

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
JUNE 8, 2020**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, May 11, 2020, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley
Susan Besser
Jeff Carson, arrived 5:04 pm
Mike Hathaway
Brian Laster
Ken Scalf
Mary Pearce

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelly Dannenfelser, Planning & Sustainability Department
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department
Robert Mott, Communications Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department

Call to Order

Vice-Chair Pearce called the June 8, 2020, meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

RESOLUTION 2020-83

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to approve a Consideration of Resolution 2020-83, “A Resolution Declaring That The Historic Zoning Commission Shall Meet On June 8, 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.” Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Vice-Chair Pearce 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 615-550-8420 to listen to the meeting. 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. Comments will be accepted up to one hour prior to the meeting.

- Share your official comment with the agenda item specified in the comment section of the Facebook or YouTube live videos.

Minutes: May 11, 2020

Mr. Laster moved to approve the May 11, 2020 minutes. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

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

No Requests.

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 1:

Consideration of Alterations (Accessory) at 203 2nd Ave. S.; Dianne & Mike Christian, Applicants.

Ms. Rose stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the alteration of an existing garage accessory structure at 203 2nd Ave. S. Ms. Rose stated the project consists of the removal of a modern garage door and its replacement with custom carriage-style doors composed of cedar. Ms. Rose stated the doors will have strap hinges and will be painted to match the exterior or trim of the outbuilding. Ms. Rose stated that cross bracing made of cedar will be located across both doors. Ms. Rose stated the doors will be 2.25" thick and will measure 9' x 6.6' total. Ms. Rose stated the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its May 18, 2020 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support replacement of features like doors with compatible replacements. Ms. Rose stated the current garage door is modern, and the style and materials of the proposed door are more consistent with the character and architectural style of the principal building the outbuilding serves. Ms. Rose stated the proposed alteration conforms to the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed accessory structure alteration as follows:

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

Ms. Christian stated Ms. Rose covered everything.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved to approve project #7275 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed accessory structure alteration. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

**Item 2:
Consideration of Signage at 149 1st Ave. N.; Emily Kuykendall, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of signage at 149 1st Ave. N. Ms. Rose stated the flush-mounted letters are located on the first story of the building storefront and are composed of 0.25” plate aluminum letters painted navy blue. Ms. Rose stated the larger letters are 13” in height and the smaller letters are 3” in height. Ms. Rose stated the smaller letters are pre-mounted to a flat metal bar that will be painted to match the façade. Ms. Rose stated the logo measures 20.25” by 15.25” and contains a design with orange used as an accent. Ms. Rose stated the letters and logo cover 14 square feet of the storefront’s 31’ façade width. Ms. Rose stated the proposed window sign on the door measures two square feet. Ms. Rose stated the sign features the logo design and both light and dark-colored lettering. Ms. Rose stated the proposed sign size (14 square feet of letters on a façade with a 31-foot width) and material (plate aluminum letters and a metal bar) are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that sign colors should complement the colors of the building, strong primary colors should only be used as accents, and signs should have no more than two or three colors. Ms. Rose stated the proposed color scheme (dark navy lettering with an orange accent) is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that the locations, sizes, and placement of signs should be selected to complement those of neighboring or adjacent buildings. Ms. Rose stated this application is the first sign package proposed for a storefront located within the office/retail spaces along the 1st Avenue side of the building.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed window sign features the dark blue and orange logo and letters design with white accents and additional light-colored lettering. Ms. Rose stated the design is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed signage as follows:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit. If the proposed window sign exceeds the size permitted by the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant shall work with Planning and Building & Neighborhood Services staff to reduce the size of the decal.
2. Any changes must be returned to staff for review and approval.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions project #7274 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed signage. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

**Item 3:
Consideration of Addition, Alterations (Porte Cochere Enclosure, Roofing), Demolition (Accessory), and New Construction (Accessory) at 209 2nd Ave. S.; Marcus Brooks, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 209 2nd Ave. S., as follows:

- The construction of a one-story rear addition;
- The demolition of the rear yard outbuilding;
- The new construction of an accessory structure in the same approximate location as the existing outbuilding;
- The enclosure of the porte cochere to serve as a sunroom; and

- The replacement of the principal structure’s metal roofing with wood shake roofing material.

Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission deferred review of the items at its April 13, 2020, meeting to allow for additional discussion and for the applicant to present additional information. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the most recent proposal at its May 18, 2020, meeting.

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”. 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. 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.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed addition is located on the rear elevation of the residence. Ms. Rose stated its designed at a one-story scale, the hipped addition rests on the back side of the side-gabled form and extends outward, matching the ridge height of the front-facing gable. Ms. Rose stated the addition is subservient in size and primarily designed to read as a glassed-in porch, with a small section of the addition is proposed to be clad in cementitious siding. Ms. Rose stated the height, scale, offset, and material changes differentiate the form from that of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated the footprint of the proposed addition measures 335 sq. ft., which equates to an approximate 28.7 percent addition to the existing structure. Ms. Rose stated the addition size is consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommends that additions be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed reclaimed stone veneer base is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the use of cementitious siding is also consistent with the *Guidelines*, though the use of a 4-5” lap is recommended as a historical equivalent over the proposed 6” reveal. Ms. Rose stated due to the proposed size of the double chimney, additional stone will likely be required beyond that reclaimed. Ms. Rose stated window specifications have not been submitted for consideration. Ms. Rose stated please note that the proposed roofing material for the addition is reviewed as part of the proposed overall principal structure roofing material replacement later in the presentation.

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. Ms. Rose stated the criteria are listed as follows:

1. Loss of Architectural and Historical Integrity;
2. Unreasonable Economic Hardship;
3. Public Safety and Welfare; and
4. Structural Instability or Deterioration.

Ms. Rose stated within the online application submission, the applicant states that “the existing shed is compromised structurally and historically” and that “it currently stands on posts without footings and has been significantly altered recently, per historic aerials.” 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 in Exhibit 1. Ms. Rose stated the structure is historic, but the integrity of the structure's original form has been compromised by these recent alterations.

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. 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. Ms. Rose stated architectural details should complement, but not visually complete with, the character of the historic principal structure. Ms. Rose stated new accessory buildings should "use components typically used in historic equivalents."

Ms. Rose stated the proposed accessory structure is located at the rear of the property, in roughly the same location as the existing outbuilding proposed for demolition. Ms. Rose stated this proposed location is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the design of the proposed accessory structure also conforms with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the design is comparable to the existing outbuilding, utilizing lap siding, a single carriage-style door underneath the front-facing gable, and a standing seam metal roof. Ms. Rose stated the lap reveal should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings, which is typically 4"-5". Ms. Rose stated the size of the proposed accessory structure is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the footprint square footage of the principal structure measures 248 sq. ft. *Guidelines* recommend that accessory structure be designed to be visually subordinate in size to their respective principal structures.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant has submitted additional information to provide clarity on proposed lot coverage, which relates to guidelines for proposed enclosed additions and new construction. Ms. Rose stated the lot measures approximately 4,883 sq. ft. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to add 335 sq. ft. to the existing building, which consists of approximately 1167 sq. ft. of footprint. Ms. Rose stated the proposed accessory structure measures 248 sq. ft. Cumulatively, the proposed lot coverage amounts to 35.8 percent, which is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint. Ms. Rose stated the property has been reduced significantly in size recently by previous owners, and the resulting less-than-one percent overage in building coverage is imperceptible.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting to enclose the porte cochere in order to serve as conditioned space. 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." 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. Ms. Rose stated as previously designed, the enclosure could not be reversed without compromising historic elements, as the enclosure proposed to utilize masonry instead of screening or glass, and a large portion of

the left elevation wall was proposed to be removed to open the enclosed area to the main residence. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has revised the design to address these issues.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to replace the existing standing seam metal roofing on the principal structure and to replace it with wood shake roofing. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that roof materials contribute to building style and historic character and recommend that one retain historic roof materials, adding that if partial or wholesale replacement is needed, one use materials whose composition and appearance match the historic materials. Ms. Rose stated since historic photographs of the subject property cannot be located by staff and have not been provided, staff researched Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps to gather any relevant information on the historic roofing materials. Ms. Rose stated on the 1928 Sanborn Map, updated in 1940, the map notes that a composition roof was in place on the principal structure and that a tin or slate roof was present on the accessory structure. Ms. Rose stated based on this historical documentation, the proposal to replace the standing seam metal is appropriate, but the *Guidelines* suggest that the most appropriate replacement material would be the historic material, a composition roof. Ms. Rose stated asphalt composition roofing was widely in use by the 1910s.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed addition, demolition of the outbuilding, and new construction of the accessory structure, as follows:

1. The proposed lot coverage amounts to 35.8 percent, which is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.65, #12). The property has been reduced significantly in size recently by previous owners, creating a lot that is much smaller than those around it. The resulting less-than-one percent overage in building coverage is imperceptible.
2. The chimney stone material must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The applicant must utilize a historically appropriate lap reveal for the addition and the accessory structure (between 4"-5") for consistency with the *Guidelines*.
4. The windows for the addition and the accessory structure must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. The outbuilding must be satisfactorily photographed inside and out for commission records prior to its demolition.
6. 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 property must maintain a minimum of 40 percent Landscape Surface Area to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - The demolition and new construction work for the accessory structure must be submitted on a separate plan for a building permit.
7. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Brooks stated the only comments are in regard to the landscape surface area and in regard to the exposure on the lap siding. Mr. Brooks stated landscape surface area is calculated on the first page of our set and came to 50 percent and the lap siding on the addition is to match the lap siding on the shed. Mr. Brooks stated one comment that up during our DRC was that it should have corner boards on the lap siding of the accessory structure/shed and he did not know if that needed to match across or if he could do mitered corners on that since it is a contemporary addition.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if there were any citizen comments for this item.

Ms. Dannenfels stated there was no one on the phone lines, but believes Ms. Rose has some comments from others.

Ms. Rose stated the owners of the property did provide neighborhood letters for support and she received four letters that she would summarize. Ms. Rose stated the first letter is that which the Robisons, the owners, sent when they sought to receive some support for their variance. Ms. Rose clarified a variance is a legal term and not quite what they are seeking here. Ms. Rose stated they are seeking approval for items that they may or may not meet the intent of the Guidelines, depending on what the request is.

- Ms. Rose summarized that the Robisons were seeking support for a request for overage on the lot coverage of 35.8 percent, as opposed to the 35 percent recommended by the Guidelines.
- Ms. Rose summarized from the letter that the Robisons are seeking support for closure of the porte cochere, stating that the letter reads that it will be constructed in a way that is temporary and can be reverted to the original design if desired in the future.
- Ms. Rose stated that the letter reads that the Robisons requested support for the demolition of the existing shed in the back, which is in disrepair and not historical.
- Ms. Rose stated the letter reads that the Robisons have asked permission for support to add an addition to the existing building, which the Robisons state falls within the Guidelines.
- Ms. Rose stated further the letter states if the neighbors agree with the plans, the Robisons asked the neighbors to pass along the information to the Commission.

Ms. Rose stated they did receive four letters in favor of the plans. Ms. Rose stated letters were signed by Mr. Kelly Hardwood, who lives at 202 2nd Avenue South; Mr. Ira Shivitz, who lives at 202 Church Street; Mr. John Robertson, who lives at 211 2nd Avenue South; and Ms. Dianne Christian at 203 2nd Avenue South. Ms. Rose stated those were all the comments received.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to approve project #7274 with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition, outbuilding demolition, and accessory structure new construction. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated the comment she would make is that there has been no scaling back to the chimney scale, as discussed at DRC.

Ms. Pearce stated that if there is no other discussion, she will take a roll call vote.

Ms. Rose stated Mr. Brooks asked for guidance on the corner boards on the accessory structure in relation to Ms. Rose's recommendation that the siding have a 4 to 5-inch lap reveal as opposed to the 6-inch reveal proposed, and Ms. Rose would like the commission to discuss this for clarification for the motion.

Ms. Rose pulled up the elevations.

Mr. Brooks stated it is on the sided portion of the addition and a single corner.

Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to include corner board be added to the siding to rear right elevation.

Mr. Scalf seconded the motion to amend, and the motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Laster requested to know if the stone would be painted grey on the rear to match the stone on the front.

Mr. Brooks stated yes, it would be.

Mr. Laster requested to know what material will be used for the windows, especially the vertical members—the mullions and muntins.

Mr. Brooks stated all windows are wood windows.

With the main motion having been amended, the main motion carried 7-0.

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

1. 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.”
2. If issued a COA, 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 application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed porte cochere enclosure as submitted. Mr. Hathaway stated he moved to approve based on it being easily removeable as currently designed, as opposed to the demolition that was requested before.

Mr. Laster stated he seconded the motion due to its original use is no longer being a modern way of using that space and what better way to use the space than like a sunroom that can be reversed in the future.

The motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Besser voting no.

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

1. Based on staff’s research of primary resource materials, the proposal to replace the standing seam metal is appropriate; the *Guidelines* suggest that the most appropriate replacement material would be the historic material indicated on the Sanborn Fire Insurance map, a composition roof. The use of a composition, or asphalt shingle, roof can provide dimensional qualities similar to that of the proposed wood shakes while meeting the intent of the applicable *Guidelines*. If the applicant finds evidence of a historic roofing material underneath the existing metal roof, the applicant may contact the Preservation Planner whether the discovered material qualifies as an in-kind replacement material.
2. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed roofing material alterations. Mr. Carson seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Item 4:

Consideration of Alterations (Landscaping) at 230 Franklin Rd.; Gamble Design Collaborative, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of a section of walkway at the Factory at Franklin property and to replace it with concrete pavers. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its May 18, 2020, meeting.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that original landscape features and configurations be maintained and that one preserve and maintain historic sidewalks and walkways. Ms. Rose stated new sidewalks and walkways should follow historic patterns of alignment, configuration, width, and materials. Ms. Rose stated the proposal to replace the walkway is consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the walkway was not present historically; it was installed when the previous owner purchased the property. Ms. Rose stated the walkway is the central course from the mid-section of the rear parking area to the location of Mojo Taco, and it currently consists a combination of marble pavers, railroad ties, and concrete sidewalk. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* suggest that the new replacement materials follow historic patterns. Ms. Rose stated the applicant indicated that the use of a traditional concrete sidewalk was initially considered but is not preferable, as several underground utilities run through the area of the walkway. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the use of a paver that would allow for lesser difficulties in ongoing utility maintenance as well as correct ongoing tripping hazards, drainage issues, and potential ADA conflicts.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to use the combination of two pavers from the Belgard line of products—the main field choice is the Catalina Grana paver in the Savannah color, and the sailor course choice that is proposed to line the walkway is the Dublin Cobble paver of an unidentified color. Ms. Rose stated an accent area of Dublin Cobble is also proposed to be added at the main factory entrance. Ms. Rose stated Staff asked for additional information on the Dublin Cobble paver choice. Ms. Rose stated the applicant provided a photograph from the interior courtyard of a downtown hotel for reference. Ms. Rose stated the color choice is not listed. Ms. Rose stated the product website indicates that the Catalina Grana paver is from the “Metropolitan” line, with pavers exhibiting smoother, linear surfaces for a more contemporary look. Ms. Rose stated the Dublin Cobble stone is from the “Heritage” line, with the pavers exhibiting more distressed, tumbled surfaces. Ms. Rose stated the distressed look is evident in the applicant’s courtyard photograph. Ms. Rose stated the character of the Factory site is industrial, with use of bricks, metals, and concretes. Ms. Rose stated while the most appropriate walkway replacement may be the use of a standard concrete sidewalk—like others on the site—staff understands the need to access the many utilities demonstrated on the plan set. Ms. Rose stated while the use of a sailor course is appropriate, the use of a contemporary style as the main field material with a distressed style as the sailor course does not appear to be consistent with the character of the site.

Ms. Rose stated that the applicant revised the presentation before the Historic Zoning Commission this evening to include a new material to replace the Dublin Cobble material for the commission’s consideration, called Holland, in order to address staff’s comment in the report.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed landscaping alteration, as follows:

1. The applicant must either utilize the Belgard “Metropolitan” line or the “Dublin Cobble” selection of colors from the Belgard “Heritage” line for both the main field and sailor course pavers, but not mix the two lines. While the use of a sailor course is appropriate, the use of a one style as the main field material with another style as the sailor course does not appear to be consistent with the character of the site.
2. Additional information must be submitted to the Preservation Planner to substantiate the request for the paver material placement at the main factory entrance (location/area of disturbance, with the exact paver selection matching that approved by the HZC for the subject walkway) for consideration and approval prior to work commencing.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
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. Frymire stated Ms. Rose covered all the points and showed the photographs and this would be the only sidewalk with the pavers. Ms. Frymire stated the paver picked is the same color and looks like what is there. Ms. Frymire stated they would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Gamble stated there is an area adjacent to Mojo that they are considering outdoor dining, and if that is decided to be done, they would bring back a submittal for that.

Ms. Rose stated she had some questions and requested to know if the Holland material is from the Metropolitan line.

Ms. Frymire stated yes, and she would send Ms. Rose a catalog. Ms. Frymire stated she did not have a photograph of the stock color and explained both the field and edge are Holland stone.

Ms. Rose stated for the commission to keep in mind the applicant is asking for a sailor course which would run the other way.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if there were any citizen comment for this item.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed landscaping alterations. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser moved to amend the motion to have staff review the samples before being used. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

With the main motion and amendment, the motion carried 7-0.

Item 5:

Consideration of Addition (Rear Porch Extension) at 106 Mayberry Ct.; Kimberly Henderson, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the extension of an existing rear porch at 106 Mayberry Ct., inside Myles Manor Subdivision. Ms. Rose stated the applicants are also seeking to place a concrete patio between the rear porch and an existing bedroom area at the rear of the building and have provided information about the request in the application. Ms. Rose stated the at-grade patio does not require issuance of a COA, however. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that the

construction of porches or decks may be supported on rear or secondary elevations where they are not readily visible from the street and that new porch materials should be compatible with those found on the principal structure or match existing porches found within the district. Ms. Rose stated the residence is a noncontributing infill structure, constructed ca. 2011, so the alteration of the existing porch may be appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the existing porch is proposed to be extended into the rear yard by 10 ft., producing additional building coverage of 187 sq. ft.

Ms. Rose stated the applicants propose to use matching materials for the extension—brick base, matching posts, matching architectural shingle roofing. Screening material is proposed to be added. Ms. Rose stated the footprint of the proposed addition measures 187 sq. ft., which equates to an approximate 5.7 percent addition to the existing structure. Ms. Rose stated the addition size is consistent with the *Guidelines*, 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 30 percent, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent, as measured by building footprint. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed rear porch extension, as follows:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
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. Henderson stated they appreciate the Commission's consideration.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if there were any citizen comment for this item.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed rear porch extension. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Other Business.

None.

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:39 p.m.

Acting Secretary