

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
JANUARY 11, 2021**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, January 11, 2021, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker
Susan Besser
Brian Laster
Lisa Marquardt
Mary Pearce
Jim Roberts
Kathy Worthington

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelly Dannenfelser, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelli Gibson, Planning & Sustainability Department
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department
Barrett Petty, Building & Neighborhood Services Department

Call to Order

Chair Roberts called the January 11, 2021, meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Chair Roberts welcomed Ms. Kathy Worthington.

RESOLUTION 2020-273

Consideration of Resolution 2020-273, “A Resolution Declaring That The Historic Zoning Commission Shall Meet On January 11, 2021, 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. Laster moved to approve Resolution 2020-273. Ms. Baker seconded the motion and the motion carried 7-0.

Chair Roberts read the following:

The City will restrict physical access in the meeting room to a small number of staff members due to current limitations on public gatherings to prevent further spread of COVID-19 and to

protect the health, safety, and welfare of City of Franklin officials, staff, and citizens. 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 meeting 1-312-626-6799; Meeting ID: 942 7737 3966; Password:566959. Callers will be unmuted and given the opportunity to comment during the meeting at specific times • Limited viewing will be available in the lobby at City Hall for up to ten persons, but in-person comment in the Boardroom will not be available. • The public may email comments to planningintake@franklintn.gov to be provided in full to the Commission and included in the minutes but not read aloud in their entirety during the meeting.

Ms. Worthington stated she was a native of New Orleans and a professional interior designer who has been practicing since 1980 to 2016, when she moved to Franklin. Ms. Worthington stated that she is currently teaching at Belmont in their Interior Design program and that most of her work has been centered around historical properties, both residential and commercial. Ms. Worthington stated she loves living in Franklin. Ms. Worthington stated she did a lot work in the French Quarter, on the Vieux Carre Commission and in public housing. Ms. Worthington stated her side has always been on the applicant side and is happy to be on this commission.

Minutes: December 14, 2020

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the December 14, 2020 minutes as submitted. Ms. Baker seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Consideration of 2021 Commission Chair and Vice-Chair

Ms. Marquardt moved to have Mr. Roberts as Chair and Ms. Pearce as Vice-Chair. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0, with Mr. Roberts recusing himself from the vote.

Approval of 2021 Meeting and Application Deadlines Calendar

Ms. Besser moved to approve the meeting and application deadline calendar. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

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

No non-agenda emergency items, but there was a staff announcement.

Ms. Rose stated she forgot to add Announcements but wanted to state there is DRC next Tuesday at 4 pm. Ms. Rose also stated she wanted to note that everyone should have received an email from her concerning two federal preservation grants that the City would like to move forward with submitting applications. Ms. Rose stated they are in reference to an update to the National

Register documentation update for the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District and for some burial marker restoration work at both City Cemetery and Rest Haven Cemetery. Ms. Rose stated she is working to see if the City Administrator will allow her to move forward with these grant opportunities.

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 add anything to the Agenda.

Item 1:

Consideration of New Construction at 326 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6); 906 Studio Architects, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a two-story principal structure with attached 1-½ story garage at 326 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6). Ms. Rose stated the residence is proposed to be situated so that its rear elevation backs to Fair St. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission denied issuance of a COA for a previous rendition of the proposal at its October 12, 2020 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the applicant then revised the proposal and presented it to the Design Review Committee for discussion at its December 21, 2020 meeting.

Ms. Rose stated the Hincheyville Historic District consists primarily of single-family residential buildings ranging in construction from ca. 1828 to the 1950s and represents influences of Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Italianate, Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival, and Craftsman, among others. Ms. Rose stated buildings range from one to two stories, and historic garages and outbuildings are common. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detract from the character of the historic district. Compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street, and the height of infill buildings on newly created streets should be compatible with the building heights on the nearest block face within the established historic district (p.66, #4-5).

Ms. Rose stated the proposed scale of two stories for the main portion of the structure is appropriate for the Hincheyville Historic District. Ms. Rose stated the garage portion is proposed at one and a half stories. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that “in areas

where historic garages are generally detached, new garages should appear to be detached. Attached garages should be designed in such a way that they are located at traditional locations behind the rear plane of the main form of the house or otherwise not be visible from the street” (p.68, #22). Ms. Rose stated the Hincheyville Historic District features more detached accessory structures than attached garages, and because of this, the applicant worked to address staff and DRC comments related to massing in order to provide better consistency with the context of the district. Ms. Rose stated the applicant utilized staff’s recommendation to break up the massing by semi-detaching the garage portion of the structure. Ms. Rose stated while the semi-detached garage cannot be placed behind the rear plane of the principal structure in its entirety, it is recessed behind the front plane and therefore lessens the massing of the overall form significantly. Ms. Rose stated additionally, the placement of the garage helps serve as a lesser-massed transitional piece between the new construction and Fair St.’s historic buildings behind it.

Ms. Rose stated the height of the proposal, at 29’-1”, is consistent with the portion of the *Guidelines* that state that infill construction height compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street. Ms. Rose stated the approved Fair Park Ct. construction heights are 32’-8” (Lot 4) and 29’-11” (the adjacent Lot 5), and the additional building on the block face, located at 322 11th Ave N., measures approximately 34’. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also state that the height of infill buildings on newly created streets should be compatible with the building heights on the nearest block face within the established historic district (p.66, #4-5). Ms. Rose stated heights range along the adjacent portion of Fair Street (from approximately 24’ to approximately 31’.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant has included a design element on the front elevation that is not entirely typical to historical equivalents. Ms. Rose stated the use of a two-story vertical bay, while not as typical to the Hincheyville Historic District, is a feature seen on some historic structures. Ms. Rose stated the inclusion of the porch/covered balcony area is a bit atypical, but it is designed so that the porch element is not as immediately from vantages to the left or right of the structure, as it is mostly inset. Ms. Rose stated the inset design allows the porch to function without presenting a distraction to the overall context of the district. Ms. Rose stated further, because this is infill construction on a newly created street and the front elevation is not in view of the adjacent historic structures situated behind the property, this modern interpretation may be appropriate.

Ms. Rose stated in lieu of using an awning over the garage doors, which is not typical to historic equivalents, the applicant has utilized the roofline to create a covered area over the garage doors. Ms. Rose stated this treatment also allows for the perception of a roof dormer that is located 2’ off the front wall of the garage, despite its function as a wall dormer. Ms. Rose stated this treatment is atypical to historic structures, but because this is infill construction of both the principal and garage structures on a newly created street, this interpretation may be appropriate.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed materials of the proposed new construction are listed as cementitious lap siding, cementitious panel, shake siding for the gables and dormers, architectural shingle roofing, standing seam metal for bay component, and brick foundation, all of which are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated window specifications have not been provided. Ms. Rose stated the proportion and rhythm of window openings are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend maintenance of the rhythm and spacing of window and door openings of adjacent structures (p.68, #17). Ms. Rose stated the applicant altered the placement of the window on the garage portion's dormer (raising it off the eave), as suggested by the DRC, so that it will have a more historically compatible appearance.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed building coverage is 36.6 percent, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.67, #10).

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

1. The proposed building coverage is 36.6 percent, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.67, #10).
2. If issued a COA, the applicant must utilize a smooth-faced siding with a historically appropriate lap reveal (between 4"-5") for consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.83, #4-5).
3. If issued a COA, the 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.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant wished to speak.

Mr. Hathaway stated he wanted to thank the commission for their patience as we address a lot of the concerns for this project. Mr. Hathaway stated they were excited about the new direction, and from a massing perspective, we like it a lot better where it has the feel of a detached garage. Mr. Hathaway stated that practically we felt it necessary to have a connection for a lot of reasons like security and a lot of other things from the garage into the house. Mr. Hathaway stated they also reduced the size of the front porch in order to reduce the overall coverage. Mr. Hathaway stated he understands the 35 percent coverage and they have done all they can to reduce it and getting it down to about 36.5 percent made consistent with the guidelines or close to the guidelines. Mr. Hathaway stated they are not substantially over that amount, so we would ask for your approval of that.

Mr. Hathaway stated the upstairs recessed porch was an idea of his client, which we originally had that as a two-story boxed bay, and they asked if they could create a porch on the second level

because most of their living is going to be done on the second story. Mr. Hathaway stated she will live mostly upstairs, and with this being an infill, we are asking for sort of an interpretation of a second-level porch maybe seen in more traditional application. Mr. Hathaway stated they have worked hard to keep the height low and thought they were at 29'-1", and that is from a lot of conversation and effort to get that down, and we appreciate your consideration of that as well and will be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to comment, and no one requested to comment.

Mr. Laster moved to approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated January 11, 2021. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster requested that Mr. Hathaway elaborate on that a little more on his statement that he made that they had done all they could to reduce the square footage.

Mr. Hathaway stated they worked really hard to create a house that is livable for our client and that included the amount of square footage she needed for living space, dining, and kitchen, as well as the garage, which uses up some of the percentage. Mr. Hathaway stated where it got larger was where we detached the garage and had that connector that took us over the 35 percent, so were in practicality, other than that infill between the garage and main house, at 35 percent, but the connector piece puts us over the edge.

Mr. Laster thanked Mr. Hathaway for his explanation and stated he knows there has been a lot of accommodations from the DRC on this project, and that is why he moved to approve it.

Ms. Baker added that 1.6% is perceivable and that she is not sure we should ask the applicant to adjust it down due to anybody noticing the difference from any view shed.

Ms. Pearce stated she has supported going over the percentage, but it has been where there is a very large lot or there has been perceived open space, and this backs up to a National Register District, so in support of the district, she thinks the changes that have been made to the house are wonderful, but it concerns her that we are giving any variance on something that backs up to a National Register District. Ms. Pearce stated just a few of these lots do, but she thinks this is one of them.

Chair Roberts stated just looking at square footage, the difference is 104 square feet between the 35 percent versus what is proposed.

With the motion having been made and seconded, the motion carried 4-3, with Ms. Pearce, Ms. Worthington, and Ms. Besser voting no.

Item 2:**Consideration of Signage at 99 E. Main St.; Renee Mediamolle, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a signage package at 99 E. Main St., as follows:

- The placement of wall signage above the storefront and canopy, with gooseneck fixtures proposed to be mounted above it;
- The installation of projecting arm signage adjacent to the storefront, underneath the canopy; and
- The installation of window decal signage.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed wall sign is located above the building canopy and below the second-floor windowsills. Ms. Rose stated the sign is rectangular in shape and is proposed to be centered over the storefront entrance. Ms. Rose stated while the proposed location is typical of neighboring buildings, the design of the building face includes an approximate 1' brick projection that bisects it. Ms. Rose stated thus, the centered wall sign requires the use of spacers so that it can rest on the brick projection. Ms. Rose stated because of this, the proposed sign placement is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend against the placement of signage over original decorative designs or detailing (p.121, #23) and state that applied wall signs should be mounted to the flat surfaces of buildings (p.121, #15).

Ms. Rose stated the wall sign is aluminum in material, with acrylic or metal lettering, which is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.120, #11). Ms. Rose stated the color of the background is dark gray, while the lettering is green in color.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed coloring is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that one utilize a darker background and lighter lettering and that sign colors should complement the colors of the building (p.120, #3-4). Ms. Rose stated the use of a darker green shade would be more in keeping with the building colors.

Ms. Rose stated the wall sign measures at 3'-5" x 16'-8", or approx. 58 sq. ft., which does not appear to be consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that wall signs should measure no more than one square foot per linear foot of width of the storefront (p.120, #1) to order to maintain appropriate scale with the façade. Ms. Rose stated confirmation of the storefront width is required in order to determine the appropriate wall sign sizing.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed lighting consists of gooseneck fixtures that will project light directly onto the wall sign. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new light fixtures used to illuminate signs be unobtrusive and have appropriate placement on the building (p. 112,

#2), and because of this, the type and location of the proposed lighting are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting install a projecting arm sign underneath the canopy, adjacent to the storefront. Ms. Rose stated the projecting arm sign features a flat steel arm and an aluminum sign face that measures 5 sq. ft. in size; this exceeds the recommendations of the *Guidelines*, which note that projecting arm sign faces should not exceed 4.5 sq. ft. in surface (p.120 #1). Ms. Rose stated the sign face is designed with a dark gray background and green and white lettering colors. Ms. Rose stated the proposal does not indicate the exact location of the proposed sign, however. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that sign locations complement those of neighboring buildings and as such, it is recommended that the sign be installed to the left or right of the storefront glazing. Ms. Rose stated applicable codes require that the bottom of the sign face be installed so that it provides at least 8' of clearance from the grade surface.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting to install a window decal on the left side of the entrance. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that window decals consist of light lettering and that they do not distract from the building façade or engross the window (p.120, #8). Ms. Rose stated Staff spoke with the applicant and recommended the use of an individual lettering in lieu of the solid applique (see attached email from applicant to staff, dated December 30, 2020).

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of the proposed wall signage as follows:

1. The proposed sign placement does not entirely meet the intent of the *Guidelines*, as it is proposed to be placed over building detailing and not on a flat surface of the building.
2. If the Historic Zoning Commission determines that the sign placement is appropriate, the applicant must confirm of the storefront width so that staff can determine the appropriateness of the proposed sign size. The wall sign will then need to be rescaled accordingly.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit.
4. Any changes 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 approve with conditions the proposed projecting arm and window decal signage as follows:

1. The proposed projecting arm sign measures 5 sq. ft. in size; this exceeds the recommendations of the *Guidelines*, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The

sign must be resized for compliance and resubmitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a sign permit.

2. The proposal does not indicate the exact location of the proposed sign. The sign should be installed to the left or right of the storefront glazing. Applicable codes require that the bottom of the sign face be installed so that it provides at least 8' of clearance from the grade surface. The sign location and clearance from grade must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a sign permit.
3. The redesigned window decal signage must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review in light of applicable *Guidelines* prior to installation.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant wished to comment on this.

Mr. Ritzen stated it seemed everyone is in agreement with the window decals. Mr. Ritzen stated we have no problem achieving the minimum eight-foot height for the projecting sign, as we can easily cut 1.75 inches around the perimeter to get under or below the 4.5 square feet.

Mr. Ritzen stated the issue is the wall sign and that there is a couple of factors going on here. Mr. Ritzen stated they are the first tenant, so what we want to do will result in setting a precedent for others, and we want to make it easy to adhere to along the way. Mr. Ritzen stated he has built a ton of buildings, and he gets the brick accents and things like that, but this projection is an inch, at best, protrusion. Mr. Ritzen stated it is the same brick color as either side of it, so what you have is that the building that they built has a storefront that was always intended to have signage above it, so this brick accent is just there. Mr. Ritzen stated if you put our signage on side or the other, it is going to look silly, so symmetry was the primary concern because we wanted it to look symmetrical. Mr. Ritzen stated obviously if the brick outset was an accent color or something distinctively different, and he asked Ms. Rose to reference an email he sent with a different signage option where we had to pick one side or the other to go on. Mr. Ritzen stated there is a million ways we can skin a cat here with the sign installation. Mr. Ritzen stated we could, in fact, go in and pull the bricks that are protruding and made them flush and just mounted everything flush.

An example was projected on the screen. Mr. Ritzen stated you have the definitive area framed in, and there is no world where it will look okay sitting on top of this peach color to the left of the sign (referencing example on screen of other building). Mr. Ritzen stated there is a couple of ways to do this, one being thickening the back of the sign on either side so that the backing is absolutely flush with the brick at all locations and appear the brick outset terminates at the top of the sign, or I could pull the brick to make them flush underneath, which I am not sure it would do the same thing. Mr. Ritzen stated he feels his signage guy took a little bit of liberty here in this rendering to make the backing match where how the bricks were laid or something like that. Mr. Ritzen stated the backing can adjust to whatever size it needs to be. Mr. Ritzen stated the real thing is how to address the overall size to fit 32 feet. Mr. Ritzen stated they don't want it to look

silly being on one side or the other. Mr. Ritzen stated the question is how we achieve placing the sign to make it look right.

Ms. Pearce moved to deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed wall signage, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated January 11, 2021. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts noted his issue was the size of the sign, not how it is positioned.

Ms. Pearce stated he is the first one at this nice new building downtown and has no problem with the position, but with the size of the sign. Ms. Pearce stated she felt this is worthy of coming back to DRC.

Ms. Baker stated she did not feel we would encounter this with every tenant but is something we should keep in consideration.

Ms. Rose stated this was one building that had two storefronts combined and that Ms. Baker is correct that it will not come up all the time.

Ms. Worthington questioned how the awning affects the sign.

Ms. Rose stated it is a continual integrated brick canopy that comes over the sidewalk due to how the building was constructed and the canopy is below where the applicant is placing the sign and is the whole length.

Ms. Marquardt stated this building reminds her of the one across from the factory and that she doesn't recall these kinds of signs are on the brick this way. Ms. Marquardt questioned if the signage could be lowered and not on the brick at all but on the overhang. Ms. Marquardt stated she agrees with Ms. Pearce's suggestion of going back to DRC.

Ms. Marquardt moved to defer this item to the next voting meeting and come to DRC to discuss options. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

The first motion is overridden by this motion to defer.

Ms. Besser stated if the applicant came back with a sign more in keeping with our square footage that would really help because the proportions are really off.

The motion to defer carried 7-0.

Ms. Baker moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed projecting arm and window decal signage. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Item 3:

Consideration of Ramp Construction, Alterations (Parking/Driveway, HVAC Placement), & Fencing at 128 4th Ave. N.; Chisel Workshop, Applicant.

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 128 4th Avenue N., as follows:

- Construction of an ADA accessibility ramp
- Alterations to the existing parking area and driveway
- Construction of fencing
- HVAC placement

Ms. Gibson stated that proposals related to this item appeared before the Design Review Committee at its March 16, 2020 and May 18, 2020, meetings.

Ms. Gibson stated the proposed accessibility ramp is located on the rear elevation of the house. Ms. Gibson stated the ramp is composed of wood and is designed to include wood or metal balusters and painted wood lattice. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend that ramps be composed of wood and placed on rear or secondary elevations. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that ramps be designed to be reversible and have a minimal impact on historic features and that detailing be similar to that found on the historic building (p. 80, #1-4). Ms. Gibson stated wood balusters should be selected for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the location, design, and detailing of the proposed ramp are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Gibson stated the HVAC pad will also be located on the rear elevation of the house between the building and ramp. Ms. Gibson stated the ramp provides screening for the HVAC units. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend that utilities be placed and screened in order to minimize their impact on the district and the use of placement, landscape, and/or fencing to hide trash or utility units (p.89, #1 and #4). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed HVAC placement is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend that driveways follow historic patterns, be located along rear or side elevations, and should be landscaped to mitigate impact on the district's historic character. Ms. Gibson stated driveways and parking configurations are required to meet the standards set forth by the Zoning Ordinance (p. 77, #3 and #6). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed concrete parking area is located on the side of the building and behind the façade of the home. Ms. Gibson stated landscaping will provide screening to mitigate the impact on the

district. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed parking and driveway alterations are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed ramp construction, HVAC placement, and parking and driveway alterations as follows:

1. Wood balusters should be selected for the ramp for consistency with the *Guidelines*.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, including but not limited to meeting minimum parking requirements. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant wished to speak on his item.

Mr. McCreary stated he had nothing to add.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to comment, and no one requested to comment.

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed ramp construction, HVAC placement, and parking and driveway alterations. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated in part of this application it states that the project may not meet the parking requirement and it confuses her as to how we approve it.

Chair Roberts stated we are voting on everything before any consideration of an addition.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Gibson stated the proposal includes the replacement of existing wood fencing along the western property line and the construction of aluminum primary yard fencing. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed wood fencing is six feet in height and extends along the side yard of the property into the primary yard. Ms. Gibson stated as proposed, the fencing is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that wooden plank fencing be recessed at least 20 feet from the plane of the residence's primary façade and fence height should not exceed three feet in primary yards (p. 59, #8 and #10). Ms. Gibson stated fencing style specifications were not included in the application and will be required in order for staff to fully review the request.

Ms. Gibson stated the proposed aluminum fencing with brick piers extends along the primary yard of the property and ties into a sliding gate of the same style and materials located at the

entrance to the parking area on the side of the house. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed fencing is consistent with the *Guidelines* for height (three feet), but not style (p. 59, #10). Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the use of aluminum fencing in primary yards and instead recommend the use of wooden picket fencing, as wooden picket fencing is the most common fencing material for primary yards. Ms. Gibson stated other appropriate fencing materials include open-weave brick or cast-iron designs (p. 58, #4 and #7). Ms. Gibson stated as the property is a vernacular frame house, a wooden picket fence would be most compatible with the surface materials of the building (p.58, #6). Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* also recommend against the use of sliding gates, stating that front yard entrances should not have sliding gates, sliding gates should be avoided in general, and operable gates should be configured to swing inwardly and not open onto the public sidewalk (p. 59, #12).

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

1. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval, as primary yard fencing is not eligible for administrative approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant wished to speak on his item.

Mr. McCreary explained that the side yard fence on the left side currently has an existing fence, and we would like to replace that fence in-kind. Mr. McCreary questioned if that plays into the interpretation at all.

Ms. Rose questioned where the fence stops currently.

Mr. McCreary pointed it out on the drawing that was projected and stated it ends down by the furthest parking place.

Ms. Rose stated when fences are removed, technically speaking, they must be placed back per the guidelines.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there was a picture of the existing fence.

Mr. McCreary stated no. Mr. McCreary stated he had a question about fencing in the buffer zones for parking. Mr. McCreary stated in the Zoning Ordinance, it requires there be a buffer all the way that basically covers every single parking space that is added, and our interpretation would be that it is covered from the rear furthest back parking space all the way up to the front between three to six feet, so if the fence was a shorter height within those Guidelines, he inquired if that would that change the conversation.

Ms. Rose stated the Guidelines do recommend there be a three-foot height anywhere between twenty feet behind the front façade, which, in this case would be in line with the right side of the porch. Ms. Rose stated the height he has mentioned would be appropriate, but the style of the fence as a privacy fence would still be inappropriate in light of the guidelines stating primary fences should not be of a privacy style. Ms. Rose stated to speak specifically to his point about buffering, which is a valid point, there could be landscaping used in lieu of fencing in that twenty-foot area to screen any proposed parking there.

Mr. McCreary stated on the front yard fencing, we don't have any major objection to a different style of fence the Planning staff's recommendation of wood instead of a metal fence seems to make sense. Mr. McCreary asked if we need to come back before the commission with another design or if staff can approve administratively.

Ms. Gibson stated staff could not approve primary yard fencing administratively, so it would have to come back to the commission.

Mr. McCreary stated he had a question on the sliding gate and stated he knows that is kind of a hang up for a lot of things, but the intent here was the sliding gate would be something that would be open during business hours and closed for after hours. Mr. McCreary stated the appearance of the gate would be that of any other kind of swinging gate, so if you look at the elevation on the last sheet it shows it to look like two separate panels when closed, so the only time you would know it is a sliding gate is when it is in operation during business hours and would be screened by the landscaping on the left side of the entry drive. Mr. McCreary requested to know with this information does it cause any commissioners to think differently.

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

Mr. Laster moved to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed fencing based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt stated she would like a little more detail about the fencing being an in-kind replacement.

Mr. McCreary explained there is a fence already there and they would just replace that.

Ms. Pearce stated she thinks there has been a fence there and replaced for a number of years and probably put there before historic zoning existed.

Ms. Pearce moved for deferral of all the fencing to the February HZC meeting and for the applicant to come to DRC. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Item 4:**Consideration of Addition at 128 4th Ave. N.; Chisel Workshop, Applicant.**

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for an enclosed addition to the principal building at 128 4th Avenue N. Ms. Gibson stated this review pertains only to the proposed enclosed addition. Ms. Gibson stated Staff separated this application from the additional alterations because the proposed addition does not appear to meet Zoning requirements for parking. Ms. Gibson stated the proposals related to the item appeared before the Design Review Committee at its March 16, 2020 and May 18, 2020, meetings.

Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility. (p.54, #1). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed addition is located on the side and rear elevations of the house. Ms. Gibson stated designed at a one-and-one-half-story scale, the addition roof ridge height matches that of the front-facing gable. Ms. Gibson stated the portion of the addition located on the side elevation of the building is recessed from the plane of the building façade behind the side elevation porch.

Ms. Gibson 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. Gibson stated the historic building must be clearly identifiable and approaches that unify the existing structure and new construction into a single architectural whole should be avoided (p.54, #2). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed addition is differentiated from the historic structure through the use of insets, and some material changes (foundation). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed roof material and siding will match the existing structure. Ms. Gibson stated TPO membrane roofing will be placed on a small, flat portion of the existing roof. Ms. Gibson stated the proposal includes a gable and gabled dormers on the rear elevation of the house. Ms. Gibson stated the window located within the gable gives the appearance of a half story. Ms. Gibson stated the window should be removed to lessen the perceived scale of the addition, as the historic structure is a single-story. Ms. Gibson stated the dormers are located and scaled appropriately. For compatibility with historic equivalents, the dormers should be set back two feet from the exterior façade wall. Ms. Gibson stated the window located on the side of the dormer should be removed, as this is not a typical location for windows. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed addition skylights appear to be consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that skylights be installed in locations not visible from the street (p. 119, #3).

Ms. Gibson stated the footprint of the proposed addition measures 1106 sq. ft., or approximately 38 percent of the existing structure. Ms. Gibson stated the addition size is consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that additions be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building (p.54, #4). Ms. Gibson 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. Gibson stated the proposed building coverage (29%) is also consistent with the *Guidelines* (p. 55, #5).

Ms. Gibson stated the proposed smooth Hardie lap siding (4” reveal) and foundation materials (CMU with parge coat) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #3 and #6). Ms. Gibson stated the TPO membrane and asphalt shingle roofing is also consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed windows are composed of wood and appear to have historic dimensions and profile. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed style of trim boards is appropriate in light of the *Guidelines*, but the K-style metal gutters should be half-round or round for consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.63, #3).

Ms. Gibson stated based on updated information from the applicant, the proposed addition square footage as shown on the plans will require 12, not 14, parking spaces. Ms. Gibson stated the submitted plans do not appear to reflect this requirement. Ms. Gibson stated the parking requirements will be reviewed by building and Neighborhood Services in the building permit phase.

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

1. The windows must have historic profiles and dimensions 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.
2. The dormers must be set back two feet from the exterior façade wall for compatibility with historic equivalents.
3. The K-style metal gutters should be half-round or round for consistency with the *Guidelines*.
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, including but not limited to the minimum parking requirements for the addition, prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if Mr. McCreary requested to comment.

Mr. McCreary stated they went before DRC a couple of months ago and wanted to note the changes they made from the DRC meeting. Mr. McCreary stated the new design has taken in the comments from DRC to provide an addition much more in scale and in style comparable to the existing building. Mr. McCreary stated they made sure to make the additions small enough so you would not be able to see them, we added the dormers on the rear are set back, and previously we had a shed roof but now have gables. Mr. McCreary stated the gutters on the existing building are K-style right now, so switching to half rounds on the new addition may be inconsistent with the two and would like you all to consider that. Mr. McCreary stated regarding

the windows at the rear, the property is pretty well screened on all sides so this addition is really hard to see, so we would like your consideration on the two windows behind the larger gabled end because these are office spaces and it is difficult to have an office space without a window, so we would like your consideration on these windows because they are not visible from really and other elevations and are hidden. Mr. McCreary stated they are the one on the side by the two gabled corners and requested Ms. Gibson go to sheet HZC-09. Mr. McCreary stated on this sheet, you can see a little bit of that window, but for the most part that is screened from view as well. Mr. McCreary stated the only time you would see it is if you were on the property looking at the back of the house.

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

Mr. Laster moved to defer this item to the next HZC voting meeting and have the applicant come back to DRC. Mr. Laster stated there are a lot of issues that need to be discussed. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser explained there are just a lot of things going on with this application and she is not comfortable with how it is currently.

Mr. McCreary stated if you look at the property as a whole, he thinks it is important to consider that this is a fairly wide piece of property and there is a large bit of yard to the right side of the property where the addition is going. Mr. McCreary stated you can see a lot going on with that roofline already, and we think we are simplifying it a little bit. Mr. McCreary noted the imaging makes the addition look larger than it really is and on page HZC-12 it shows how the addition does not seem as big as it looks on previous pages, especially from the street, and the addition does not overwhelm the property.

Chair Roberts requested to know if it would help the commission if the applicant provided photographs with some markings to show the addition.

Ms. Marquardt stated absolutely.

Mr. Laster stated it would be very helpful and referenced page HZC-06.

Ms. Pearce stated the confusing thing to her is where staff states they are showing not enough parking, and then if we approve the addition, she doesn't understand if the cart is before the horse or how you do that because both things have to happen.

Chair Roberts stated it has changed from the 14 parking spaces to 12.

Ms. Rose stated there are ways to address the parking issues.

Ms. Besser stated from the elevation it is coming across as a duplex and should be a single house. Ms. Besser reference HZC-06 and stated if the addition did not come out as far, it would look better.

Chair Roberts requested to know how far back the addition sits from the front of the existing structure.

Mr. McCreary stated it is 33 and a half feet back (shown on HZC-03) and that the addition is less than half the existing structure.

With the motion to defer, the motion carried 7-0.

Item 5:

Consideration of Additions (Upper and Lower Levels) and Alterations (Breezeway Enclosure; Removal of Window Bays & Modification of Rooflines/Openings on Non-Historic Additions; Shutter & Garage Door Replacement; Select Window Replacement) at 402 Bridge St.; Chisel Workshop, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the subject property is a corner lot and features a ca. 1830s historic structure, which is oriented toward Bridge Street. Ms. Rose stated the historic structure features a ca. 1900 addition as well as one from 1981, both of which are designed as wings off the rear elevation and massed toward 4th Ave. N. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work, as follows:

- The construction of a second-floor addition onto the existing additions located behind the historic form of the structure;
- The modification of the existing garage size;
- The alteration of rooflines on the 1981 addition, including the enclosure of the breezeway and modification of the fenestration pattern through the removal of window bays and the relocation of select window openings;
- The replacement of select non-historic windows; and
- The replacement of the garage door and the shutters throughout the structure.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its November 16, 2020 and December 21, 2020, meetings.

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 for the proposed upper-level addition ties into the 1830s mass near the center of its rear elevation. Ms. Rose stated as such, it rests on a portion of the 1981 addition and on the ca. 1900 addition, creating a “T” shape. Ms. Rose stated its ridge aligns with that of the historic portion. Since this is a corner lot, the proposed addition is highly visible, which is not entirely in keeping with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated it is, however, situated onto an existing addition that is highly visible from the street. Ms. Rose stated because of this, the Design Review Committee expressed concern about the proposal’s overall massing at its December 2020 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has revised the proposed design to incorporate the recommendations from the DRC by lessening the overall proposed square footage of the upper level and recessing its mass away from the corner of the house, which allows the 1830s portion to remain more fully exposed at rear and corner vantages. Ms. Rose stated the ca. 1900 addition, located at the left and rear elevation, is not readily visible from the street; the proposed alterations allow it to be maintained as an identifiable portion, however, due to the offset of the upper-level addition and the maintenance of siding on the 1981 addition.

Ms. Rose stated the materials of the proposed addition (wood siding and trim, wood windows, brick chimney, asphalt shingles) are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55). Ms. Rose stated the use of k-style gutters is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*; the use of half-round gutters is more appropriate to the age and style of the Federal home (p.63, #1). Ms. Rose stated the exact window specifications have not been provided.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to extend the garage depth by 2’ in order to better accommodate vehicles. Ms. Rose stated as a non-historic addition, alteration may be appropriate. Ms. Rose stated its modification corresponds with the alterations discussed below:

- The applicant is proposing to address the overall massing of the building by altering some of the rooflines associated with the 1981 addition, specifically, through the enclosure of the breezeway, through the relocation of the wall that creates the covered patio area by approximately 5’, and through the adjusted depth/location of the garage wall by 2’. The removal of the window bays and slight relocation of select window openings on the existing wing of the building may also be appropriate, as this portion is not historic. Collectively, the proposed alterations to the massing of the existing additions render a more simplified, cohesive look that supports the simple detailing of the Federal style historic portion of the structure, all of which are in keeping with the *Guidelines* recommendations for enclosed addition design.
- The *Guidelines* recommend that one preserve and maintain historic windows and their openings. Replacement windows or new addition windows should have historic profiles

and dimensions that relate to the window materials found on the historic structure (p.90, #1, #4-5). The repair of existing historic windows is encouraged and qualifies as in-kind repair. Replacement of the non-historic windows with grilles between the glass, on all portions of the building, is entirely appropriate and encouraged. Replacement shutters must be wood and appear operable, per Guidelines (p.90, #7).

- The replacement of the garage door is appropriate as well. The *Guidelines* recommend that a door style similar to a historic equivalent, such as a carriage-style look, be utilized (p.64, #6).

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

1. The applicant must utilize half-round gutters, as they are more appropriate to the age and style of the Federal home, and the addition has visibility from the street view.
2. All new windows (both for replacement or for the addition areas) 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. Replacement garage door and shutter specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The applicant must match the existing lap reveal or otherwise utilize a smooth-faced siding with a historically appropriate lap reveal (between 4"-5") on the addition and the reworked 1981 addition, for consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.83, #4-5).
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant wished to speak on this application.

Ms. McCreary stated after DRC they went back and gathered their thoughts and looked at this building holistically, and the biggest challenge is multiple facades on that Fourth Avenue side where there are a lot of in outs on that 1980s addition. Ms. McCreary stated the problem with that was our scale was still off and odd and that she doesn't disagree with those comments we had at the DRC meeting. Ms. McCreary stated they gathered together as a team and the builder wants to do it right historically. Ms. McCreary stated they have intention of restoring the front portion of the historic home with the windows and the trim and the brick. Ms. McCreary stated the problem they had was with the box bays, and instead, they decided to just take them off. Ms. McCreary stated they are proposing to make the addition smaller with two full window bays so at this point and time the only window you are not seeing from the historic is the window being replaced in the middle of the second floor, and the other part important to her is that we align up the second floor addition with the 1980s addition on the first floor. Ms. McCreary stated they

made the 1980s addition shorter and moved that sidewall where that breezeway is toward the historic house five-feet. Ms. McCreary stated so that way when we are stacking the new addition on top of the 1980's addition that scale is appropriate for a Federal style house.

Ms. McCreary stated the other part on this addition is where she has always struggled with the garage and that double gable it makes it so tall and prominent, they decided to strip all that down and make it more simplified. Ms. McCreary stated the thought process here is moving that back and getting better in scale to tell the story of today's time and what has been done to it overtime. Ms. McCreary stated she felt the front historic portion is actually Queen Anne due to the down spouts coming through the middle of the soffit. Ms. McCreary stated they were open to whatever the commission decides on a gutter standpoint and noted they had planned on doing round gutters. Ms. McCreary stated she knows there has been discussions about the windows and if they should be one-over-one or two-over-two and the existing windows will be replaced with wood windows and wood siding.

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

Ms. Rose noted for the record the current owner, Ms. Julie Fisher, did have the applicant submit an email requesting voting in favor of the changes.

Ms. Besser moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition and alterations and modify the existing elevation to include multi-pane windows to come back to staff for approval of project 7447. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster stated if you look at the front of the house, the window lights are nine-over-nine, and so what was shown in the drawing to the rear are four-over-four. Mr. Laster questioned if it was truly four-over-four.

Ms. McCreary stated yes, any smaller windows on the historic brick portion are four-over-four.

Mr. Laster questioned if Ms. Besser meant four-over-four in her motion.

Ms. Besser stated no, because the windows are all different sizes, and that is why I have it coming back to staff for approval. Ms. Besser stated Ms. McCreary has done an excellent job on this application.

Mr. Laster stated he echoed Ms. Besser. Mr. Laster stated he would ask to consider on the garage portion and the window in between may stay one-over-one. Mr. Laster stated that was food for thought.

Ms. McCreary questioned if she would come back to staff or come to the commission.

Ms. Rose stated her.

Ms. Pearce asked if the garage portion of the building—since it is so exposed from the street has it been contemplated, since it is being ripped off—could be changed the front of the garage and the back where the doors will be to brick. Ms. Pearce stated there is such a run of siding going down the side.

Ms. McCreary stated they thought of putting shutters down that side to break it up and that it would be difficult to change to brick due to the foundation and explained they are trying their best to not mess with the foundation.

Ms. Baker requested to know if we have an existing left side.

Ms. Rose stated no.

Ms. McCreary stated to look at SK-10 and everything there is original as is except for the except for the second-floor portion that pops out above the bottom portion.

Ms. Baker stated she was looking through the plans and on SK-12 it appears the existing 1900s addition has a chimney and wanted to know if we would be losing that chimney.

Ms. McCreary stated there is a chimney there and the fireplace is not functional and has been closed in. Ms. McCreary stated from the exterior, yes, there is a chimney and that is part of the reason we looked at anchoring this addition with another chimney in the general vicinity of where it was because we like that look from a general standpoint it anchors, elevation and a gable that is on a Federal style building. Ms. McCreary stated it is their intention to use a tumble brick.

Ms. Baker requested Ms. Rose read the guidelines on chimneys.

Ms. Rose did so.

Ms. Marquardt asked if it is a historic structure since it was placed there in 1900.

Ms. Rose stated yes and explained about the 1980s addition.

The motion carried 7-0.

Other Business.

Ms. Rose noted there would be a DRC meeting on January 18, 2021.

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

Acting Secretary