

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
OCTOBER 14, 2019**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, October 14, 2019, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley  
Susan Besser  
Jeff Carson  
Mike Hathaway  
Brian Laster  
Mary Pearce

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department  
Randy Tosh, BNS Department  
Kelly Dannenfelser, Planning & Sustainability Department  
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department

**Item 1:  
Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the October 14, 2019, meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

**Item 2:  
Minutes: August 12, 2019**

Ms. Besser requested on page nine that the motion be approved, not denied.

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve the minutes with the correction made by Ms. Besser. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

**Items 3:  
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated there is a DRC meeting coming up next week at October 21<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Rose stated on October 24<sup>th</sup> there will be a closed meeting training for the commission.

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

No Requests.

**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:**

**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 7 be placed on the consent agenda.

Ms. Baker- Hefley moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion was approved 6-0.

**Item 7:**

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

This item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

**Item 8:**

**Consideration of Alterations (Side and Rear Porch) at 515 Church St.; Andrew King, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the enclosure of the existing left side and rear porch with glass at 515 Church St. Ms. Rose stated the use of 36” cementitious half walls are proposed at the base. Ms. Rose stated the porch is currently enclosed with screening material. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its September 16, 2019 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing one of three different options:

- The use of twelve-lite casement windows (applicant’s preferred option);
- The use of paired casement windows; or
- The use of one-over-one double-hung windows.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that if enclosure of porches on side or rear elevations is desired, one should use screen or glass with the minimal number of vertical and horizontal framing members needed to support the enclosure (p.78, #5). Ms. Rose stated since the applicant is seeking to utilize functional windows, the window muntins add to the appearance of the framing members; the *Guidelines* recommend utilizing a minimal number. Ms. Rose stated the Design Review Committee also recommended the use of the double-hung windows, as they are the simplest profile that is similar to what is on the existing building. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed side and rear porch alterations with the following:

1. The applicant must utilize the one-over-one double-hung window enclosure option, as it is the option most in keeping with the intent of the *Guidelines* (p.78, #5).
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. King stated they would prefer scheme A.

Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6892 with Scheme A for the multiple lights. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Mr. Hathaway explained why he chose Scheme A.

Mr. Laster stated the different schemes were discussed at DRC due to the house having different window lights. Mr. Laster stated Scheme A would be keeping with the rear of the house.

With the motion having been made and seconded, the motion failed 1-5, with all but Mr. Hathaway voting no.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6892 for the side and rear porch alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated October 14, 2019, noting that this would be Scheme C. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-1, with Mr. Hathaway voting no.

#### **Item 9:**

#### **Consideration of Rear Addition (Principal), Window Alterations (Principal) & Alterations (Accessory) at 927 Fair St.; 906 Studio Architects, Applicant.**

Mr. Hathaway recused himself of this item.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 312 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S., as follows:

#### Principal Structure

- The construction of a 233 sq. ft. rear enclosed addition; and
- The conversion of two rearward left elevation window opening into a side elevation entrance, with bracketed awning cover.

#### Accessory Structure

- The removal of the existing, non-original siding, its replacement with a cementitious lap siding of a 5" reveal, and addition of a bracketed awning over the garage doors.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its September 16, 2019, meeting to discuss the proposal. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building and be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building. Ms. Rose stated the original building is defined to include "all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age" (p.54, #3-4). Ms. Rose stated the historic building must be clearly identifiable, and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition, as through approaches that unify the existing structure and new construction into a single architectural whole (p.54, #2). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility, noting, however, that rear or side elevations may not always be appropriate for additions, as some historic buildings have visual prominence from many vantage points (p.54, #1). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to convert two existing window openings at the rearward side of the left elevation into a side elevation entrance,

with bracketed awning cover. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one preserve and maintain historic windows and their openings and that one not enclose, reduce, expand, conceal, or otherwise obscure historic windows (p.90, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated that while the proposed location of the alteration is rearward on the side elevation, the proposal is not in keeping with the intent of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to remove the existing, non-original siding and to replacement it with a cementitious lap siding of a 5” reveal to match that proposed for the rear addition. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also proposing to add a bracketed awning over the garage doors. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one repair or, if repair is not possible, replace historic features like windows, siding, and doors on outbuildings. Ms. Rose stated matching replacements are recommended when visible from the street (p.74, #2-3). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* specific to siding recommend that one maintain historic siding and that one replaces deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding (p.83, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated it appears that the outbuilding was modified heavily during the mid-century period, based on the style of the existing siding (though it is unclear without more substantive documentation). Ms. Rose stated since the siding is not original, and it is not clear if it is historic, the Design Review Committee recommended that the applicant either maintain the existing siding, repairing it in-kind, or that the applicant consider utilizing a lap siding profile that is more appropriate to the perceived age of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated without a photograph that demonstrates the style of the original siding, one should look to nearby outbuilding for context. Ms. Rose stated a wood siding of a 4-5” reveal is a common historic equivalent on outbuildings and would be entirely appropriate for replacement, in this case, as cementitious siding is not a matching replacement to what would have been the original siding, and the side elevation of the outbuilding is largely visible from the street view (p.83, #2, #4). Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed enclosed addition and accessory structure alterations with the following:

1. The enclosed addition windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The roofing material from the enclosed addition must match that of the existing principal structure.
3. The applicant must utilize wood siding on the accessory structure, as opposed to cementitious siding, for consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.83, #2, #4).
4. It appears, from Perspective Views 1 and 3 on page 9 of the submittal, that a fence may be proposed at the end of the driveway. If so, there is insufficient information included within the submittal to substantiate a Certificate of Appropriateness review. If desired, the applicant may submit a separate COA application for consideration of a fence at a later date. Fences may qualify for administrative review.
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 the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed side elevation window alterations with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend that one preserve and maintain historic windows and their openings and that one not enclose, reduce, expand, conceal, or otherwise obscure historic windows (p.90, #1-2). The proposal is not in keeping with the intent of the *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 additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Katsaitis stated the windows on the side rear yard side are not the original windows and explained. Mr. Katsaitis suggested the commission look at page 3. Mr. Katsaitis stated they would get with Ms. Rose on material, etc.

Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one did.

Ms. Baker- Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7096 for the principal structure addition and accessory structure alterations, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated October 14, 2019. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster stated he wanted to ask a question concerning the reveal. Mr. Laster requested to know if the reveal should match the garage or neighborhood.

Mr. Staudacher, the property resident, stated they planned on matching both.

Ms. Besser requested to know the date.

Mr. Katsaitis stated 1924 to 1927.

Mr. Staudacher stated the brick was done in 1959.

Discussion ensued on the reveal.

The motion carried 5-0.

Ms. Baker- Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7096 for the proposed side elevation window alterations. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker- Hefley stated there was conversation the windows were not original and asked if the opening is original.

Mr. Staudacher stated there are no photos on this house.

Discussion ensued.

Chairwoman Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

The motion carried 5-0.

**Item 10:  
Adjourn.**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.

---

**Acting Secretary**