

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
May 14, 2018**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, May 14 , 2018, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present:     Jeff Carson  
                              Jim Roberts  
                              Mary Pearce  
                              Ken Scalf  
                              Lisa Marquardt

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

**Item 1:  
Call to Order**

Vice - Chairwoman Pearce called the May 14, 2018 meeting to order at 5 pm.

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

Mr. Scalf moved to approve the March 12, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

**Items 3:  
Minutes: April 9, 2018**

Mr. Roberts moved to approve the April 9, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

**Item 4:  
Staff Announcements.**

Mr. Svoboda introduced new City Attorney Ms. Misty Roy.

**Item 5:  
Consideration of Requests to place non-agenda emergency items on the agenda.**

No one requested to add any non-agenda items.

**Item 6:  
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 7:  
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 items 8-10 be placed on the consent agenda.**

Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Consent Agenda containing items 8-10. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

**Item 8:  
Consideration of Alterations (Parking) at 1016 Fair St.; John Brevard, Applicant.**

Approved on the Consent agenda

**Item 9:  
Consideration of Alterations (Exterior Lighting) at 113 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. S.; Sean Miller, Applicant.**

Approved on the Consent agenda

**Item 10:  
Consideration of Addition (Deck Roof) at 118 Lewisburg Ave.; Diane & Allen LeBlanc, Applicants.**

Approved on the Consent agenda

**Item 11:  
Consideration of Alterations (Window Sash Replacement) at 120 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S.; Pam Palmer, Applicant.**

**No one present to represent item.**

**Item 12:  
Consideration of Addition at 419 Boyd Mill Ave.; Daigh Rick Landscape Architects, Applicant.**

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 119-sq. ft. enclosed porch addition to the left elevation of the building located at 419 Boyd Mill Ave. The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its February 19, 2018 and April 16, 2018 meetings. Mr. Bryan stated this addition is proposed to be placed onto the left elevation, recessed toward the rear of the original structure, which is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated the addition consists of a hipped roof form that is in keeping with the original structure, and it projects from the main façade wall by 8'-6" as so to differentiate itself from the original form. Mr. Bryan stated the addition's roof ties underneath the eave of the original structure, further differentiating it from the existing structure (p.54, #1-3). Mr. Bryan stated the materials of the proposed addition (brick pier foundation with lattice enclosure, brick steps, wood columns and trim to

match those on the front porch, metal roof, glass) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55), though the lattice material and metal roofing type have not been specified. Mr. Bryan stated minimal vertical framing members are proposed to install the glass. Mr. Bryan stated the size of the proposed addition is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated the footprint of the proposed addition (119 sq. ft.), combined with the footprint size of recent additions (approximately 666 sq. ft.), measures approximately 38 percent of the original structure's footprint (approximately 2,081 sq. ft.). Mr. Bryan stated the proposed total building coverage on the lot (including the proposed addition and existing outbuildings) measures approximately 9 percent, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.55, #5). Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed enclosed porch addition with the following:

1. The material of the lattice foundation enclosure has not been specified. Wood is recommended. The applicant must submit the specifications to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The type of metal proposed for use on the roof has not been specified. Standing seam metal is recommended. The applicant must submit the specifications 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 Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Durden stated it is self-explanatory of what they want to do, which is build screen porch off their master suite and pointed it out on projected plan. Mr. Durden stated they were okay with some staff's suggestions and will recommend on the building permit drawings.

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

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6697 for the enclosed porch addition with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 14, 2018. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

It was noted that the comments made at DRC were responded to.

Ms. Marquardt stated she felt this addition would impact the front view of the home and detracts from the integrity of the historical part of the house and she would have to vote against it.

The motion carried 4-1, with Ms. Marquardt voting no.

### **Item 13:**

#### **Consideration of Alterations (Window/Door Replacement, Parking/Hardscapes, Wall) at 1102 W. Main St.; Charles Massey, Applicant.**

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of alterations to the property at 1102 W. Main St., as follows:

- The replacement of the French doors at the upper-level balcony;

- The replacement of two sets of double-sash left windows at the left elevation bay (kitchen areas) with sets of casement windows;
- The widening of a portion of the left side of the driveway through the introduction of cobblestone pavers;
- The replacement of the concrete at the front yard walkway with antique brick and a cobblestone border; and
- The construction of a rear terrace with seat walls.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its April 16, 2018 meeting to discuss the proposal. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing to replace the French doors located at the upper-level balcony. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that original doors be maintained unless significant deterioration is demonstrated and that one-use designs appropriate for the building's style and age for replacement doors (p.56, #5-6). Mr. Bryan stated the existing French doors are not original to the residence, so their replacement is appropriate. Mr. Bryan stated the proposed replacement door is a job-style door that utilizes side lites within the same opening as the existing door. Mr. Bryan stated the lite pattern and proportion of the glass openings on the replacement door are in keeping with the building's fenestration style and are appropriate to the building's style and age. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic windows and historic window openings. Mr. Bryan stated new windows are recommended to have historic profile and dimension and have a double-hung or double-sash appearance and further, new replacement windows are recommended to match the historic materials found on the building (p.90, #1, #4-5).

Mr. Thurman requested to show the photo of the front of the house be projected and stated the doors are not in keeping with the time period of this home. Mr. Thurman requested the photo of the replacement be shown.

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 #6698 for the proposed balcony door replacement in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 14, 2018. Mr. Carson seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing to replace two pairs of non-historic double-sash windows at the left elevation bay area (kitchen). Mr. Bryan stated the replacement windows are six-lite casement style windows. Mr. Bryan stated the proposed windows are taller, which will modify the window openings. Mr. Bryan stated casement windows are not consistent with the windows found elsewhere on the visible facades of the building and do not meet the double-hung or double-sash appearance recommended by the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed window replacement at the left elevation with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend that new windows have historic profile and dimension and have a double-hung or double-sash appearance. The proposed casement windows are not consistent with the windows found elsewhere on the visible facades of the building and do not meet the double-hung or double-sash appearance recommended by the *Guidelines*.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Thurman stated the replacement windows are in keeping with the time period and that he recognizes that they are not double hung, but at that time period they did have fixed windows and these will look like a fixed high-quality window.

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 deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6698 for the proposed left elevation window replacement in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 14, 2018. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalf requested to know why Mr. Thurman would prefer casement window over double hung.

Mr. Thurman explained the casement windows would allow more light to come in and with the crank out design it would allow for more wind flow to come into the room better.

Mr. Roberts stated the windows do not look right now as they are.

Ms. Marquardt requested to know how the sizes compare.

Mr. Thurman stated they are pretty close in size and explained.

After discussion, the motion failed 1-4, with Mr. Scalf voting yes.

Mr. Roberts moved to approve that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6698 for the proposed left elevation window replacement due to the existing windows not being historic to the building portion. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalf moved to amend the motion to have the applicant work with his millwork consultant and see if the appearance for the windows can be modified to appear to be a double hung window and brought back to staff for approval. Mr. Carson seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Mr. Thurman stated he did not know if that would be possible.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce stated if it can't be done it must come back to staff for approval.

The main motion and amendment passed 5-0.

Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that original landscape features and configurations be maintained and that one preserve and maintain historic sidewalks and walkways (p.70, #1-2). Mr. Bryan stated the building, while historic, is not original to the site, and it is likely that the sidewalk was created for the building after its relocation. Mr. Bryan stated resurfacing the existing configuration may be appropriate; the antique brick and cobblestone specifications, however, have not been provided for consideration. Mr. Bryan stated the creation of a rear yard terrace with seat walls is appropriate, as it is located out of view from the street and does not significantly alter the topography of the property (p.70, #1). Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that parking and driveways follow historic patterns, be located along rear or side elevations, and landscaped to mitigate its impact on a district's historic character. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* also recommend the use of durable materials that are historically typical as such as gravel, concrete, bricks, and asphalt (p.77, #6-7). Mr. Bryan stated the request to widen the driveway by extending the surface area to the left, past the front façade of the building, maintains open space in front of the historic residence (p.70, #6). Mr. Bryan stated the use of a cobblestone may not be entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend the use of durable

materials that are historically typical as such as gravel, concrete, bricks, and asphalt (p.77, #6-7). Mr. Bryan stated the cobblestone specifications have not been provided for consideration. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed alterations to the entrance with the following:

Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed landscaping and parking/driveway alterations with the following:

1. Unless samples of the proposed materials are approved by the Historic Zoning Commission at its May 14, 2018 meeting, it is recommended that the item be deferred. Without material samples, it is difficult to determine if the proposed alterations are consistent with the applicable *Guidelines* (p.70, p.77).
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Thurman stated he had samples of the hardscape and requested a photo be projected. Mr. Thurman stated currently there is just aggregate and they would like to match the brick that is at the house across the street.

Mr. Bryan stated the brick would be appropriate, but not the limestone.

Mr. Thurman explained the pattern.

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

Ms. Marquardt asked if the only reason this was deferred was due to not having any material selection submitted.

Mr. Bryan stated yes.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6698 for the proposed landscaping and parking/driveway alterations in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and have the materials finalized with staff. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued on the driveway with the applicant showing plans of what they wanted to do. Mr. Roberts stated the drawing did not really show everything.

Vice-Chairwoman stated she did not want the cobblestone banding done and recommended it be deleted.

Ms. Marquardt moved to amend the motion to include the entry path area only have brick pavers and no cobblestone stone border and the rest of the plan as shown with the materials seen at this meeting. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the amendment carried 5-0.

The main motion with amendment was approved 5-0.

#### **Item 14:**

#### **Consideration of Alterations (Siding) at 1302 Adams St.; Ben Stealy, Applicant.**

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of wood siding at the side gables and rear gable of the principal structure located at 1302 Adams St. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant has recently removed synthetic siding from the gables. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one maintain and preserve historic wood siding (p.94, #1) and that one replace deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding in material, profile, and design (p. 83, #2; p.94, #4). Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* also state that the use of cement wood siding may be appropriate for replacement of deteriorated wood siding on rear elevations or for new construction (p.83, #4). Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing to replace wood siding on the side elevation gables with cementitious siding of the same or narrow lap exposure as the existing siding. Mr. Bryan stated both gables possess limited areas of deterioration and chipped paint. Mr. Bryan stated the gable located on the rear elevation displays limited areas of deterioration. Mr. Bryan stated as with the side elevation gables, the applicant is proposing to replace all wood on the rear gable with cementitious siding of a matching or narrower exposure. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed siding replacement on the side elevation gables with the following:

1. The proposal to replace the existing wood siding with cementitious siding is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend that one maintain and preserve historic wood siding (p.94, #1) and that one replace deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding in material, profile, and design (p. 83, #2; p.94, #4).
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, and any proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed siding replacement on the rear dormer with the following:

1. While the *Guidelines* recommend that one maintain and preserve historic wood siding (p.94, #1) and that one replace deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding in material, profile, and design (p. 83, #2; p.94, #4), the *Guidelines* also state that the use of cement wood siding may be appropriate for the replacement of deteriorated wood siding on rear elevations (p.83, #4). The gable located at the rear of the structure offers limited visibility from Adams Street or the Adams Street Historic District. As a condition of approval, the cementitious siding must match the profile and design of the existing siding.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, and any proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Stealy stated they researched areas to find a design compass as we took down the aluminum siding that was there before. Mr. Stealy stated they uncovered brick, but due to the covering the two gables suffered different types of weathering and explained. Mr. Stealy stated the homeowner wants to put up synthetic material to prevent such things from happening again. Mr. Stealy stated it is their desire to put up something that would hold up better with the elements.

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 issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6697 for the replacement of the siding on the side elevation gables in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and that it be replaced with the same siding as the rear elevation gable. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include materials must come back to staff for approval. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

The main motion with amendment carried 5-0.

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

Mr. Bryan recapped his previous recommendation.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6697 for the replacement of the siding on the rear elevation gable with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 14, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

**Item 15:**

**Consideration of Alterations (HVAC Placement & Screening) at 117 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.; Keith Bush, Applicant.**

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of a roof-mounted mechanical system and screening onto the front, left corner of the roof of the building at 117 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. N. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is also proposing to replace some of the existing first and second-floor windows. Mr. Bryan stated due to the placement of the proposed utilities, it has been determined that this proposal does not qualify for Administrative Review. Mr. Bryan stated therefore, it has been forwarded to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing to place an exhaust fan and fresh air makeup unit atop the front and left corner of the roof of the building. Mr. Bryan stated a 4-ft. tall metal louvered wall is proposed to screen the 46"-tall mechanical system (the applicant's roof plan denotes a 3-ft. screen, possibly considering the depth of the roof deck from the roof edge). Mr. Bryan stated the roof plan demonstrates that the mechanical system is proposed to be inset from the side/alley elevation by approximately 30'-4" and inset from the front elevation by 11'-6". Mr. Bryan stated at staff's request, the applicant has provided point-of-view renderings to depict how the system may appear from viewpoints at the front and side of the building. Mr. Bryan stated distance, combined with the height of the building, will mitigate most of the side elevation view of the system; the applicant's materials indicate that the system is proposed to be placed in such a way that distance will not mitigate the front elevation view, however. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed placement of the roof-mounted utilities and screening with the following:

1. The placement of the proposed mechanical system may not be entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. The applicant's materials indicate that the proposed mechanical system is proposed in such a way that distance and building elements may not mitigate its view from the front elevation of the building. It is recommended that the applicant appear before the Design Review Committee at its May 21, 2018 meeting to further discuss the proposal and determine how the proposal may be altered to better meet the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any changes to approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting approval for the “replacement of some existing windows located on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors at the rear and back sides of the structure classroom and administration area.” A small diagram at the bottom, right corner of the photograph indicates that these areas are located along the rear and right elevations. Mr. Bryan stated as a ca. 1970s non-historic building, the replacement of windows may be appropriate (p.129, #1). Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that replacement windows be appropriate to the period of the building and utilize true divided-light or simulated divided-light profiles (p.129, #4, #7). Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* state that composite materials that have the appearance wood are appropriate for windows, stops, jambs, and trim (p.129, #8). Mr. Bryan stated the proposed replacement windows, Pella 250 Series, are vinyl in material. Mr. Bryan stated a sample has not been provided to determine how the proposed replacement window 1) relates to the existing windows, and 2) relates to the material recommendations of the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed window replacement with the following:

1. As a ca. 1970s non-historic building, the proposed replacement of windows may be appropriate (p.129, #1). The *Guidelines* recommend that replacement windows be appropriate to the period of the building and utilize true divided-light or simulated divided-light profiles (p.129, #4, #7). The *Guidelines* also state that composite materials that have the appearance wood are appropriate for windows, stops, jambs, and trim (p.129, #8). The proposed replacement windows, Pella 250 Series, are vinyl in material. A sample has not been provided to determine how the proposed replacement window 1) relates to the existing windows, and 2) relates to the material recommendations of the *Guidelines*. It is recommended that the applicant appear before the Design Review Committee at its May 21, 2018 meeting to further discuss the proposed replacement window relates to the existing window and the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*.

Mr. Bush stated one of the challenges for this project is the interior renovations and one is bringing the existing kitchen located on the front side of building facing 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Bush stated they would like to take the exhaust for the kitchen up to the roof. Mr. Bush stated they were not able to attend DRC and worked with Ms. Rose on this project. Mr. Bush stated on the windows it is the first and second floor and stated they would replicate the appearance of the existing windows.

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

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6700 for the proposed placement of the roof-mounted utilities and screening with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 10, 2018. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts questioned if the roof floor is lower or flush with the wall.

Mr. Bush stated there is not a parapet wall.

Vice-Chairwoman Pearce stated it should come to DRC for review.

Discussion ensued on what would be needed.

Mr. Roberts moved to amend the motion to include a site visit next Monday, May 21, 2018 at 3 pm and have a mock up. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion and motion carried 5-0.

With the main motion having been made and amended the motion carried 5-0.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6700 for the proposed window replacement with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 10, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

**Item 16:**

**Consideration of Partial Demolition (Rear Addition) at 724 Fair St.; Old Hillsboro Building Company, Applicant.**

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition and reconstruction of a principal structure rear addition at 724 Fair St. Mr. Bryan stated he applicant met with City team members Amanda Rose and Randall Tosh on-site to discuss the proposal on March 22, 2018. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the removal of historic buildings from historic districts one or more of the demolition criteria is determined by the Historic Zoning Commission to have been met by the information provided by the applicant (p. 52, #1). Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting approval to demolish and reconstruct a portion of a non-original rear addition based on structural integrity concerns. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant acknowledges that internal water issues have led to "severe rot and floor joists that have sunk 10 inches" and that "the current state is so structurally unsound that the corner of the house needs to be demolished and rebuilt." Mr. Bryan stated photographs of the both the interior and exterior of the building have been provided within the application packets. Mr. Bryan stated additional photographs of the interior have been provided to staff. Staff visited the site with the applicant on March 22, 2018, to view the degree of structural damage. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing to maintain the existing roof structure and portion of the rear addition deemed to be in solid shape. Mr. Bryan stated the scope of work proposed includes the bracing of the roof and the removal of approximately 10'-6" x 10'-6" of area (interior bathroom dimensions measure 10' x 10'). Mr. Bryan stated the area of disturbance is delineated by a rear window and the depth of the addition itself. Mr. Bryan stated the portion of the removed addition is proposed to be rebuilt in kind, within the same footprint, using beveled cypress siding. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions of the proposed partial demolition and reconstruction of the rear addition with the following:

1. The partial demolition and reconstruction of a portion of the non-original rear addition is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Further, the area proposed for demolition and reconstruction offers limited visibility from the street, and the removal and reconstruction of the designated portion will not adversely impact the historic district's character.
2. The portion of the addition to be removed must be reconstructed in kind.
3. All approved exterior demolition is limited to what is indicated on the application plan set. Any demolition that may compromise the exterior materials, details, or forms of the existing residence must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Zoning Commission prior to work proceeding.
4. 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 Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Sapp stated the addition it is not in good shape.

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

Mr. Carson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6701 for the partial demolition and reconstruction of the rear addition with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 10, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued on the amount of the building to be demolished and anything further must come back to the Commission for review.

The motion carried 5-0

**Item 17:**

**Consideration of New Construction at 345 Franklin Rd.; Chris Goldbeck, Applicant.**

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a two-story single-family residence with attached side-loaded three-bay garage at 345 Franklin Rd. (Harlinsdale Manor, Lot 14). Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detract from the character of the historic district (p.66, #4). Mr. Bryan stated further, the *Guidelines* state that the height of new construction should be compatible with the existing buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street and that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street (p.66, #5). Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed new construction with the following:

1. The large shed dormer element is not common to the Franklin Road Historic District on historic structures or infill structures. The use of multiple Gothic-inspired windows on the dormer call more attention to the uncommon feature. As a condition of approval, the design must be altered to separate the dormer from the Gothic gable form to lessen its prominence. The revised design must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. All 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.
3. The type of metal proposed for use on the roof has not been specified. Standing seam metal is recommended. The applicant must submit the specifications to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The type of stone veneer proposed for use has not been specified. The applicant must submit a sample of the stone veneer to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Goldbeck stated they are fine with the conditions set forth.

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 defer approval to DRC coming up on May 21, 2018 for Project PL #6702 for the proposed new construction due to the location of the structure on a highly visible gateway corridor into the city. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

**Item 18:**

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

There were no non-agenda emergency items.

**Item 19:**

**Adjourn.**

**With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.**

---

**Acting Secretary**