

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
June 11, 2018**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, June 11, 2018, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Susan Besser
Jim Roberts
Mary Pearce
Ken Scalf
Kelly Baker-Hefley

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**

Chairwoman Besser called the June 11, 2018 meeting to order at 5 pm.

**Item 2:
Minutes: May 14, 2018**

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

**Items 3:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated at this time there were no items submitted for DRC at this time. Ms. Rose stated that could change and she would let everyone know if it would be held.

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

No one requested to add any non-agenda items.

**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 Alterations (HVAC Placement/Screening & Window Replacement) at 117 4th Ave. N.; Keith Bush, Applicant.

Ms. Rose 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 4th Ave. N. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also proposing to replace some of the existing first and second-floor windows. Ms. Rose stated due to the placement of the proposed utilities, it has been determined that this proposal does not qualify for Administrative Review, and therefore, it has been forwarded to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission deferred review of the item at its May 14, 2018 meeting and requested a Site Visit to view a mock-up of the proposed HVAC placement/screening and to view the existing windows on the building. Ms. Rose stated the Site Visit took place on May 21, 2018. Ms. Rose 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. Ms. Rose 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). Ms. Rose 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".

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed placement of the roof-mounted utilities and screening with the following:

1. 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 Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Rose 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, Anderson 100 Series, are "Fibrex," or reclaimed wood fiber and PVC polymer in material. A sample has not been provided to determine how the proposed replacement relates to the material recommendations of the *Guidelines*. It is recommended that the applicant provide a physical sample of the replacement window to the Historic Zoning Commission so it may consider how it relates to the existing windows and to the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*.

Mr. Bush thanked everyone for attending the mock-up and stated at the time of the DRC meeting, there was a vinyl window sample on site for consideration. Mr. Bush stated that they have changed that since the site visit and passed around a sample of the new window. Mr. Bush stated his preference would be to use a non-simulated divided light window.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve 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 June 11, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-0.

Ms. Pearce stated the mock-up was amazing and was very helpful.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6700 for the proposed window replacement that was provided at the meeting manufactured by Anderson and in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalf stated he felt the window was appropriate but that the applicant should work with staff.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to amend the motion to include staff's approval of final configuration and installation. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and after discussion, the motion passed 5-0.

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

Item 7:

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

Ms. Rose 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). Ms. Rose stated on May 14, 2018, the Historic Zoning Commission deferred consideration of the item for additional discussion. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee meeting at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed new construction with the following:

1. The use of a large shed dormer at the front elevation is not common to the Franklin Road Historic District on historic structures or infill structures. While the applicant did modify the shed dormer to detached it from the front gable, it is designed at a large scale and thus remains prominent as an atypical feature of the Franklin Road corridor. The dormer must be scaled down or removed for better consistency with the *Guidelines*. 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 he has photos of the stone and has also brought a couple of different options from Ms. Rose's comments. Mr. Goldbeck passed out the options and photos.

Ms. Rose stated option 1 would be scaling down the size of the shed dormer and the second option would be a gable dormer with two windows in it.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6702 for the proposed new construction in accordance with the two-window shed dormer and based on *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts stated he went and looked at the lot and questioned the size.

Ms. Rose stated the previous application lot coverage was 15 percent as proposed, with the lot size about 25,600 sq. ft.

Discussion ensued with an aerial photo being projected.

Ms. Pearce stated she was concerned about this house due to not having the symmetry the other homes around had.

Chairwoman Besser stated the gable dormer works better with this house.

After discussion, Mr. Robert's motion failed 2-3 (with Ms. Pearce, Ms. Besser, and Ms. Baker-Hefley voting no).

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6702 for the proposed new construction as proposed with a scaled-down gable dormer. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion passed 5-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Alteration (Single Window Replacement) at 334 Main St.; Marianne DeMeyers, Applicant.

Mr. Bryan stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of a rear window at 334 Main Street. Mr. Bryan stated that the existing wood window has a six-over-six lite pattern and is located on the alley side of the building behind a dumpster enclosure and that the applicant is proposing to replace the window with a single-lite window. Mr. Bryan stated that no proposed window material or specifications have been submitted at this time. Mr. Bryan stated that the *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic windows and historic window openings and that new windows are recommended to have historic profile and dimension and have a double-hung or double-sash appearance. Mr. Bryan stated that new replacement windows are recommended to match the historic materials found on the building (p.129, #1, #5) and that the applicant is requesting to replace the deteriorated rear window with a new single-lite window. Mr. Bryan stated that to substantiate the request, the applicant provided a photograph of the rear elevation and the state of the existing window. Mr. Bryan stated that the existing window appears to be in a state of disrepair and has minimal visibility from public view and that there are no other windows on the building with which to compare the proposed window replacement design. Mr. Bryan stated that it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed left elevation window sash replacement request with the following:

1. No window specifications have been submitted for review in light of the *Guidelines*. Without additional information, it is difficult to determine if the proposal meets the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*. Additionally, this is the only window located on the rear of the building making it difficult to determine if the proposed window pattern meets the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*.
2. If issued a COA, the applicant must submit window specs to the Preservation Planner for approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, and any changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. DeMeyers stated she appreciated Mr. Bryan coming out to work out the specifications needed for the window.

Ms. Rose walked around a window sample.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6643 for the replacement of the rear window based on the sample Central Woodwork and based on a one-over-one window configuration based in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines*. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if the window being replaced had multiple lites.

Mr. Bryan stated it is a six-over-six lite window but there were no other windows to compare this to on the rear façade of the building. Mr. Bryan stated the window is very low visibility.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if this could be an original window and any evaluation.

Mr. Bryan stated it is in severe need of repair.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know if it could be repaired instead of replacement.

Ms. DeMeyers stated it is literally falling out and that she feels it cannot be repaired.

Pictures were projected and discussion ensued.

With motion having been made and seconded, the motion carried 5-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 418 Boyd Mill Ave.; C. Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 1,050-sq. ft., one-story detached accessory structure at the rear of the property. Mr. Bryan stated the proposed structure features a hipped roof form, cementitious lap siding, brick base, and single-lite windows. Mr. Bryan stated the structure also features a wooden pergola at the entrance. Mr. Bryan stated the garage is proposed to be located at the rear of the property at the end of the existing driveway with the front of the structure oriented towards the street. Mr. Bryan stated the application also mentions two prefabricated storage structures that are to be removed. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposed accessory structure construction on March 19, 2018.

Mr. Bryan stated the existing prefabricated storage structures are not considered permanent buildings and their removal is appropriate. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that accessory structures be constructed in traditional locations behind the principal structure and designed to be visually subordinate in placement, size, mass, and intricacy to their respective principal structures (p.64, #1-2). Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that accessory structures be designed to be shorter in height than and designed to be consistent with the contexts of the principal structures they serve (p.64, #3-4) and that new accessory buildings should “use components typically used in historic equivalents” (p.64, #6). Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed accessory structure construction with the following:

1. As a condition of approval, the applicant must lower the brick base to be compatible with the foundation height of the principal structure.
2. As a condition of approval, the accessory structure windows must consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window and garage door specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission 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. The applicant should ensure that the proposed use of the accessory structure meets the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance since the accessory structure, as currently designed, may not meet the requirements of the Accessory Dwellings ordinance.
4. Any proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval, and a scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Coffey stated they were fine with staff’s comments and that everything around this house is multiple stories.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6728 for the construction of the accessory structure with staff’s comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if there was a picture of the house.

Ms. Rose stated there is one in the packet.

Ms. Pearce stated to know if the blank window can be seen from the street.

Mr. Coffey stated no.

With the motion having been made and seconded, the motion carried 5-0.

Item 10:

Consideration of New Construction at 122 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 4); Andrew King, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a two-story single-family residence with attached two-bay garage at 122 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 4). 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 *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). Ms. Rose stated that 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). Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed new construction with the following:

1. While the proposed foundation height along the main form of the structure at the front elevation appears to be consistent with the foundation height of the adjacent structures on the same side of the street, the foundation height at the stairwell element, however, is not consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.67, #12; p.66, #4). The foundation level of the stairwell element should be lowered for consistency with the *Guidelines*, with revised drawings returning to the Preservation Planner or Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The lap reveal of the siding must measure between 4” and 5” for consistency with the architectural features of adjacent structures.
3. 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.
4. 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.
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. King stated he had no additional comments and was fine with staff’s conditions and thanked Ms. Rose for helping through this process.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6729 for the proposed new construction in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018, and the water table indicated on the stair element presented tonight. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated on the chimney, the faux whitewash brick with stone does not fit into this neighborhood and suggested painting the brick the color of the stone or red brick. Ms. Pearce stated she also had a concern on the capitals on the posts on the porch should be brackets or a square kind of capital.

Mr. King stated they are brackets.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include the chimneys could be either stone or red brick submitted to staff or a gray painted brick submitted to staff.

Chairwoman Besser stated the motion to amend failed due to not having a second to the motion.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to have the brick color brought back to staff for approval for the chimneys. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Svoboda stated he felt the commission should be comfortable on the paint color instead of having to come back to staff.

Ms. Pearce stated that was hard to do with examples.

The amendment carried 3-2 (with Mr. Roberts and Mr. Scalf voting no).

With the main motion having been made and amended, the motion carried 4-1, with Chairwoman Besser voting against the motion.

**Item 11:
Consideration of Alterations & Addition (Accessory) at 151 Franklin Rd.; Turner Binkley,
Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the enclosure of an existing two-bay carport at the rear of the principal structure located at 151 Franklin Rd. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also requesting approval for the construction of a three-bay garage addition. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to alter an existing attached two-bay carport by enclosing it and constructing a three-bay enclosed garage addition. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that one should not place additions to buildings on primary elevations, noting that appropriate locations for additions are on rear or obscured elevations. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that one limit the square footage of additions to no more than half of the square footage of the historic building (all portions of the building that are at least 50 years of age). Ms. Rose stated porches and all roof-covered surfaces factor into a building's footprint (p.54, #1, #4). Ms. Rose stated the historic building must be clearly identifiable and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition, per *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one avoid design approaches that unify the existing structure and new construction into a single architectural whole, and the use of differentiating methods such as roof breaks, insets, offsets, and material change are recommended to separate existing construction from new construction (p.54, #2). Ms. Rose stated the it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed alterations and addition with the following:

1. All windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood, and garage doors must be consistent with that on neighboring historic buildings. The window and garage door specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. 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. Binkley stated he had no additional comments and thanked Ms. Rose for her time on this project.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6730 for the proposed alterations and addition in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated the new portion where the bays are should use cementitious board used so it will read as another piece.

With no second, Ms. Pearce's amendment failed.

The main motion passed 4-1, with Ms. Pearce voting no.

Item 12:

Consideration of Fencing at 1102 W. Main St.; Josh Thurman, Applicant.

Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of rear yard fencing at 1102 West Main Street. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing a wooden privacy fence 7' in height. Mr. Bryan stated the applicant is proposing to install the new privacy fence along the rear, left, and right property lines. Mr. Bryan stated the right side and rear property lines share boundaries with the Colony House residential development.

Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new fencing materials "be compatible with the surface materials of the building." (p.58, #6). Mr. Bryan stated the proposed fencing would be constructed of wood and is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated the location of the fence is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated the *Guidelines* state that rear yard fencing begins 20 feet from the plane of the residence's primary façade (p.58, #5). Mr. Bryan stated the proposed location of the new fence begins at the front plane of the principal structure. Mr. Bryan stated the fencing would need to be recessed 20 feet from the front plane to be considered rear yard fencing. Mr. Bryan stated the style of the fence is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Mr. Bryan stated the proposed fence features a running board at the top which gives a more contemporary appearance and that removing this running board or painting the entirety of the fence a solid color will make the fence more compatible with the style of the principal structure. Mr. Bryan stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed fencing with the following:

1. As a condition of approval, the proposed fencing must be recessed 20 feet from the front plane of the house.
2. As a condition of approval to better meet the intent of the *Guidelines*, the running board along the top of the fence must be removed or painted the same color as the fence to be more compatible with the style of the principal structure.
3. 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. Thurman stated projected a picture of the proposed fence and explained how the Colony House fence needs to be replaced. Mr. Thurman stated they would essentially be putting this fence up to hide the Colony House fence.

Ms. Rose stated the Colony House fence is being addressed by the Building and Neighborhood Services Department.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6737 for the fencing with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated she thinks what the applicant is saying is that he wants to cover the Colony House fence with this fence.

Ms. Rose projected photos of the Colony House and showed Mr. Thurman's house and the location of the existing fence.

Mr. Thurman pointed out where he wanted to place his fence.

Ms. Pearce suggested using landscaping to mitigate seeing the adjacent fence.

Discussion ensued on the placing of the fence and the guidelines.

The motion carried 5-0.

Item 13:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 325 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 2); Scott Black, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 325 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 2). Ms. Rose stated the residence is proposed to be situated to front Fair Park Ct. and back against floodplain areas visible from Highway 96W. Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative 6-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking the following new alterations:

- The expansion of the single-bay garage to a double-bay garage (thus altering the front elevation mass and roof line);
- The modification of the rear elevation through the relocation of the chimney, the relocation of the deck, and alteration of the fenestration placement;
- The alteration of the left elevation fenestration placement; and
- The removal of one right elevation window.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the all elevations have been drafted at a 1/8" scale. Ms. Rose stated the it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. The left elevation fenestration must be altered to be more vertically aligned to better address the intent of the *Guidelines*, and the right elevation fenestration must utilize a "faux window" treatment through the use of at least one set of closed shutters for greater consistency with the

Guidelines. The revisions must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

2. Any deviation from the overall height (approximately 28'-8" at highest point of front elevation and approximately 31'-6" at highest point of rear elevation), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to construction.
3. Window, garage door, and plantation shutter specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
5. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Black stated they were fine with all of staff's comments and would work with Ms. Rose.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6731 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Ms. Rose pulled up the site plan for the commissioners to review.

Ms. Baker-Hefley questioned the plantation shutters and stated it did not seem consistent with the other homes in that area.

Ms. Rose stated she did not comment on the shutters at this review due to them already being previously approved.

Mr. Coffey stated there are two or three places that do have this type of shutter fabric.

Ms. Pearce requested the applicant point out some of the houses.

Discussion ensued on the visibility of the houses.

The motion carried 5-0.

Item 14:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 331 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 3); Scott Black, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 331 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 3). Ms. Rose stated the residence is proposed to be situated to front Fair Park Ct. and back against floodplain areas visible from Highway 96W. Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a

COA from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative six-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. The Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. The applicant is seeking the following new alterations:

- The expansion of the single-bay garage to a double-bay garage (thus altering the front elevation mass and roof line) and the use of lap siding in lieu of board-and-batten;
- The modification of the rear elevation roof planes through the removal of a single-story shed projection and its incorporation into the second-story form as well as the use of an additional hipped roof plane (to cantilever over lower-level deck);
- The use of lap siding along right portion of the rear elevation in lieu of board-and-batten siding;
- The modification of the fenestration alignment on the right elevation; and
- The removal of one window and the use of lap siding (in lieu of board-and-batten) on the left elevation.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the all elevations have been drafted at a 1/8" scale. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. The right elevation fenestration must be altered to be more vertically aligned to better address the intent of the *Guidelines*. The revision must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The façade materials on the rear elevation must meet the intent of the previous condition of approval for this project, which states that "the siding treatment must be uniform as either lap siding or vertical board-and batten on each building projection," with a note that "lap siding treatment is more common to the historic district." To meet this previous condition of approval, the applicant must use lap siding along the entire rear elevation, as the shed projection was removed from the design and no longer creates a natural roof break to introduce a secondary siding material.
3. Any deviation from the overall height (approximately 31'-3" at highest point of front elevation and approximately 35' at highest point of rear elevation), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to construction.
4. Window and garage door material specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* 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 additional changes plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
6. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Black stated they would work to accommodate staff's comments.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6732 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Besser stated she had a question about the right elevation.

Ms. Rose stated she added the previously-approved elevations to the staff reports and explained her comments.

After discussion, the motion carried 5-0.

Item 15:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 332 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 4); Scott Black, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 332 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 4). Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative 6-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking the following new alterations:

- The expansion of the single-bay garage to a double-bay garage (thus altering the front elevation mass and roof line); and
- The alteration of the footprint of the rear elevation shed projection to render it slightly larger.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated all elevations have been drafted at a 1/8" scale. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. Any deviation from the overall height (27'-9"), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to construction.
2. Window and garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* 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 must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
4. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6733 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in

accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like to speak, and no one requested to speak.

The motion carried 5-0.

Item 16:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 326 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 5); Scott Black, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 326 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 5). Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative 6-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking the following new alterations:

- The expansion of the single-bay garage to a double-bay garage (thus altering the front elevation mass and roof line);
- The introduction of a small shed projection onto the main form of the front elevation; and
- The alteration of the roofline/breaks on the rear elevation.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the all elevations have been drafted at a 1/8" scale. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. Any deviation from the overall height (29'-10" to the highest point of the hipped roof and 28'-6" to the highest point of the front gable), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to construction.
2. Window and garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* 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 approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
4. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Black stated he had no comments.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6734 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if staff had any thought about the windows not being lined up on the front façade of the house.

Ms. Rose stated she limited her comments to the items that had only changed from the previously-approved plan.

Mr. Coffey stated this style is edging more to the Victorian style and explained.

After discussion, the motion carried 5-0.

Item 17:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction at 320 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6); Scott Black, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 320 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6). Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative 6-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking the following new alterations:

- The expansion of the single-bay garage to a double-bay garage (thus altering the front elevation mass and roof line);
- The addition and alteration of windows on the front elevation; and
- The alteration of the roofline/breaks and the introduction of additional fenestration on the rear elevation.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant has also submitted a “mirrored” plan set for consideration, as his architect suggests that the alternative plan may be appropriate as well. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting.

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

1. The front elevation fenestration must be altered to be more horizontally alighted to better address the intent of the *Guidelines*. The revisions must be returned to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. Any deviation from the overall height (approximately 29’-10” at the highest point of the front gable), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to construction.
3. Window and garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The use of either plan set—mirrored or otherwise—is appropriate.
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to approved plans

must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

6. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Coffey stated he would address the window. Mr. Coffey stated between the approval from last time until now we have made an interior change and the window is following up the stair. Mr. Coffey showed what he was talking about on the projected plan.

Ms. Pearce requested to know on which side the house the garage would be located.

Ms. Rose stated Mr. Coffey believes it would be better suited on the right.

Mr. Coffey stated it was due to on-street parking.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like 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 #6735 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts requested to know if it was being approved with the garage on the right or left.

Mr. Coffey stated he would like the option of flexibility for either side to be approved.

Mr. Roberts moved to amend the motion to include the bottom stairwell window on the revised front elevation, to the right of the front porch, be eliminated. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion, and the motion passed 4-1, with Ms. Pearce voting no.

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

Item 18:

Consideration of Demolition (Principal) at 121 Morningside Dr.; Steve Graham, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 320 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6). Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative 6-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking the following new alterations:

- The expansion of the single-bay garage to a double-bay garage (thus altering the front elevation mass and roof line);
- The addition and alteration of windows on the front elevation; and

- The alteration of the roofline/breaks and the introduction of additional fenestration on the rear elevation.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant has also submitted a “mirrored” plan set for consideration, as his architect suggests that the alternative plan may be appropriate as well. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the new proposal at its May 21, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose noted all elevations have been drafted at a 1/8” scale. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. The front elevation fenestration must be altered to be more horizontally alighted to better address the intent of the *Guidelines*. The revisions must be returned to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. Any deviation from the overall height (approximately 29’-10” at the highest point of the front gable), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to construction.
3. Window and garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The use of either plan set—mirrored or otherwise—is appropriate.
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
6. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Graham stated to remodel the property is not going to happen and that it is just not possible. Mr. Graham stated the historical piece is only some hardwood floors, some chimney that is left, and some plaster still on some of the walls. Mr. Graham stated this is on a slope and we know it does have historical significance. Mr. Graham stated they would like to take the house down and turn into the area into green space with the multifamily residences around it, and then, with the commission’s guidance, put a plaque on the site. Mr. Graham stated it would not make sense to make it into a single home with multi-houses already around it. Mr. Graham explained all the hardships the home currently has. Mr. Graham stated they are happy to have a conversation on what to do but that fixing it is not going to work.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens would like to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuances of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6736 for the demolition of the principle structure, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated June 11, 2018 and the application does not satisfactorily address the criteria necessary to make the determination whether demolition is appropriate as described in the report and recommendation. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts stated he feels this is the third or fourth time we have dealt with this property. Mr. Roberts stated he did not know what else we can say without input from BNS on what can be done with this property. Mr. Roberts stated we are not getting anywhere.

Ms. Pearce commented on a couple of other houses in this similar condition and the houses were built back in the form there were in previously.

Mr. Graham stated there is not enough historical material left.

Ms. Pearce stated she hates to see us go down this road again and would be happy to have an exterior restoration and something interior imperfect and will be supporting denial.

Mr. Graham requested to know if this commission would approve a demolition if he built it back to what it looks like now.

Mr. Svoboda explained issues that happened on previous properties with the intent to build back like they were. Mr. Svoboda stated that more justifications are needed for demolition and then the applicant could submit what he would want to rebuild. Mr. Svoboda stated all the issues need to be addressed to the commission.

After continual discussion on additional information being needed, the motion carried 5-0.

Item 19:

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

There were no non-agenda emergency items.

Item 20:

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Acting Secretary