

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 11, 2019**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, November 11, 2019, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley
Susan Besser
Jeff Carson
Brian Laster
Mary Pearce, Vice-Chair
Lisa Marquardt
Jim Roberts, Chair
Ken Scalf
Mike Hathaway

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelli Gibson, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelly Dannenfeler, Planning & Sustainability Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the November 11, 2019, meeting to order at 5:05 pm.

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

Mr. Scalf moved to approve the August 12, 2019 meeting minutes with the corrections requested of Mr. Laster on Page 5 of the document. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include a revision to the chair name on Page 1, under Item 1. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion to amend, and the motion carried 9-0.

With the main motion having been made and seconded, the motion carried 9-0.

**Item 3:
Consideration of 2020 Historic Zoning Commission and Design Review Committee Meeting Dates & Application/Notification Deadlines.**

Mr. Scalf moved to approve the 2020 Meeting Dates & Application/Notification Deadlines. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

**Items 4:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated that the Design Review Committee will be meeting on November 18th at 4:00 pm.

Item 5:

Consideration of Requests to place non-agenda emergency items on the agenda.

No Requests.

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:

Consideration of Rear Addition at 109 Everbright Ave.; Hunter & Carma Daniel, Applicants.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 518 sq. ft. rear enclosed addition at 109 Everbright Ave. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission (HZC) approved issuance of a COA for the previously-proposed addition—along with other alterations—at its June 13, 2016, meeting. Ms. Rose stated the approval has since expired. Ms. Rose stated the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss a reduced scope of 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).

- The addition is proposed to be placed onto the rear elevation, recessed toward the right corner of the original structure. Due to its proposed location and shape, it is designed to be differentiated from the existing building. The use of matching brick, shingle roofing, and window style is appropriate. The height and roof forms are designed to be consistent with that of the existing building (p.55).
- The footprint of the proposed addition measures 518 sq. ft., which equates to a 25.6 percent addition to the existing structure (2,021 sq. ft. footprint). This is consistent with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed lot coverage measures 10.1 percent, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.55, #5).

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed **rear addition** with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend that addition materials and details be compatible with the building (p.54, #3). As such, any new brick associated with the project must consist of a brick color that is in keeping with the brick on the original portion of the historic structure.

2. The 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 HZC 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 HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Hunter Daniel, the applicant and property owner, represented the item.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7121 for the rear addition, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 11, 2019. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Alterations (Site Features: Trellis) at 214 3rd Ave. S.; Michael Hoff, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the removal of a non-historic trellis along the side elevation of the residence and its replacement with a new trellis. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its October 21, 2019 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to remove the existing trellis, the low walls securing the trellis to the grade surface, and approximately 31' of concrete walkway underneath the trellis. Ms. Rose stated the applicant then proposes to construct a new, unpainted cedar trellis in the same area as the remaining concrete walkway. Ms. Rose stated the trellis is not historic, so its removal is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the modified walkway pattern is consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*, as it does not alter original landscape features or configurations and does not significantly alter the property's topography (p.70). Ms. Rose stated the applicant indicates that the property owner intends to plant a magnolia tree in front of the garage/guest house elevation, at the location where the trellis section is proposed to be removed. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed site alterations 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 the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Matt Ream, an associate of the applicant and the property owner, represented the item.

Ms. Besser moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7122 for the proposed site alterations in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 11, 2019. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include that landscaping be used mitigates scale of brick wall that achieves at least 12 feet of mature height, and with staff approval. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

The overall motion carried 9-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of Additions & Alterations (Masonry, New Window Openings) at 906 Fair St.; Michael & Sarah Hathaway, Applicants.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 906 Fair St., as follows:

1. The construction of a 1 ½-story, two-bay garage addition with screened porch, at the rear of the structure;
2. The construction of an enclosed “hall” connector addition along the left elevation of the 1964 portion of the structure;
3. The placement of additional window openings onto the right elevation of the 1964 portion of the structure; and
4. The painting of the masonry of the 1964 portion of the structure.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its October 21, 2019 meeting. Ms. Rose noted a COA was issued on May 13, 2013 for the construction of an enclosed 120 sq. ft. addition between the two the original 1924 portion of the structure and the ca. 1964 portion. Ms. Rose stated at the time, these two structures were connected by a partially-enclosed outdoor shed/utility area (thus defined as one structure). Ms. Rose stated the ca. 1964 portion of the structure was determined to be historic in its own right, as it dates to over 50 years in age. Ms. Rose stated a garage addition and “connector” addition—which have not been constructed—was also approved as part of the same COA. Ms. Rose stated the COA has since expired. Ms. Rose also noted that revised square footage calculations, provided by the applicant, have been added to packet materials.

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 utilizing a “connector” design, the applicant is proposing the construction of an enclosed hall to attach the 1924 portion of the residence to the newly proposed garage addition, while acknowledging the 1964 portion of the residence as a stand-alone, enclosed form. Ms. Rose stated the applicant seeks to differentiate the new “connector” from the existing forms by using a shed roof form—clad with a standing seam material—and using heavy fenestration to lessen mass and allow the original wall to remain visible. Ms. Rose stated the footprint of the proposed “connector” enclosed addition—205 sq. ft.—equates to an approximate 8.8 percent addition to the historic structure (2,324 sq. ft. footprint), which is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #4). Ms. Rose stated the materials of the proposed “connector” enclosed addition (brick foundation, paneled trim, multiple windows in a lite pattern consistent with the original portion of the structure, standing seam metal roofing) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55).

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 proposed garage addition is recessed entirely behind the existing house and ties into the 1964 portion in such a way as to allow the existing house to continue to read as distinctive forms, as the proposed addition is designed at a taller height (26'-5") than the ca. 1964 portion but takes advantage of topography so as to remain 2'-9" shorter than the original portion of the residence. Ms. Rose stated the garage addition models the roofline of the original portion of the residence and utilizes a lap siding that is comparable in reveal. Ms. Rose stated overall, the proposal is compatible with the historic structure while demonstrating change over time.

Ms. Rose stated a shed-style screened porch is situated at the rear of the garage addition as a two-floor projection. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the construction of porches onto rear elevations or onto secondary elevations that are not readily visible from the street. Ms. Rose stated new porch materials are recommended to be compatible with those found on the principal structure or match existing porches within the historic district (p.79, #7). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to add a 155 sq. ft. covered porch to the left side elevation of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated the visibility of the porch is limited by the setback of the principal structure from the sidewalk. Ms. Rose stated the footprint of the proposed garage and screened porch addition—979 sq. ft.—equates to an approximate 42 percent addition to the existing structure (2,324 sq. ft. footprint), which is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #4). Ms. Rose stated the cumulative proposed additional square footage (205 sq. ft. connector + 979 sq. ft. garage and screened porch addition, including the previous addition approved in 2013 (133 sq. ft.)), equates to 56 percent of the historic structure, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #4). Ms. Rose stated the materials of the proposed garage addition (brick foundation, cementitious siding of a 5" maximum reveal, wood panel (on connector), asphalt shingles, standing seam metal roofing on screened porch, screening, carriage style garage door) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55).

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to place additional window openings onto the right elevation of the 1964 portion of the residence. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that one should not add new window openings to primary or readily visible secondary elevations (p.90, #3). Ms. Rose stated the location of the proposed window openings is not readily visible from public viewsheds.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to paint the 1964 portion of the structure to highlight the brick on the original 1924 portion. Ms. Rose stated the 1964 portion of the structure is historic, as it is over 50 years in age and is designed relatively compatibly with the original, ca. 1924 portion of the structure. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one "preserve and maintain original exterior masonry walls and details" and that one "do[es] not paint masonry walls that have not been previously painted except for those which have had extensive patching or repointing, resulting in a patchwork of masonry surfaces" (p.73, #1, #3). Ms. Rose stated further, the *Guidelines* recommend against the painting of historically unpainted buildings (p.75, #3). Ms. Rose stated as such, the request to painting the 1964 portion of the building is not consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed additions and the proposed additional windows at the right elevation of the 1964 portion of the structure with the following:

1. The cumulative size of the proposed footprint, including the previously-approved connector in 2013, exceeds the recommendations of the *Guidelines* by approximately 6 percent (p.54, #4). As a condition of approval, the applicant must work with staff to lessen the footprint size of the screened porch portion of the proposal to meet the recommendations of the *Guidelines*.

2. The *Guidelines* recommend that addition materials and details be compatible with the building (p.54, #3). As such, any new brick associated with the project must consist of unpainted brick that is in keeping with the brick on the original portion of the historic structure.
3. The connector addition and garage 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 HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The garage door must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for consideration 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 to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed painting of the brick on the 1964 portion of the structure with the following:

- The 1964 portion of the structure is historic, as it is over 50 years in age and is designed relatively compatibly with the original, ca. 1924 portion of the structure. The *Guidelines* recommend that one “preserve and maintain original exterior masonry walls and details” and that one “do[es] not paint masonry walls that have not been previously painted except for those which have had extensive patching or repointing, resulting in a patchwork of masonry surfaces” (p.73, #1, #3). Further, the *Guidelines* recommend against the painting of historically unpainted buildings (p.75, #3). As such, the request to painting the 1964 portion of the building is not consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Hathaway, the applicant and property owner, represented the item.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7123 for the proposed additions and the proposed additional windows at the right elevation of the 1964 portion of the structure, with staff’s comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 11, 2019. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include a condition that the applicant drop the brick base on the garage portion of the addition to match the height of the brick base on the 2013 addition, at the lowest point of the garage portion of the addition, to achieve a more traditional look. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion. The amendment passed 6-2, with Mr. Scalf and Mr. Roberts voting no.

With the main motion made and amended, the motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7123 for the proposed painting of the brick on the 1964 portion of the structure, with staff’s comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 11, 2019. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued about the age of the addition and the inability to condition approval of paint colors.

The motion failed 3-5, with all but Ms. Marquardt, Mr. Carson, and Mr. Scalf voting no.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7123 for the proposed painting of the brick on the 1964 portion of the structure, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 11, 2019. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

**Item 10:
Adjourn.**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Acting Secretary