

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
APRIL 12, 2020**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, April 13, 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
Mary Pearce
Susan Besser
Ken Scalf

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Emily Hunter Wright, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelly Dannenfeler, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelli Gibson, Planning & Sustainability Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department
Vernon Gerth, Assistant City Administrator
Robert Mott, Communications Department

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the April 13, 2020, meeting to order at 5:03 pm.

Chair Roberts read a statement letting the public know how they may access the meeting and make comments, and it states as follows:

To prevent the spread of COVID-19 and to protect the health, safety, and welfare of City of Franklin officials, staff, and citizens, the Historic Zoning Commission will restrict physical access in the meeting room to a small number of staff members due to current limitations on public gatherings.

Accommodations have been made to ensure that the public is still able to participate in the meeting.

The public may participate in the following ways:

- Watch the meeting on FranklinTV or the City of Franklin website.
- Watch the live stream through the City of Franklin Facebook and YouTube accounts.
- Call in to the conference meeting 1-312-626-6799 to listen to the meeting via Zoom. Meeting ID 430 399 1941.

Callers will be unmuted and given an opportunity to ask questions during the meeting at specific times.

- Limited viewing will be available in the lobby of City Hall to watch the live video.
- The public may email questions to planningintake@franklintn.gov to be read aloud during the meeting.

RESOLUTION 2020-38

Ms. Baker Hefley moved to approve a Consideration of Resolution 2020-38, “A Resolution Declaring That The Historic Zoning Commission Shall Meet On April 13, 2020, And Conduct Its Essential Business By Electronic Means Rather Than Being Required To Gather A Quorum Of The Members Physically Present In The Same Location Because It Is Necessary To Protect The Health, Safety, And Welfare of Tennesseans In Light Of The COVID-19 Outbreak.” Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 2:

Minutes: January 13, 2020 & March 9, 2020

Mr. Laster moved to approve both sets of minutes, and Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated she submitted a correction to Ms. Rose for the March minutes.

Ms. Rose stated there was a typo and a request for additional supplement be added to Item 6, specific to the applicant’s response to Ms. Besser’s comment.

With the corrections noted, the motion carried 9-0.

Item 3:

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

No Requests.

Item 4:

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 5:

Consideration of Addition at 236 3rd Ave. N.; Marla Shuff, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking consideration of an addition at 236 3rd Ave. N. The addition is proposed to follow alterations that were previously approved by the commission at the March 9, 2020 meeting, including the elevation of the structure out of the floodplain. 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 addition has been designed to consist of two masses. Ms. Rose stated utilizing a

“connector” design, the applicant is proposing the construction of the entire addition at the rear of the existing house. Ms. Rose stated the “connector” mass is inset and contains a first level porch and an at-grade chair lift entrance. Its materials consist of lap siding, brick columns, and a parged-coated masonry base. Ms. Rose stated then, extending rearward, the “connector” ties into the second mass, which features a brick foundation with an at-grade opening for leisure use and a lap-sided, side-gabled first level. Ms. Rose stated the rear roof form features a simple shed box bay. Ms. Rose stated the rear roofline and foundation openings were simplified upon the recommendation of the Design Review Committee. Ms. Rose stated the right elevation inset, while present, is not quite as pronounced between the “connector” and the secondary mass, but the utilization of a marked roof break helps to further differentiate the existing and addition forms. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has revised the proposed design to incorporate several recommendations compiled by both the applicant and staff from the Historic Zoning Commission deliberation on March 9, 2020 as follows:

- The removal of the proposed shiplap siding material on the “connector” portion of the left side of the addition, in lieu of a masonry material that will meet floodplain construction standards (parged masonry and brick), and the adjustment of fenestration sizing, shapes, and style to be more consistent with that on the original structure;
- The revision of the “connector” portion stair design through the opening of the area underneath the stair and chair lift, the addition of an open railing all the way across the case and deck, and the removal of proposed shiplap and its replacement with parged masonry and brick;
- The modification of the proposed rear bay window by its adjustment in shape—pulling it below the main roofline—and the adjustment of its fenestration sizing, shapes, and style to be more consistent with that on the original structure; and
- The adjustment of fenestration sizing, shapes, and style on the right elevation to be more consistent with that on the original structure.
- Other modifications for floodplain compliance included the relocation of the required vents and the reductions of the window openings on the right elevation firewall.

Ms. Rose stated the footprint of the proposed addition measures 698 sq. ft., which equates to an approximate 55 percent addition to the existing structure (1,260 sq. ft. footprint) based on the applicant’s provided information. Ms. Rose stated the addition size is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #4), which recommends that additions be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building. Ms. Rose stated the proposed lot coverage measures 20 percent, which is consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines* (p.54, #5). Ms. Rose stated the materials of the proposed addition (brick foundation and columns, parged masonry foundation, wood lap siding to match existing, standing seam metal roofing, and architectural asphalt shingles) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55). Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed addition with the following:

1. The footprint of the proposed addition measures 698 sq. ft., which equates to an approximate 55 percent addition to the existing structure (1,260 sq. ft. footprint) based on the applicant’s provided information. Therefore, the addition size exceeds the recommendations of the *Guidelines* by approximately 5 percent (p.54, #4). As a condition of approval, the applicant must work with staff to lessen the footprint size of the proposal to meet the recommendations of the *Guidelines*.
2. The railing must have the appearance of wood to best meet the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*, which recommend that railings be wood and simple in design as opposed to metal (p.79, #21). It is understood that wood may not be appropriate for floodplain construction requirements, which require that materials located below base flood elevation be required to be flood/decay resistant. The specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. 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.
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - The use of appropriately sized flood vents located within 12 inches of grade;
 - The submittal of calculations to determine if required minimum Landscape Surface Ratio percentage is met; and
 - The elevation of all utilities to be above base flood elevation, including electrical, plumbing, and HVAC.
5. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Wilson stated they are pretty much in agreement with all the recommendations with one exception on the square footage, since we are pretty close to it, and in past conversations the general consensus was that it was a marginal amount and it would be okay. Mr. Wilson stated other than this one request, they are fine with everything else.

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

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for COF Project 7228 for the proposed addition. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Mr. Hathaway moved to amend the motion to include to take away condition number 1 from the staff recommendation. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 8-1, with Ms. Marquardt voting no.

Ms. Pearce stated she would agree to have number 1 removed from staff conditions on Project 7228, but all other conditions must stay. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

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

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously Approved Construction (Accessory Structure Addition) at 1018 W. Main St.; Michael Lee, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant requests consideration of alterations to a previously approved addition to an accessory structure at 1018 W. Main St. Ms. Rose stated that the *Guidelines* recommend that additions be designed to be clearly 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 *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility, noting, however, that the 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 *Guidelines* also state that the historic building must be clearly identifiable, and its physical integrity must not be compromised by new additions (p.54, #2). Ms. Rose stated as previously approved, the addition was designed as a shed roof off the left side of the outbuilding. Ms. Rose stated the new roof fell underneath the eave of the existing outbuilding, dropping to 5’ at the new outside wall (see Exhibit 3). Ms. Rose stated the Building & Neighborhood Services Department has expressed concern about the

ability to gain enough head room in the area, as approved, for its intended use as a bath area. Ms. Rose stated the proposed re-design raises the outside wall height to 7'. Ms. Rose stated the addition remains inset approximately 11' from the front elevation, as previously designed. Ms. Rose stated the size of the addition is not proposed to change from that approved previously. Ms. Rose stated the revised design continues to allow the outbuilding to read as the main form with the addition reading as a contemporary yet compatible form, as recommended by the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the materials are also proposed to remain the same as those approved previously—wood siding of a 5" reveal, block foundation, shingles to match existing, wood windows, Craftsman trim). Ms. Rose stated all window specifications have all been approved by the Preservation Planner, as conditioned by the previous COA.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed alterations to the previously approved construction 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 additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.

Ms. Gottlieb, the property owner, stated she thought Ms. Rose covered everything and requested to know if there were any questions.

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

Ms. Marquardt move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations to the previously approved construction of Project 7223. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Alterations (Columbarium Construction) at 435 Main St.; Ed Triggs, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant requests consideration of alterations through the construction of a columbarium at 435 Main St. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking approval for the construction of a columbarium to be built adjacent to the subject church building, along the rearmost area of the left elevation, as viewed from Main St. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that modern elements that contribute to the functionality of a building be placed along rear elevations or otherwise out of view from the main street, and visibility should be further screened through landscaping or fencing (p.128, #1). Ms. Rose stated the Secretary of Interior's Standards also suggest that any construction related to historic resources be done so in a way so as not to destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. Ms. Rose stated the new work shall be differentiated from the old and be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment. Ms. Rose stated further, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired (p.3). Ms. Rose stated the proposed columbarium is designed to be freestanding and not connected to the historic church building, which is consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Ms. Rose stated with a brick casing, limestone base, and metal niches, the design takes cues from the architecture of the historic church, which the proposed mass and scale are clearly subordinate. Ms. Rose stated material samples were not submitted for consideration in light of applicable masonry guidelines (p.113, #8). Ms. Rose stated the placement is also subordinate and consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*, as it is recessed deeply into the courtyard, behind existing landscaping and utilities, out of view from the main street (see Exhibit 2).

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed columbarium construction with the following:

1. A brick and limestone sample must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval in light of the applicable *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including the following:
 - The wall requires sealed, signed, and dated Architectural and Structural Engineered Plans to be submitted for review.
 - The structural portion of the wall design shall include, but not be limited to, footing details, wall construction, Uniform Design Load Factors, window, snow, brick information, etc.
 - The architectural portion of the review shall include, but not be limited to, type of filler for the back of the columbarium, the brick information, ties, flashing, accessible sidewalk of 48” width leading to the columbarium, a 60” turning space in front of the columbarium, etc.
3. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Triggs stated he guesses he goes along with everything Ms. Rose has submitted and asked for clarification on who he brings the material to for approval.

Chair Roberts stated to Ms. Rose and to meet all of Building & Neighborhood Services’ regulations.

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

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project 7224 for the proposed columbarium construction. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of Alterations (Entrance) at 132 1st Ave. S.; Rhonda Maxey, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant requested to defer this item.

Item 10:

Consideration of Alterations (Construction of Dormers on Accessory Structure) at 246 4th Ave. S.; Mike Rapier, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant requested Consideration of Alterations (Construction of Dormers on Accessory Structure) at 246 4th Ave. S. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state new construction should be compatible in scale and proportions with adjacent structure and consistent with the context of the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Rose stated dormers should relate to the style and proportion of windows on the principal structure and should be set back a minimum of two feet from the exterior wall (p.64, #5, #11). Ms. Rose stated the existing front-facing dormer is situated approximately one foot from the exterior wall, so the applicant has proposed to inset the new dormers one foot off the exterior wall as well in order to match the pitch. Ms. Rose stated while the proposed side elevation dormers are scaled more appropriately to the size of the existing dormer and those seen on similar historic and infill accessory structures in the historic district, the proposed rear elevation dormer is designed at much larger scale than the existing dormer. Ms. Rose stated the dormer height is within inches of the overall structure roof peak. Ms. Rose stated though this is likely done in order to maintain an 8/12 pitch, this creates an overall dormer form—both for scale and placement in relation to roof ridge—that is not compatible with the

context of the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Rose stated the use of transom windows on the rear dormer was suggested by staff in order to meet transitional features regulations of the Zoning Ordinance as related to privacy. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also proposing the placement of new fixed transom windows onto the lower level right elevation. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of new window openings onto primary or readily visible secondary elevations and that new windows have historic profiles and dimensions. Ms. Rose stated windows for an infill structure should relate to the architectural style of the structure (p.90, #3-5). Ms. Rose stated the proposed windows are similar in rhythm, spacing, and placement to those found on the existing garage doors and will not be readily visible from the street view. Specifications have not been provided for consideration. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed side elevation dormer construction and window placement with the following:

1. While the *Guidelines* state that dormers should be set back a minimum of two feet from the exterior wall (p.64, #11), the existing front-facing dormer is situated approximately one foot from the exterior wall, so the proposed side elevations are designed to match the scale, pitch, height, and placement.
2. The new 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, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Adherence to Section 5.2.7 (A) of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, “Accessory Dwellings;”
 - The submittal of calculations to determine if required minimum Landscape Surface Ratio percentage is met; and
 - Habitable rooms above garages are required to be separated by not less than 5/8” Type X gypsum board or equivalent, per IRC Table R302.6.
4. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed rear dormer construction with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* state new construction should be compatible in scale and proportions with adjacent structure and consistent with the context of the surrounding neighborhood (p.64, #5). While the proposed side elevation dormers are scaled more appropriately to the size of the existing dormer and those seen on similar historic and infill accessory structures in the historic district, the proposed rear elevation dormer is designed at much larger scale than the existing dormer. The dormer height is within inches of the overall structure roof peak. As such, the overall dormer form—both for scale and placement in relation to roof ridge—is not compatible with the context of the surrounding neighborhood.
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, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Adherence to Section 5.2.7 (A) of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, “Accessory Dwellings;”
 - The submittal of calculations to determine if required minimum Landscape Surface Ratio percentage is met; and
 - Habitable rooms above garages are required to be separated by not less than 5/8” Type X gypsum board or equivalent, per IRC Table R302.6.

3. If issued a COA, any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Rapier stated he appreciated the time and opportunity to speak to the rear dormer that has been talked about and denied. Mr. Rapier stated Mr. Kyle Kramer, an architect, will speak here in a second. Mr. Rapier stated they had initially brought this project to the Historic Society to test it out and we had the outside stairway going in the back and really the dormer size was created to create the space necessary to support the pitch of the stairs going up and moved from outside to inside in order to have privacy issues that they were concerned about be addressed as soon as could be with the proposed stairway being moved inside. Mr. Rapier stated therefore the dormer space is a little larger than the existing to be consistent with what has been talked about needed to be that large in order to adequately to have the stairwell work. Mr. Rapier requested to know if Mr. Kramer wanted to speak.

Mr. Kramer stated he would agree with that but didn't know if it was much larger than the other dormers. Mr. Kramer stated it is still below the roofline but not visible from the front elevation, the accessory structure—which non-historical as Ms. Rose pointed out—is very far from the road, it is adjacent to the rear property line, and we did revise the windows on that property line, and he thinks whoever was present at the previous meeting should remember we had exterior stairs back there and that has been moved internal. Mr. Kramer stated this is honestly the smallest this dormer can get and still allow for the head room required by code to get upstairs, inside the garage as it is now, without penetrating the roof plane. Mr. Kramer stated they are really cornered there with regard on how we come up inside that structure without coming up into the middle of that second floor.

Ms. Rose projected the floor plan with Mr. Kramer pointing out the stairs.

Mr. Kramer stated he is trying to keep the second floor a useable floor plan upstairs. Mr. Kramer stated the windows are not used for egresses, the ceil pipe is above your head, allowing light into the stairwell. Mr. Kramer stated if the dormer walls have to come in, and we will not have the head height and have to come through the second floor diminishing the area. Mr. Kramer stated they looked at the roof pitch and could drop the roof pitch to make it that much closer to the ridge, but considering we are still underneath the ridge and not visible, he thinks it is more appropriate to keep the roof pitch the same as the rest of the roof pitches. Mr. Kramer stated they are trying to make it as small as they can.

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

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed side elevation dormers and windows. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster asked the applicants if they have considered if a spiral staircase in that location might work better with the size of the dormer recommended by staff.

Mr. Rapier stated the original concept for this property was that his folks are getting older and are not in good health. Mr. Rapier stated that they had talked about doing a spiral staircase but felt a straight stairway would be easier for getting in and out of the space.

Mr. Laster requested to know if the applicants could actually lower the roof line of the dormer and still get the width they need and comply with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Kramer stated if he lowers the roof pitch of this dormer, he could lower it relative to the main ridge of the garage. Mr. Kramer stated that he does not know if that is any more appropriate.

Mr. Laster asked the applicant if he lowers that to match the other dormers, will the staircase still be functional.

Mr. Kramer stated if he keeps the 8/12 pitch and lower the ridge that will make me move the walls in toward the middle—it will make a skinnier dormer—and then he will not have the head height to get underneath and will not have the 80 inches required once he tries to tuck under that exterior wall. Mr. Kramer stated if it would work and he could match all three, but the stairs will not work there.

Chair Roberts asked that the commission consider the motion on the floor for the side dormers.

With the motion having been made and voted on, it carried 9-0.

Ms. Marquardt moved to grant issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed rear dormer construction, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation for Project 7226 and based on what we heard of the necessity and the efforts the applicant has made to make this work as best as possible, and also based on the fact that it is in the rear, thereby not being very visible. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster stated he wanted to clarify the question had nothing to do with the width of the dormer but its height in relation to the roofline and the other dormers. Mr. Laster asked the applicant if he were so able to keep the width and lower the pitch on that dormer roof if he could still have a useable staircase.

Mr. Kramer stated yes, the pitch of the roof on the dormer does not affect the head height issue. Mr. Kramer stated the issue is not at the soffit line or the fascia line, so really, he could make that work at a lower pitch, but the problem is where he comes down on the floor plan. Mr. Kramer stated he could flatten that pitch out a little bit and he believes he would be okay from an egress standpoint.

Mr. Laster stated he was just trying to clarify when he says a “pitch” and the applicant says “pitch” that they are talking about where the other dormer first meets that pyramid roof and that this dormer could meet in that same place, except just be wider.

Mr. Kramer stated correct, if he kept the width alone in order to do that, he would have dropped it from an 8/12 to, say, a 6/12. Mr. Kramer stated he can get it to where it would be right on it and would be a lesser pitch.

Mr. Laster stated he would like to hear discussion from some of the other board members on this.

Ms. Pearce stated she could support the roof with the modifications that have been suggested.

Mr. Scalf stated with the location of this dormer, if he just had a guarantee that the ridge line would not exceed the height of the existing ridge line, he would be satisfied because it is not going to be visible.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if it could be a foot lower than the main roof at the point of the pyramid.

Chair Roberts stated he didn't think they were looking at the rear elevations on the screen.

Ms. Rose offered to share the elevation again and showed the rear elevation and side elevation.

Ms. Pearce stated her question is can that dormer on the rear miss the top point of the pyramid by twelve inches and leaving the width.

Mr. Kramer asked Ms. Pearce if she would like to see the ridge dormer be twelve inches lower than the main ridge of the main garage, leaving the width. Mr. Kramer stated the answer right now is it is three inches now, so Mr. Kramer asked if Ms. Pearce want him to lower that pitch nine more inches to give us a one-foot differential.

Ms. Pearce stated correct.

Mr. Kramer stated it is possible to make that twelve inches lower.

Ms. Pearce stated she would make an amendment to reduce the height to the rear dormer to be twelve inches below the ridge line. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

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

Item 11:

Consideration of Addition, Alterations (Porte Cochere Enclosure, Chimney), Demolition (Accessory Structure), & New Construction (Accessory Structure) at 209 2nd Ave. S.; Marcus Brooks, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant requests consideration of an addition, alterations (porte cochere enclosure, chimney), demolition (accessory structure), & new construction (accessory structure) at 209 2nd Ave. S.

Addition—Ms. Rose stated that 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, with 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 that 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 that 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 that the proposed addition is located on the rear elevation of the residence and designed at a 1 ½-story scale, the addition rests on the back side of the side-gabled form and extends outward, beyond the historic structure’s exterior wall. Ms. Rose stated that much of the upper level is enclosed, while some is proposed to consist of covered and unroofed porch space. Ms. Rose stated that a stair is proposed to extend from the upper level to the yard along the right/south elevation. Ms. Rose stated that while the addition height does not exceed that of the existing roof ridge, the proposed scale is incongruent with the form of the existing building, which reads as a single-story structure. Ms. Rose added that staff recommended that the applicant consider the use of a dormer to capture upper-level space during the February DRC site visit, as this approach is used more typically in the historic districts to maintain form and proportional relationship between the historic structures and new construction elements.

Ms. Rose stated that the footprint of the proposed addition measures 393 sq. ft., which equates to an approximate 37 percent addition to the existing structure, based on the Williamson County Property Assessor’s information. Ms. Rose stated that the addition size is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #4), which recommends that additions be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building.

Ms. Rose stated that the proposed lot coverage is unclear. Ms. Rose stated the lot measures approximately 4,900 sq. ft. and that the existing principal structure footprint, according to the Williamson County Property Assessor site, measures 1074 sq. ft., and according to the same site, the existing outbuilding

footprint measures 290 sq. ft., though this measurement may be reflective of the previous configuration shown on the Location Map. Ms. Rose stated that clarification is needed on the existing and proposed accessory structure footprint in order to determine proposed lot coverage. Ms. Rose stated that the *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.65, #12).

Ms. Rose stated the proposed stone veneer base and standing seam metal roofing materials appear to be consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55). Ms. Rose stated that without a material sample, however, it is unclear how well the proposed stone compare to the historic stone façade in scale and texture. Ms. Rose added that the applicant has not indicated the material of the proposed horizontal siding and that other elements, such as the porch materials, have also not been specified.

Alterations (Porte Cochere Enclosure)—Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting to enclose the porte cochere in order to serve as conditioned space. Ms. Rose stated research of the 1928/1940 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the area demonstrate that the porte cochere was present historically. Ms. Rose stated as a historic architectural feature, the *Guidelines* recommend against enclosure, stating that “historical architectural features should be preserved and maintained” and that “enclosing a porte cochere changes the overall character of a residential building and should be avoided” (p.48, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation also suggest that any construction related to historic resources be done so in a way so as not to destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. Ms. Rose stated the new work shall be differentiated from the old and be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment. Ms. Rose stated further, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired (p.2-3). Ms. Rose stated as designed, the enclosure cannot be reversed without compromising historic elements, as the enclosure utilizes masonry instead of screening or glass with vertical framing members, and a large portion of the left elevation wall is proposed to be removed to open the enclosed area to the main residence. Ms. Rose stated due to the use of the masonry, the enclosure is not designed in such a way that will continue to allow the porte cochere to read as a historic element of the historic structure (that has been enclosed) as opposed to a modern addition to a historic structure. Ms. Rose stated without a material sample, it is unclear how well the proposed stone compare to the historic stone façade.

Alterations (Chimney)— Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking to salvage the brick and rebuild the existing chimney, as he indicated that it is unstable during the February DRC site visit. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that if chimneys are collapsed or unstable, one reconstructs them to match their original appearances (p.51, #3).

Demolition (Accessory)— Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking approval to demolish the rear yard outbuilding. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the demolition of historic buildings or structures and state that demolition only be approved if the Historic Zoning Commission deems one or more of the demolition criteria met, as listed (p.52, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated the criteria are listed as follows:

1. The first criterion by which demolition may be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission is that of Architectural and Historical Integrity, specifically, if a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district’s historic character. The *Guidelines* state that “loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that address relevant issues” (p.52, #1).
2. A second criterion by which demolition may be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission is that of Unreasonable Economic Hardship, specifically, if denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the Historic Zoning

Commission. The *Guidelines* recommend that one “please refer to the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist as provided” on page 53 of the document. The *Guidelines* further clarify that the Historic Zoning Commission will use this checklist to assist with the review of economic hardship claims (p.52, #1).

3. A third criterion is Public Safety and Welfare, specifically, if the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure or building (p.52, #1).
4. A fourth criterion by which demolition may be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission is that of Structural Instability or Deterioration, specifically, “if the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect” The *Guidelines* state that “such a report must clearly detail the property’s physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition.” The *Guidelines* also recommend that “there should be a separate report which details future action on the site (p.52, #1).

Ms. Rose stated the applicant has not indicated a specific criterion by which demolition is requested for consideration and has not provided narrative information specific to any of the listed criteria. Ms. Rose stated evaluation of the 1928/1940 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the area indicate that the outbuilding was in place at the location, and it has remained in the same footprint and configuration until recently, as indicated by the Location Map aerial. Ms. Rose stated curiously, the photographs demonstrate that the outbuilding appears to have been altered through partial demolition or disassembly recently, perhaps by previous owners.

New Construction (Accessory)—Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to build a new accessory structure in roughly the same location as the existing one. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that accessory structures be constructed in traditional locations behind the principal structure and designed to be visually subordinate in placement, size, mass, and intricacy to their respective principal structures (p.64, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that accessory structures be designed to be shorter in height than and designed to be consistent with the contexts of the principal structures they serve (p.64, #3-4). Ms. Rose stated architectural details should complement, but not visually complete with, the character of the historic principal structure (p.64, #4). Ms. Rose stated new accessory buildings should “use components typically used in historic equivalents” (p.64, #6).

Ms. Rose stated the applicant has not provided a complete elevation set for the proposed accessory structure, as the front and rear elevations are missing from the plan set. Ms. Rose added that materials are not specified and that clarification is also needed on the proposed accessory structure footprint in order to determine proposed lot coverage. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.65, #12).

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed addition with the following:

1. While the addition height does not exceed that of the existing roof ridge, the proposed scale is incongruent with the form of the existing building, which reads as a single-story structure. 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. (p.54, #3). Several material specifications are missing, most importantly those related to the proposed stone veneer and horizontal siding. The proposed lot coverage is also unclear; clarification is needed on the existing and proposed accessory structure footprint in order to determine the proposed cumulative lot coverage. The *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.65, #12).

2. If issued a COA, 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. If issued a COA, the stone base material must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. If issued a COA, the horizontal siding must consist of wood or cementitious material for a historically appropriate reveal (4-5") for consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.83, #4-5).
5. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - The inclusion of floor plans and the driveway on the plot plan;
 - The submittal of calculations to determine if required minimum Landscape Surface Ratio percentage is met; and
 - The demolition and/or new construction work for the accessory structure must be submitted on a separate plan for a building permit.
6. If issued a COA, any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Robison, the property owner, stated she would be happy to talk about the item. Ms. Robison stated as they shared a site visit, she and her husband never had in mind they would live here. Ms. Robison stated they love the neighborhood and the neighbors and business owners. Ms. Robison stated they don't have a need for very large square footage home. Ms. Robison stated there are things they have had to compromise with things they could live with and without. Ms. Robison stated the living space is an issue for them due to having five grown children and ten grandchildren and would like to be able to have them come there for family affairs. Ms. Robison stated the present living space is only 783 square feet, which is very small. Ms. Robison stated they did not even have a functioning kitchen right now. Ms. Robison stated in order to make the floor plan fit for the needs of her family is where they came up with filling the porte cochere. Ms. Robison stated she hopes they can come up with some kind of compromise with the commission and find a way to make this work for her family. Ms. Robison stated when they purchased the property the outbuilding was already where it is and they did not move it.

Mr. Brooks stated thank you for having them and it is exciting moving to the step. Mr. Brooks stated he was going to speak to the meeting they had on site. Mr. Brooks stated because of the restrictions to the site, like the thirty-foot setback put in place in January and the seven-foot side yard setback, Mr. Brooks stated at the on-site meeting it was decided that building behind the porte cochere was not a good idea so to move on and get the compromise, we were to step down in the master bedroom, which was a huge compromise, it gave them eight-feet of head space on the second level. Mr. Brooks stated the second compromise was to consider a single dormer to come off the roof and had Ms. Rose project the elevation. Mr. Brooks stated the way he sees it is as the single dormer comes off the main ridge of the house and creates that upper level and what he did was to squeeze in the sides and bring down the scale of it. Mr. Brooks stated those changes were in response to the site meeting. Mr. Brooks stated that is all on the addition.

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

Mr. Laster moved to defer the entire Project 7227 to the May 11th HZC meeting and to invite the applicant to the DRC meeting. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Rose explained the procedure being implemented currently of how meetings were being held.

Ms. Marquardt stated she thought of making a similar motion and understands what the applicant needs, but there are too many open-ended questions and that this needs to be reviewed by Design Review.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated her only concern is the chimney and asked if it is in a condition of where it can fall down in a month.

Mr. Laster moved to defer project 7227, with the exception of the chimney, to the May 11th HZC meeting, and make comments by DRC. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt stated this should be deferred to a meeting in DRC with people being there in person.

Ms. Dannenfels explained we do not know at the moment when a meeting can be held in person.

Mr. Laster stated that he saw the comments from the last DRC, which were submitted by comment, and that he thought there were a lot of good suggestions. Mr. Laster stated this might be a good way for us all to be able to make suggestions on this project without a physical meeting and reassemble in May and take up this issue again.

The motion carried 9-0.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed chimney alterations with the following:

1. The chimney must be rebuilt to match its current appearance, per *Guidelines* (p.51, #3). A photograph of the existing conditions must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to work commencing.
2. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Pearce moved to **approve with conditions** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed chimney alterations at the project on 209 7th Ave. South. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 12:

Other Business.

No other business.

Item 13:

Adjourn.

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

Acting Secretary