

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 10, 2020**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, February 10, 2020, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley
Jeff Carson
Mike Hathaway
Brian Laster
Lisa Marquardt
Jim Roberts, Chair

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

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the February 10, 2020, meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**Item 2:
Minutes: December 9, 2019**

Mr. Laster requested on page 7 to have the word “eyesore” removed and replaced with “inappropriate additions.” Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose explained we were a little bit behind on the minutes due to updating the website to include an Application User Guide that helps everyone understand the new Zoning Ordinance updates and how things are to be submitted. Ms. Rose stated the new Certificate of Appropriateness hybrid hard copy/electronic submittal process will be starting soon. Ms. Rose stated the new Application User Guide will help with this process as well.

**Item 3:
Consideration of 2020 Commission Chair and Vice-Chair**

Mr. Laster moved to nominate Mr. Roberts to be Chair and Ms. Pearce to be Vice-Chair for the 2020 meeting dates. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

**Items 5:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated that the Design Review Committee will be meeting on February 17, 2020. Ms. Rose stated she asked about having a site visit around 3 pm if the weather is permitting and stated that she would let everyone know soon.

**Item 6:
Consideration of Requests to place non-agenda emergency items on the agenda.**

No Requests.

Item 7:

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 8:

Consideration of Signage & Walls at Splendor Ridge Subdivision (Entrance Location at Parsons Pl.), located at 151 Franklin Rd.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for construction of a freestanding development signage in the form of walls at Splendor Ridge Subdivision, located at 151 Franklin Rd. Ms. Rose stated subdivision entrance will be located off Parsons Place, though the subject project is located within the Franklin Road Historic District. Ms. Rose stated applicant appeared before the January 13, 2020 Historic Zoning Commission for consideration. Ms. Rose stated item was deferred to the February 10, 2020 Historic Zoning Commission meeting, and the applicant appeared attended the January 21, 2020 Design Review Committee meeting to discuss the item. Ms. Rose stated Splendor Ridge Subdivision development plan is vested under the previous Zoning Ordinance (effective 7/1/08 to 12/29/19), and as such, those regulations specific to Freestanding Development Signs in Section 5.12.10(2) must apply. Ms. Rose stated *Guidelines* recommend that new fences and walls support the historic character of the district (p.58). Guidance on walls is more specific to retaining and perimeter site features, as monument style signage is not recommended as appropriate in residential historic districts (p.85, #9). Ms. Rose stated few examples of residential freestanding development monument signs exist in this area; the closest in at Harlinsdale Manor on Franklin Rd. (see applicant's photograph). Ms. Rose stated applicant addressed the Design Review Committee's comments about the overall design and has thus presented a modified wall height, shape, and length. Ms. Rose stated proposal includes a main column height of 7'-0" with a secondary column height of 5'-6". Ms. Rose stated height has been reduced to 3'-3", and the length and shape have been adjusted to be comparable to that seen at Harlinsdale Manor. Ms. Rose stated signage has been reduced a monogram, "SR," flanking each side, alongside lanterns. Ms. Rose stated wall materials are similar in texture, color, and form, however, as those historically used on the Riverview site (p.58, #2). Ms. Rose stated scale of the proposed wall is subservient of that of the historic Riverview wall, which measures 3'-6" in height with 7'-3" columns.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed signage and walls with the following:

1. The applicant has modified the proposal to be more in keeping with the scale of the historic Riverview wall and has adjusted the length, shape, and lettering of the wall to be more in keeping with that seen elsewhere in the historic district.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. The application must also meet any applicable floodplain regulations.

Mr. Hathaway has recused himself from this item and item 9.

Mr. Gamble stated he was representing the applicant for Splendor Ridge. Mr. Gamble stated he would like to clarify some items Ms. Rose asked him to address. Mr. Gamble stated the secondary column showing is really meant to be a bookend to the fence. Mr. Gamble stated they had planned it to be a seven-foot height, so it could have a gas lantern on it but that they are not opposed to it being a lower height to match the secondary column if the commission feels that would be more appropriate. Mr. Gamble stated that they are open to the commission's input and suggestions but that it is his intent with the seven-foot columns with lanterns on them. Mr. Gamble stated that his client, Mr. Jeff Bethurum, has requested that an alternative to the SR logo and requested that Ms. Rose project the second-to-last page so the commission can see on top the sign handle for Harlinsdale panel showing HM. Mr. Gamble stated that handle is 18x36 and that a typical stop sign is 32x32. Mr. Gamble stated that his sign handle is 18 inches tall by 24 inches width, and he showed the new sign logo scale with the entire Splendor Ridge letters. Mr. Gamble stated that due to the letters being smaller, it is in keeping with what Splendor Ridge is.

Chair Roberts requested to know if that was the same size as the letters.

Mr. Gamble stated yes.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Carson moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7131 for the proposed signage and walls, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts requested to know if they wanted to do an amendment or have a conversation about the initials.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated that she would like to have a conversation and stated her question is about the height of the fence.

Mr. Gamble stated that the fence is 52 inches in height.

Mr. Laster stated the question he would have for the applicant is if he knows the elevation change from the front columns to the rear columns.

Mr. Gamble stated the change is two-and-a-half to three feet in height.

Chair Roberts stated the primary columns are seven feet tall and five-foot six in the back, the way this drawing shows in the packet.

Mr. Gamble stated, to be honest, they created some confusion with the drawings. Mr. Gamble stated their intention was to have both of them at seven feet.

Chair Roberts stated the five-foot six makes sense because of the elevation change.

Mr. Laster stated he would suggest making an elevation change up and making the rear columns level with the front columns, as it would not lower them, but would give the same intent of having the columns visually look like they are the same height.

Mr. Gamble stated there would not be enough room for the gas lanterns on the columns in the back.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated we do not want to introduce any other column height and that she feels it should be the five-six column to be in proportion with the fence as a standard look. Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she would offer that as an amendment but asked how we are referencing this second batch of columns.

Ms. Rose suggested stating that the back columns need to be secondary column height.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated the back columns need to be secondary column height as an amendment. Mr. Laster seconded the amendment, and the amendment passed 5-0.

Ms. Marquardt stated on the exhibit HS1.0, the correction will be made.

Mr. Gamble stated yes.

Ms. Baker-Hefley added to her amendment that the signage as presented tonight be used. Mr. Laster seconded the addition to the amendment.

Ms. Marquardt requested some specifications on the sign material.

Mr. Gamble stated it would be limestone, with sandblasted letters and black painted letters on the inside.

The amendment was approved 5-0.

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

Item 9:

Consideration of Fencing at 709 Fair St.; Joshua & Sharon Davis, Applicants.

Ms. Gibson stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of side and rear yard fencing at 709 Fair Street (see Exhibit 1 for site plan). Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is proposing to add a 6' wooden fence to be placed 19' behind the primary façade of the house. Ms. Gibson stated placement at the 19' mark would allow the fence to tie into the back of the screen porch located on the east side of the property and would also allow the fence to be in front of the utility meters and boxes located on the west side of the house. Ms. Gibson stated if placed at the 19' mark, the fence would sit 51' from the front property line. Ms. Gibson stated the side yard located on the west side of the property is the primary yard and the property is located in the floodplain, which restricts the style of fencing that can be constructed on the property. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend new fencing materials "should be compatible with the surface materials of the building." (p.58, #6). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed fencing would be constructed of wood and is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the location of the fence is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* state that wooden plank fences should be recessed at least 20 feet from the plane of the residence's primary facade and that rear yard fencing should begin 20 feet from the plane of the residence's primary façade, at which point one may use a fence taller than three feet in height (p.58, #5, #8 #10). Ms. Gibson stated on the west and east sides of the property, the proposed fencing begins 19 feet from the front plane of the principal structure. Ms. Gibson stated the fencing would need to be recessed 20 feet from the front plane to be considered rear yard fencing. Ms. Gibson stated on the west side of the property, the owner requests fencing placement at 19' to screen mechanical units, which is consistent with the *Guidelines* pertaining to the placement and screening of utilities (p.89, #1, #4). Ms. Gibson stated on the east side of the property, the owner requests the proposed fencing to be placed at 19' from the plane of

the primary façade to avoid obstructing a window and allow the fence to tie into the screen porch (Exhibit 2).

Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed fencing with the following:

1. Due to the location of the mechanical units and porch, the proposed fencing should be able to exceed three feet in height at the 19' mark instead of at the 20' mark.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Davis stated he was the owner and had no additional comments to make.

Chair Roberts requested to know if anyone citizens requested to speak on this item, 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 #7180 for fencing with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she felt it was appropriate due to the deep property.

Chair Roberts stated there was note on exhibit two that the fence be tied into the column rather than the middle of the screen.

Ms. Marquardt stated there was comment from DRC that Ms. Pearce in particular had mentioned—ways of perhaps reducing visual impact of the fence by creating some way to soften it. Ms. Marquardt stated she sees in the pictures that some are scalloped and questioned the applicant if there are some they preferred.

Mr. Davis pointed out on the projected screen some they preferred as they discussed. Mr. Davis stated that the right side has a significant elevation change from the street to the property, so visually, it would not appear as a six foot tall fence.

Ms. Marquardt stated it would be visible from the street.

Chair Roberts stated he thinks the intent was there be some break in the middle, like a scallop or something, so that it is not aligned straight across.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know if the applicant was going to place a gate.

Mr. Davis stated yes, they were going to need a gate at that front, to the right of the house.

Chair Roberts requested to know if that was going to be done in middle.

Mr. Davis stated yes, it would be right here, and that the other thing is that it is technically an easement for the sewer that runs through there.

Ms. Marquardt made an amendment to approve the fence as amended and that the applicant will consider the exhibits given on the last page that show a scalloped edge and the applicant use the gate as an opportunity to break up the mass.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she wanted clarification on Ms. Marquardt saying to have the gate stand out a little bit, to break up, but these are scalloped all the way across.

Chair Roberts stated the intent is whether it is all the way across to have a scallop or just at the gate to break it up.

Ms. Rose stated there is an amendment on the floor and that the amendment asks for the applicant to consider an exhibit that does not condition anything. Ms. Rose stated Ms. Baker-Hefley has started what might be the start of another amendment.

Ms. Marquardt withdrew her motion to amend.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to amend the motion to include a design feature or element at the gate to break the mass and that the design feature can go through staff for approval. Ms. Marquardt seconded the amendment, and the motion carried 5-0.

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

Item 10:

Consideration of Signage at 231 Public Sq.; Betsy Shackelford/Premier Sign Co., Applicant.

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of existing signage, as follows:

- **Sign 1 (Blade-Style)**—A blade-style sign positioned on the North (Main Street) elevation of the building. The sign is mounted to the wall near the third-story window sill and measures 16 linear feet and 24 square feet. The blade spans the approximate area between the third-story window header and the middle of the second-floor window. Applied 7” brushed aluminum lettering is proposed to be mounted onto the aluminum composite material (ACM) blade.
- **Signs 2-3 (Canopies)**— Two existing canopies located at the north corner of the building (at the Main St. and Parking Lot elevations). Applied 7” brushed aluminum lettering is proposed to be mounted onto the aluminum composite material (ACM) canopies.
- **Two drive-through signs**—The two 16” by 12” aluminum signs are stud mounted to the exterior wall of the columns located at the entrance to the drive-through ATM. The signs include a white background with blue lettering. The proposed signs will replace the current signs, which have a dark blue background with white lettering.
- **One window decal**—The proposed window decal is to be placed on the entry door located on the East (Parking Lot) elevation. The decal measures 14” by 11.5” and consists of white lettering and a logo with primary colors as accents.

Ms. Gibson stated the blade-style sign is proposed to replace a previously-approved sign at the same location and of the same size, placement, material, and color. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed material (aluminum composite material blade with brushed aluminum lettering) and the proposed color scheme (black background with silver/steel-colored lettering) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.120, #3, #11, #18). Ms. Gibson stated the only differences between the proposed sign and the existing, previously-approved sign are the size and materials of the lettering. Ms. Gibson stated the current sign features 10”

stainless steel lettering and the proposed sign includes 7" brushed aluminum lettering. Ms. Gibson stated the canopy-style signs are proposed to replace the previously-approved signs at the same location and of the same size, placement, material and color. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed sign material (aluminum composite material with brushed aluminum lettering) and color scheme (black background with silver/steel-colored lettering) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.120, #3, #11, #18). Ms. Gibson stated the only differences between the proposed sign and the existing sign is the size and materials of the lettering. Ms. Gibson stated the current sign features 10" stainless steel lettering and the proposed sign includes 7" brushed aluminum lettering. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* support the use of canvas storefront awnings and canopies (p.100) and recommend that "awning lettering" measure a maximum of 12 square feet or 25 percent of the total square footage of the front-facing panel (p.120, #7). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed design appears to be consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the two proposed drive-through signs are not previously-approved but will replace existing signs currently mounted at the same location. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed sign material (aluminum) is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.120, #11). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed color scheme (white background with blue lettering) is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend dark backgrounds with light-colored lettering (p.120, #3). Ms. Gibson stated the current signs consist of a dark blue background with white lettering, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed window decal was not previously approved but will replace an existing decal currently in place at the same location. Ms. Gibson stated the decal features light-colored lettering, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed blade-style-signage and canopies as follows:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit, and any changes must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed drive-through signs and window decal signage.

1. The color scheme of the drive-through signs must be consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend dark backgrounds with light lettering.

Ms. Shackelford stated she would be representing this item. Ms. Shackelford stated she had no comments on this application and would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Roberts requested to know if anyone citizens requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #7181 for the blade-style signage and canopies in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts asked if the face panels are being removed and not the entire sign.

Ms. Shackelford stated correct and that nothing is going to be detached or attached to the wall itself that already exists, just new faces for the signage.

Mr. Laster and Chair Roberts stated it looks like everything is the same, just the materials are changing.

Chair Roberts stated it could be a different font.

The motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Laster moved that Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #7181 for the building and window decal signage in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-0.

Item 11:

Consideration of Alterations (Porch Construction, Window Replacement, Side Entrance Stoop Removal/Replacement with Windows, Covered Entrance Construction) at 109/113, 125/129, 135/141/201/207, 159/165/213/219 Morningside Dr.; Gary Semanchik, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing similar exterior modifications to four buildings grouped together on one parcel—two duplexes at 109/113 and 125/129 Morningside Dr., and two quadplexes at 135/141/201/207 and 159/165/213/219 Morningside Dr. Ms. Rose stated the proposed scope of work is as follows:

- The replacement of entry doors;
- The replacement of windows and roofs throughout all buildings;
- The removal of side elevation stoops and their replacements with windows;
- The removal of faux chimneys on the foremost units;
- The construction of front porches with cedar siding inlay; and
- The patching of masonry and the construction of covered entrances onto the rear of the two quadplexes only.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its January 21, 2020 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the Franklin Road Historic District is located on the north bank of Harpeth River southwest of Mack Hatcher Memorial Parkway. Ms. Rose stated included in this district are several historic homes that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places including Wyatt Hall, Riverview, Creekside, Roper's Knob, Ms. Rose stated the Factory, and Harlinsdale Farm. Dates from these properties range from the early 1800s thru the 1950s and represent an array of architectural designs including Federal, Greek Revival, Folk Victorian, Neo-Classical, and Bungalow. Ms. Rose stated additional properties on Franklin Road, Winslow Road, Myles Manor, and Hooper Lane are included as part of the district due to their linkage in significance to the Franklin Road corridor. Ms. Rose stated very few midcentury homes exist along the corridor. Ms. Rose stated the subject buildings are of ca. 1968-1970 construction and are not currently contributing to the Franklin Historic District. Ms. Rose stated as noncontributing buildings to the historic district, they are not determined to add to the historic or architectural value for the period of significance currently defined for the historic district. Ms. Rose stated in the case of proposed alterations to noncontributing buildings, the alterations are reviewed in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to replace the front, side, and rear entrance doors with five-light doors. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that original entrance location and elements be maintained (p.56). As noncontributing structures—three with little to no viewshed to Franklin Rd.—door replacement is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one use designs appropriate for the building's style and age for replacement doors. Ms. Rose stated the use of the proposed

midcentury-inspired doors is in keeping with the intent of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to replace all windows with similar style two-over-two and one-lite picture windows for consistency, as many of the windows have been replaced with mismatched lite patterns and/or materials. Ms. Rose stated the applicant also states that there is damage to or evidence of rot on some of the windows. Ms. Rose stated the proposed replacement windows are of the Marvin Essentials type, which is a fiberglass product. Exact specifications have not been provided, however. Ms. Rose stated as a noncontributing structure, window replacement is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that new windows should have historic profiles and dimensions, with composite materials with the appearance of wood being appropriate for windows, stops, jambs, and trim. Ms. Rose stated replacement windows should relate to the building's architectural style (p.90, #4-6). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also proposing to replace all roof materials with asphalt shingle. Ms. Rose stated three units have asphalt shingle, and as such, this is an in-kind replacement. Ms. Rose stated the first building, however, was replaced with an inappropriate metal roofing at some point. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the replacement of roofs with materials that match the historic materials (p.82, #3), so the request is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the removal of the faux chimneys on the first building is also appropriate, as they did not utilize designs, materials, and scale in keeping with building character, as recommended by the *Guidelines* (p.82, #6). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to remove the side elevation entrances and to replace their doors with windows. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* do not recommend the enclosure or alteration of entrances on primary or readily visible secondary elevations (p.56, #1). Ms. Rose stated as noncontributing structures, the proposal should be considered in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures. Ms. Rose stated three of the buildings are not highly visible from Franklin Rd., and the foremost building appears to have been altered previously in a manner that was not in keeping with the architectural character. Ms. Rose stated the side elevation entrance has Colonial Revival nuances that do not reflect the vernacular midcentury character of the building. Ms. Rose stated the removal of the side elevation would not, therefore, impact the building negatively, nor would it impact the district's character. Further, the infill of the door area with brick will be countered by the painting of the masonry.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the construction of front elevation porches onto all four buildings and to inlay Dutch lap siding into front facade. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* do not support the construction of porches onto primary or readily visible secondary elevations visible from the street if they did not exist historically. Ms. Rose stated further, porch elements should be wood, with the use of brick or metal if appropriate (p.79, #6, #8). Ms. Rose stated original masonry exterior walls should be preserved and maintained (p.73, #1). Ms. Rose stated as noncontributing structures, the proposal should be considered in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures. Ms. Rose stated three of the buildings are not highly visible from Franklin Rd., so the construction of porches onto those buildings would not impact the district's character. Ms. Rose stated the building closest to Franklin Rd., Building 1, however, is not visible and should be considered. Ms. Rose stated stylistically, Building 1 is more vernacular in approach and does not take strong midcentury cues architectural cues. Ms. Rose stated it has been altered with inappropriate Colonial nuances. Ms. Rose stated without a strong presence of other midcentury structures along the historic district corridor, it lacks a collective context by which to draw contributory status. Ms. Rose stated because of this, the addition of a front porch would not seem inappropriate nor would it necessarily impact the district's character, if designed sensitively to the context of the district. Ms. Rose stated the concept of the butterfly metal post-and-beam porch proposal, combined with the lap siding inlay and CMU breeze block divider, creates a higher style architectural concept for the vernacular buildings and introduces an architectural element in the historic district corridor that does not currently exist. Ms. Rose stated since the Building 1 impacts the viewshed of the corridor, it is recommended that the porch relate more strongly the character of the district through stronger adherence to the *Guidelines*—use of wood porch elements and maintenance of original masonry. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is

proposing to patch masonry and construct covered entrances onto the rear elevations on the two quadplexes (the two rearmost buildings). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* do not support the construction of porches onto primary or readily visible secondary elevations visible from the street if they did not exist historically. Ms. Rose stated as noncontributing structures, the proposal should be considered in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures. Ms. Rose stated these buildings are not highly visible from Franklin Rd., and the proposed locations of the alterations—at the rear elevations—are appropriate. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning approve with conditions the proposal with the following:

1. As noncontributing structures, the proposal should be considered in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures. Three of the buildings are not highly visible from Franklin Rd., so the proposed alterations would not impact the district's character. The building closest to Franklin Rd., Building 1, is visible, and proposed alterations may impact the district's character. Because of this, the following conditions apply to Building 1:
 - a. The original masonry must be maintained, per *Guidelines* (p.73, #1). The area where the gable of the new porch extends above the roof may utilize the propose Dutch lap siding, however.
 - b. The CMU breeze block divider must not be utilized. Instead, a wood porch element should be used, as recommended by the *Guidelines* (p.79, #8). A vertical wood lattice would be appropriate.
 - c. Likewise, for consistency with the *Guidelines* and with the character of the overall historic district, the porch should utilize wood columns in lieu of metal columns (p.79, #8).
2. A sample Marvin Essentials product, or equivalent, must be submitted directly to the Historic Zoning Commission for its consideration in light of the applicable *Guidelines* prior to window replacement work commencing.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. McCreary stated she was present to represent this item. Ms. McCreary stated she would like to just clarify one thing, we would consider this from the porch standpoint an offset gable, instead of a butterfly roof.

Chair Roberts requested to know if anyone citizens requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Chair Roberts stated he would suggest we break this up into building one to start with and then the others.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve Building One with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Building 1 of Project #7182 for the proposal with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt stated she would like to hear from the applicant in relation to staff's recommend A, B and C conditions. Ms. Marquardt stated if they were opposed to any of them or are any them something you feel as an architect interferes with the consistencies of what you are trying to create.

Ms. McCreary stated Condition A, being maintaining the masonry and having the lap siding go underneath, she stated the design intent there was to as the roofline was to as the roofline peaks above the existing brick line and to take that lap siding and bring it down a little bit just so it doesn't look like an add on and to give a little bit more of a symbiotic relationship on the front façade, plus it gave a place to add a light fixture not nearly as big as the one for the siding, but to give a place and home for that, a background for it. Ms. McCreary stated that they are not opposed to just putting above if that is what the commission requests. Ms. McCreary requested to know if Ms. Marquardt wanted her to continue on, and Ms. Marquardt stated yes.

Ms. McCreary stated for the breeze block they would like to use as it has an interesting design element that you can see through it, so it gives you that element with its transparency that you can see through, but it is not blocking your view. Ms. McCreary stated it is substantial with some weight to it and make you feel private. Ms. McCreary stated as far as the vertical lattice goes, she asked Ms. Rose if she is referring to just a square lattice that is run horizontal & vertical versus the diamond pattern.

Ms. Rose stated yes.

Ms. McCreary stated she thinks they could discuss that as an option but that she has removed a lot more lattice than she has installed so she wants to be very careful that it is not considered a cheap—out for the lack of a better word or something—done as an afterthought. Ms. McCreary stated the breeze block gave it a little more substantial privacy barrier and was more interesting.

Ms. McCreary stated as far as the wood column in lieu of a metal column, the beams are coming across our wood, and they are not opposed to that either.

Mr. Laster stated that when he views this site, he kind of sees it as a whole, and first of all, all of it is non-contributing. Mr. Laster stated there seems there may be some leeway to the decision the board makes on this. Mr. Laster stated that as far as to see the breeze block, the lattice seems more country—like you would see if it was a country building, like on house number 2—and I am not opposed to the breeze block. Mr. Laster stated that he thinks that since the others would have it, it would be nice if the whole site would have it.

Ms. McCreary stated I do think it is our intention that whatever happens with Building 1, we would continue with Buildings 3, 4, 5. Ms. McCreary stated they wanted to keep consistency on all buildings.

Mr. Hathaway stated where he is struggling with this, as there are a lot of stories here. Mr. Hathaway stated there are 1950ish buildings that he guesses were built for maybe workers for the factory, that are very plain, very generic, but at the same time we have this beautiful pyramidal home right in the middle of this context. Mr. Hathaway stated that this is where he is leaning to what Ms. Rose is talking about, that at least if Buildings 1 & 2 have some similar kind of character, he feels that Buildings 3, 4, & 5 could easily go to a more modern style that is being proposed, but if you do 1, 3, 4 & 5 then Building 2 feels out of place. Mr. Hathaway stated he understands where Ms. Rose is coming from for what she is proposing for Building 1. Mr. Hathaway stated he feels as we go forward we are going to have this dilemma with 70s & 80s houses. Mr. Hathaway stated he supports what Ms. Rose is proposing for Building 1 to have some more relationship to Building 2.

Chair Roberts asked if we have enough information here with conditions Ms. Rose has put on this for Building 1, or if the commission wants to defer Building 1 and feels it needs more thought.

Ms. McCreary stated she definitely understands the dilemma and explained they have explored all different avenues and chose to have the offset and skewed above the door line as opposed to it being a

symmetrical gable form for two reasons: one, trying to not match something old—we want to give that nod to historic, but not try to do something someone previously did by making Building 1 a Colonial Revival that doesn't fit at all but to have its own style and feel, but keeping with the forms. Ms. McCreary stated the other part of it is we looked at it with a typical gabled roof where it is symmetrical, and we thought we had two of them, but it became either became disproportioned across the elevation to give it a front porch big enough for you to actually sit on and enjoy and the other thing too, with them being symmetrical, it made it look like we were trying to hard to match the historic forms that we see and the moment we shifted to an offset it finally felt this was a good look.

Mr. Laster stated for the view shed, no matter what is done for any of these buildings, the view shed is going to look out place because it does not look like this farm house.

Ms. Marquardt stated this applicant has been to DRC quite a few times now and that she does not have a problem with the design in terms of how it fits in with Building 2. Ms. Marquardt stated they do share some elements that do make them relative to each other and removing the partition would help with that and could be possibly administratively approved.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she would echo Ms. Marquardt and did not have a problem with the porches. Ms. Baker-Hefley stated that with the way it faces the hill, the view shed is very limited, but she is concerned about it facing Franklin Road and that it should be calmed down a little bit to be more considerate to Building 2.

Chair Roberts requested to know how that would be calmed down.

Ms. McCreary stated the suggestion of lattice definitely on horizontal/vertical access as opposed to diagonal is helpful and another thought would be to use some horizontal pieces instead a vertical fence like structure but doing something horizontal. Ms. McCreary stated they would still like to have some break in it just to allow some transparency, so it doesn't seem so heavy, but using a horizontal wood element as opposed to a traditional fence. Ms. McCreary stated if that is something we can put in as a condition that we can study looking at either in a rendering of a horizontal/vertical lattice or a horizontal element and resubmit that portion for either staff approval or what we need to do is definitely something we are perfectly fine with.

Ms. Rose stated that not to muddy the waters, but Ms. McCreary mentioned it does seem their intention is to perhaps echo what is approved Building 1 to Buildings 3, 4, and 5. Ms. Rose stated she did not want to tie any approvals to that specifically unless the commission chooses to do so, but if it seems appropriate to the commission it may be appropriate to have as part of the motion those changes could be reflected in Buildings 3, 4, and 5, if you find that appropriate. Ms. Rose stated that way, the applicant is not tied to the design you see in front of you for 3, 4, and 5.

Chair Roberts stated he wanted to get number 1 settled first.

Ms. Marquardt stated going back to maintaining the original masonry, she thinks the applicant puts forth a good reason to allow the application as it was submitted, rather than staff's recommendation.

Chair Roberts stated so you are saying the lap siding should extend all the way down below the gable.

Ms. Marquardt stated yes.

Chair Roberts stated he thought on one of the pages there was a light to go there as well as the numbers.

Ms. McCreary stated it is on the elevation sheet, the second to the last page.

Chair Roberts requested to know where the numbers would go.

Ms. McCreary stated they would like to have them between the light fixture and the door. Ms. McCreary stated they could move the light fixture up if needed.

Chair Roberts requested to know if they still wanted to stack them or horizontal.

Ms. McCreary stated they would like to stack them.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any thoughts on that, and there were none.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any comments on the windows.

Mr. Laster stated he would support the siding and asked if Ms. McCreary tell them more about the windows.

Ms. McCreary stated yes and stated this is from Marvin Windows and she knows the commission has approved Marvin Wood Windows in the past and they have used them quite a bit in their historic homes. Ms. McCreary stated this is from their Essentials line and this is a fiber glass unit on the exterior and on this particular one is a wood unit on the interior. Ms. McCreary stated they like the fiberglass from a maintenance standpoint, but where it is not like vinyl, it doesn't have as much movement and doesn't fade. Ms. McCreary stated they like the look and feel of it and it is a heavy unit and has a good construction quality to it. Ms. McCreary stated the other reason she likes the Marvin family in general is because their mutton lines have more of that putty glazing as opposed to the ogee and knows there is a sensitivity there because that is what is on the building currently and this particular unit and what we propose is simulated divided light and does have the spacer bar in between the wood interior and the fiberglass exterior. Ms. McCreary stated they did use on the Third Avenue project in the back of the building.

Mr. Laster stated as for the record, it is a non-contributing building.

Chair Roberts stated the original masonry must be maintained, propose Dutch lap siding, so all that is in there with breeze block divider, a wood porch element should be used with a vertical wood lattice to be approved by staff, if everybody can go along with that. Chair Roberts stated then he was going to put all that together for someone to make an amendment. Chair Roberts stated for the porch there should be wood columns used and Marvin Essential windows should be used.

Ms. Marquardt stated the only potential correction would be we discussed Part A as not being something we are not requiring the applicant to do.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to amend the motion to eliminate staff comment Part 1A, allowing the applicant to take the siding below the current masonry line and that the replacement for the CMU breeze blocker is to be approved by staff and is going to be a wooden porch element approved by staff as well as the porch light and numbering be approved by staff. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-1, with Mr. Hathaway voting no.

With the main motion for Buildings 1 having been made and amended, the motion carried 5-1, with Mr. Hathaway voting no.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Buildings Three, Four, and Five with conditions of Project #7182 for the proposal with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020 or allowing the applicants to mimic what was previously approved for Building 1. Mr. Carson seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Item 12:

Consideration of Alterations (Window/Door Glazing Replacement, Rooftop Access Construction, Rooftop Railing, Fire Escape Construction, Lighting, HVAC Relocation) at 234 Public Sq.; Patrick Gilbert, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the following scope of work at 230 Public Sq.:

- The removal of the glazing from the windows from the upper and lower floor façades and their replacement with clear glazing (resulting in a look without muntins);
- The replacement of the non-operable doors on either side of the main entrance with operable doors;
- The construction of a rooftop stairwell access and railing;
- The construction of a rear elevation fire escape;
- The placement of accent light fixtures; and
- The relocation of HVAC condenser units.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its January 21, 2020 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is updating the subject 1892 building to accommodate a new use and is seeking reference from historic photography to propose alterations to front façade. Ms. Rose stated Staff has identified several historic photographs for reference while addressing the proposal; see Exhibits 1-6. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of original windows, opening dimensions, and details (p.129, #1). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that replacement windows (if originals are missing) match the historic materials found on the building (p.129, #5) and be appropriate to the period of the building, and as such, a late 19th or early 20th century building is recommended to utilize four-over-four, two-over-two, or one-over-one sashes with distinct meeting rails and an operable appearance (p.129, #7). Per the *Guidelines*, wood, anodized aluminum with dark bronze finishes may be appropriate for replacement windows (p.129, #9). Ms. Rose stated the applicant has presented three options for glazing changes:

- Option 1: No glazing changes.
- Option 2: Changes to upper floor façade only.
- Option 3 (applicant's preferred): Changes to upper and lower floor facades.

Ms. Rose stated the following proposal applies to both Options 2 and 3:

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to replace the glazing in five (5) nine-over-nine wood double-hung windows to appear as one-over-one double-hung windows. Ms. Rose stated while the windows appear to be historic in age, it is clear if they are original, as historic photographs indicate that earlier windows were of a more historically age-appropriate one-over-one profile (see Exhibits 1-6). Ms. Rose stated as such, the alteration of the windows is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the proposed alteration appears to be complicated and may cause irreparable damage to what otherwise appears to be historic windows, though not historic to this building. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that original entrances and elements be preserved and maintained. Ms. Rose stated if replacements are required (for

non-rehabilitation), use wooden single-light doors, if possible; if metal is desired, use doors with a dark bronze or anodized aluminum finish (p.105, #1, #3).

Ms. Rose stated the following proposal applies to Option 3 only:

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to replace the glazing in the sidelights on either side of the non-operable doors to appear as clear glazing. Ms. Rose stated the storefront has been modified heavily throughout the years, as evidenced by photographs, so the replacement of the doors is appropriate. As such, the alteration of the sidelights is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also seeking to replace the non-operable doors on either side of the main entrance with operable doors with no muntin bars. Ms. Rose stated the storefront has been modified heavily throughout the years, as evidenced by photographs, so the replacement of the doors is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated since the intent is to maintain the existing wood sidelights and main entrance elements, the new operable doors should be wood for the best consistency with the context of the property. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to create a stairwell access to the rooftop and to add a railing (as the parapet is too low in height to meet safety requirements). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that rooftop additions be situated so that they are not readily visible from the street and also recommend that additions be scaled so that they are not readily visible from within a one-block area surrounding the building (p.104, #5-6). Ms. Rose stated further, the *Guidelines* recommend that addition be designed to be identifiable and distinguished from the original structure (p.104, #7). Ms. Rose stated the materials are recommended to be frame or brick; if not possible, use of concrete or metal and glass may be appropriate (p.104, #3). Ms. Rose stated the proposed addition is designed at a height and scale in keeping with the intent of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the proposed addition is much smaller than the overall building footprint. Ms. Rose stated the applicant's client placed a mock-up of the proposed location of the stairwell access on the roof; while the height of the mock-up pole does not appear to be consistent with that of the proposed stairwell access, it does not appear that there will be a high level of visibility of the proposed addition from any primary vantage point. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has proposed three different options for materials of the proposed addition, as noted on the supplemental email dated January 30, 2020 to staff—painted or colored metal panels, textured metals, or painted masonry. Ms. Rose stated the use of a masonry painted to match the façade of the building is most appropriate in light of the applicable *Guidelines*, which recommend the use of frame or brick construction be used for additions (p.100, #3). Ms. Rose stated the proposed railing will allow access to the rooftop. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that “if modern roof elements...are desired, install them so they are not visible from the street” (p.119, #3). Ms. Rose stated the mock-up demonstrates that the proposed 42” minimum railing may offer visibility from primary vantage points, depending on the proposed design and material of the railing. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has indicated three potential materials—glass with metal framing, cable with metal framing, and metal railing. Ms. Rose stated of the three options presented, the glass option is the only option that may meet the intent of the *Guidelines* in the proposed location. Ms. Rose stated otherwise, the heavier metal framing or railing options would need to be recessed further from the parapet so as not be visible from the street. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the construction of a covered fire escape at the rear elevation to allow for emergency egress from the rooftop. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one locate fire escapes and staircases on rear elevations or at locations where they are not visible from public rights of way in front of the building. Ms. Rose stated architectural features should not be damaged through the installation of fire escapes or staircases (p.106, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated the proposed fire escape is simple, metal in material, and will not be visible from vantage in front of the building. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the use of downward-facing building accent lighting on the front façade, in the form of black metal gooseneck fixtures. Ms. Rose stated two are proposed to be placed near the top of the pilasters on either side of the main entrance, and two sets are proposed to be centered over the recessed doors. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the use of new light fixtures that are not obtrusive of historic architectural features (p.112, #2). Ms. Rose stated therefore, the proposal is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to relocate the HVAC condensers onto concrete

pads at the rear elevation. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that utilities be placed along rear elevations or otherwise out of view from the street, and visibility should be further screened through landscaping or fencing (p.128, #1). Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning approve with conditions the proposed Option 3 façade alterations, door alterations, stairwell access addition and railing, fire escape construction, lighting, and HVAC relocation, with the following:

1. Facade Option 3, the applicant's preference, appears to meet the intent of the *Guidelines*. The proposed alteration may cause irreparable damage to what otherwise appears to be historic windows, however, though not historic to this building. Since the applicant has indicated that this project may be eligible for a Federal Tax Credit, it is advisable that the applicant consult 1) the Tennessee Historical Commission staff, and 2) a window restoration specialist to determine the feasibility of the window glazing replacement proposal prior to moving forward; if the windows cannot be salvaged as proposed, window replacement would be appropriate so that the historic windows can be saved and adaptively reused elsewhere. If window replacement is necessitated, the replacement windows must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration and approval prior to work commencing.
2. The new operable doors must be wood for the best consistency with the intent of the *Guidelines*. Door and bulkhead specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The rooftop stairwell access must be clad with brick veneer of a similar profile as that on the building façade and painted to match the building façade. Further, it must not exceed the height necessitated in order to meet the necessary code requirements in order to limit its visibility from primary and secondary vantage points, for maximum consistency with the applicable *Guidelines*.
4. The rooftop railing must consist of a glass material with limited black metal framing in order to lessen its visibility from primary and secondary vantage points, for maximum consistency with the applicable *Guidelines*.
5. HVAC screening, either through landscaping or fencing, must be demonstrated to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.
6. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
7. Outdoor café seating requires issuance of a permit through the Building & Neighborhood Services Department.

Mr. Adam Bates stated he would be representing this item for the owner. Mr. Bates stated the only thing he thinks he would add is if you go to page 16 of your slide images of the lighting that we have shown in the rendering we want to confirm the lighting could be modified from what you see in the image from to throw. Mr. Bates stated the intent here is to call out or exemplify the architectural features of the building primarily the vertical columns, so we would consider also two additional lights on the adjacent columns to the far side to further accentuate the architecture of the building. Mr. Bates stated again with a narrower throw so as not to provide too much extra light.

Chair Roberts requested to know if anyone citizens requested to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Chair Roberts suggested breaking the items into three separate motions. Chair Roberts stated one being the façade alterations and the door alterations, the second being the stairwell access addition/railing/fire escape construction, and last being the lighting and HVAC relocation. Chair Roberts stated he would entertain a motion for the façade alterations and door alterations.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7183 for Option 3 of the façade and door alterations.

Chair Roberts stated those conditions would be numbers 1 and 2 for the staff's comments.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster requested to know if the intent was to actually use the frame and make the windows one over one.

Mr. Bates stated they believe it was understood that the window sash may need to be replaced but the outer facing frame which you see in the images of the building the intent is to keep that if possible.

Mr. Laster asked Ms. Rose to go to the slide which shows the hotel post photo, the original ones.

Ms. Rose stated yes.

Mr. Laster stated there are several questions I have for it, and if you look at that photo, what you will see is that under the windows there is a dentil work that has been removed. Mr. Laster stated that he wonders if that was removed to accommodate those new windows. Mr. Laster stated you all will probably have to make sashes that fit that opening. Mr. Laster requested to know if the applicant plans to do anything with the door in the center bay.

Mr. Creed stated if they end up replacing the two bay doors than yes, we would replace that too.

Mr. Laster stated it appears that is the original door even today and that he doesn't think the Guidelines would support actually replacing an original door.

Mr. Creed requested to know if anyone had any information on that because he did not.

Ms. Rose stated she did not address it in the application because I did not know if you intended to replace it and she has always been under the assumption that was the original door. Ms. Rose stated she would have to do some more research to make that determination and would defer to Mr. Laster who would know more about it.

Mr. Laster stated it appears to be the original doors even from the photographs.

Ms. Rose showed a current photograph of the current condition.

Mr. Laster stated it looks like some panels have been removed from that door in order to put glass in there.

Chair Roberts stated they filled the transom.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know if the intent was to replace the transom.

Mr. Bates requested to know if it was the glass transom above the front door.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know if they wanted to replace it.

Mr. Creed stated if it was not damaged they would not.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated it currently does not have a transom right, it is just signage.

Mr. Creed stated he did not know.

Ms. Rose stated it was covered at the time the signage was approved and she does not know if there is glass in there or not. Ms. Rose stated they were applying for a federal tax credit so that is why they are trying to keep as much historic material as possible.

Mr. Creed stated outside the tax credit, we are fans of maintaining existing historic elements. Mr. Creed stated he would be concerned about the inconsistency across the front elevation.

Mr. Laster stated that since you are adding, you could make it more consistent with the original door. Mr. Laster stated he would like to offer two amendments. Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion under staff recommendation number one to include when sashes, if replaced, must be constructed of wood and match in profile and dimensions the existing one-over-one window sashes on the building, contingent on the recommendations of the Tennessee Historical Commission for tax credit purposes. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt suggested keeping the windows as is.

Mr. Laster moved the front door must be preserved, if determined to be original, contingent on the Tennessee Historical Commission for tax credit purposes.

Discussion ensued on the age of the windows, but no one was sure.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated there is a struggle with her on this one.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant isn't required to make any changes to their building at all and so if after having those conversations with the Tennessee Historical Commission or with window restoration specialist they decide to forego any changes to the front façade, then they are certainly allowed to that without any approval from Historic Zoning.

The motion carried 5-1, with Lisa Marquardt voting no.

Mr. Laster move to amend the motion under Staff Recommendations number two to include that the front door appears to be original to the building and must be preserved, if that is the case. Mr. Laster stated replacement doors for altered bays must be constructed of wood and be approved by staff. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Mr. Bates questioned if that could not be determined by the Tennessee Historical Commission, along with the windows.

Mr. Laster added that to the amendment the door must be approved by the be determined by the Tennessee Historical Commission for tax credit purposes.

The motion carried 5-1, with Chair Roberts voting no.

The overall motion passed with the amendments, 6-0.

Chair Roberts asked to discuss the second item, stairwell access addition/railing/fire escape construction and asked if anyone had a motion for this one. Chair Roberts stated that would be on staff's conditions 3, 4, and 5.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7183 for the stairwell access addition, railing, and fire escape construction with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Mr. Hathaway stated he had a question for staff concerning item number 2 being unclear, "cladding with brick veneer," and asked if that is just the rooftop portion and not the cladding the rear stairwell.

Ms. Rose stated you are correct, just the rooftop protrusion.

Mr. Laster stated he had to make a comment and stated the only other roof access would be the new Tennessee Horizon building, and if we approve a roof access for this building, then we are going to have other applicants also.

Chair Roberts stated you are going to have them anyway, as there is a roof access on a building going up right now on First and Main Street.

Mr. Laster stated the difference is those are new buildings and that this our historic building. Mr. Laster stated that the way the town looks, and it will distract from the character of the town square.

Ms. Marquardt agreed with Mr. Laster.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she agreed with Mr. Laster and withdrew her motion.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7183 for the stairwell access addition and railing and will include the fire escape as well. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Creed stated the struggle is they would not be able to—this is why we have many of the second floors to be vacant—we would like the building to have a simple use on the second floor and that we can't do that without a second egress.

Ms. Rose stated there will be requirements for stairwell accesses on rear elevations and our *Guidelines* are specific to where they are placed and how they look. Ms. Rose stated the fire escapes may require as different uses or different occupancies are introduced into buildings and that egress requirements are definitely maintained. Ms. Rose stated it is not a matter of someone having a fire escape; it is a matter of what it looks like and where it is put.

Mr. Hathaway stated he thought with his voting it was just for the roof access not the entire egress stair.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7183 for the purpose of constructing a fire escape with second story egress rather than rooftop with staff approval. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose stated staff is fine with reviewing the new revisions of the fire escape.

Chair Roberts moved on to item number 3.

Ms. Rose stated the HVAC would be moved to the rear of the building.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7183 for the proposed HVAC relocation with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for project 7183 for the proposed lighting with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 10, 2020. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts stated he would not support lighting on top of that building, but he will support exactly what they proposed for the sign areas below the building. Mr. Roberts stated we talked about this before up and down Main Street without flood lighting and we had a discussion before at DRC for another building that wanted to do something similar. Chair Roberts stated the commission would be going down a slippery slope if we allow that.

Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to deny the installation of goose neck lighting or any lighting on the pilasters of the building because lighting of these styles is traditionally used for lighting entrance doors and signage. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

The applicant requested to know if they approved the thinner beams going down.

Chair Roberts stated no lighting at all.

Mr. Laster stated just lighting over the bays.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant was talking about the LED lighting going down the building.

Mr. Creed stated yes.

Ms. Rose stated because of no specifications, this LED lighting should not be discussed at this meeting.

The amendment to the main motion carried 6-0.

The main motion with an amendment carried 6-0.

**Item 13:
Adjourn.**

With no further business, Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to adjourn, with Ms. Marquardt seconding. The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.



Acting Secretary