maximum building height 10 percent lower than Riverview's overall height, which will help offset the additional height created by the retaining wall use.
2. The requested use of "tower forms" that may extend up to one half-story above the main rooflines may create the perception of a taller scale. Without an example that shows this arrangement, it cannot be considered adequately. Further, the proposed "tower forms" are not common architectural features within the Franklin Road Historic District.
3. If issued a Preliminary COA, please note that all building materials and façade design elements (including, but not limited to, building architectural features and styles, tower forms, and materials) are not considered to be part of a Preliminary COA and are subject to review and issuance of an additional COAs by the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of building permits.

Ms. Rose stated as a project consideration, vernacular styles are quite common to the Franklin Road Historic District and are recommended to be considered in lieu of lesser common European Arts and Crafts and European Tudor styles.

Mr. Hathaway stated he wanted to clarify they were not looking for three-story buildings and would like two and half stories. Mr. Hathaway stated there was a lot of space in the attic of Riverview. Mr. Hathaway stated this is a unique site and would have a good view.

Mr. Gamble stated he really appreciated staff working with them. Mr. Gamble stated each one of the houses will be a custom design. Mr. Gamble stated they are working with Mr. Dickie Sullivan on the site

grades. Mr. Gamble explained by pointing out things on a project plan. Mr. Gamble stated they have made revisions to the site plan and submitted it on Thursday. Mr. Gamble explained all the things required by stormwater. Mr. Gamble stated they have worked with the State, the City, and Federal government for 3-4 months on a better stormwater plan and pointed that out on the projected plan. Mr. Gamble pointed out blue lines showing the elevations. Mr. Gamble stated they will be maintaining a 640' elevation along the front of the homes and explained. Mr. Gamble stated every single lot will drain from the back on the riverside to the front. Mr. Gamble stated he has examples of a retaining wall on the front and explained (see Appendix item).

Mr. Hathaway stated they agree with staff comments relatively to height. Mr. Hathaway stated they would still like the commission to consider the different styles.

Ms. Rose thanked the applicants for staying in keeping of comments provided by staff and explained.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce stated to introduce elements completely foreign to that district would compete with what is there, low ranch houses.

Ms. Marquart stated she would echo Vice-Chairwoman Pearce's comment.

Mr. Roberts stated they needed some kind of rendering coming up Parsons Drive.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Roberts suggested to defer this item to have another site visit.

Ms. Rose stated that deferral would pause the site plan review.

Mr. Gamble stated he did not understand what more was needed.

Ms. Marquardt stated they have explained and a site visit would help.

Mr. Roberts moved to defer this item to a site visit for this coming Monday. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

Discussion ensued on what staff was looking for tonight.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Splendor Ridge Subdivision Preliminary COA in accordance with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the staff comments except for height, specifying that the commission will consider overall building heights up to 39' from grade and up to 2.5 stories in scale with an understanding that all individual building heights will be evaluated for appropriateness based on grading and context, and a variety of building forms and heights will be required. Mr. Womack seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-2, with Ms. Baker-Hefley and Mr. Roberts voting no.

Item 12:

Non-agenda emergency items accepted by the commission for consideration.

Ms. Rose projected some earlier photos of the home on 223 Bridge St. Ms. Rose explained that the commission approved the addition in 2015 and the addition was approved as a non-residential project. Ms. Rose stated it was approved so staff could work with the applicant to help meet the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated there were twelve different submittals to get a building permit. Ms. Rose stated the building deterioration was further along than expected once demolition took place and the contractor took on a lot

more work than he should have before pausing and consulting City staff. Ms. Rose stated the building framing now has to be removed.

Mr. Shuff stated they had planned on remodeling the existing and add on in the back. Mr. Shuff stated the house was not built to codes and one thing after another kept coming up. Mr. Shuff stated what is existing is what was left after all the issues. Mr. Shuff explained further and stated rather than trying to build in between what is currently existing, it would be better to start over.

Vice Chair Pearce requested to know if Mr. Shuff plans on building back what was there.

Mr. Tosh stated they visited the site and that the construction foreman explained how the workers were falling through floors. Mr. Tosh stated it is his opinion there should be new construction.

Ms. Rose stated what ended up happening was that the contractor misunderstood how far the demolition could go and stated in the future they would like to engage the contractor in understanding the approved work specifications of COAs.

Mr. Tosh stated he explained to the contractor that this is not common place for historic homes and this must come to the commission for approval.

Ms. Rose explained there is an approved plan on file.

Mr. Tosh explained there must be an architect-stamped plan set submitted to Building & Neighborhood Services for approval as well.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve the demolition with the stipulation the new structure will be constructed of like materials and form of the originally-approved structure. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Womack voting no.

Discussion ensued on ways to prevent this issue from happening again.

Item 13:

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Acting Secretary