

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 8, 2021**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, February 8, 2021, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

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

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelly Dannenfelser, Planning & Sustainability Department
Bill Squires, Law Department

Call to Order

Chair Roberts called the February 8, 2021, meeting to order at 5:01 pm.

RESOLUTION 2021-09

Consideration of Resolution 2021-09, “A Resolution Declaring That The Historic Zoning Commission Shall Meet On February 8, 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”

Ms. Pearce moved to approve Resolution 2020-273. Mr. Mann seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

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: 960 6658 5073; Password: 756461. 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. Emailed comments will be accepted until 12:00pm noon on the day of the meeting.

Minutes: January 11, 2021

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve the January 11, 2021 minutes with corrections. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Announcements

Ms. Rose stated there is DRC meeting this coming Monday the 15th via Zoom with four to five items and there is a special called meeting for Monday, February 22 at 4:30 pm.

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

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

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 Signage at 99 E. Main St.; Renee Mediamolle, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of a wall sign and pin lights at 99 E. Main St. Ms. Rose stated the projecting arm and window decal signage was approved by the Historic Zoning commission at its January 11, 2021 meeting, while the proposed wall signage was deferred to allow for more discussion. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its January 18, 2021 meeting.

Ms. Rose stated the subject property is unique in that it is designed with an integrated porch, creating by a cantilevered upper level. Ms. Rose stated this arrangement was approved in order to accommodate construction requirements in the floodplain. A wall sign is proposed to be placed above the building's porch 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 the design of the building face includes an approximate 1' brick projection that bisects it between the upper floor windows. Thus, the centered wall sign requires the use of spacers or a molded backer 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 otherwise, the proposed location is typical of neighboring buildings and presents itself as a typical sign placement.

Ms. Rose stated the backer board is metal in material, with acrylic or metal lettering, which is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the use of plastic as a sign material, though metal is appropriate (p.120, #11). Ms. Rose stated the color of the background is dark gray, while the lettering is bright green. Ms. Rose stated the proposed coloring is not entirely 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 or other muted tones found in the masonry would be more in keeping with the building colors.

Ms. Rose stated the wall sign measures at 2'-8" x 12', or approx. 32 sq. ft., which is mostly 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) in order to maintain appropriate scale with the façade. Ms. Rose stated Staff confirmed that the storefront area (pilaster to pilaster) measures approximately 25'. Ms. Rose stated the façade area that includes the pilaster and other areas of the same brick pattern/tones present an additional 7'. Ms. Rose stated staff provided both measurements to the Historic Zoning Commission and the applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed lighting consists of four (4) pin neck 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 specifications demonstrate a blue fixture; in order to meet the recommendations of the *Guidelines* fully, a dark bronze or black fixture should be utilized (selected from colors listed on specification sheet).

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. If the Historic Zoning Commission determines that the sign placement is appropriate, the applicant must provide information to demonstrate how the backer board will be molded and then adhered to the building to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a sign permit.
2. The proposed sign coloring is not entirely 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). The use of a darker green shade or other muted tones found in the masonry would be more in keeping with the building colors.
3. If issued a COA, the applicant must utilize metal letters in lieu of acrylic letters on the backer board, per *Guidelines*.
4. If issued a COA, the applicant must mount the sign and the light fixtures so that bolts are installed through mortar joints rather than through the face of the masonry, per *Guidelines*.
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit.
6. Any changes must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Mediamolle stated he did not have any comments and agrees with what Ms. Rose stated and on the pin lights and tried to get rid of the gooseneck lights and will match the color of the storefront.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to comment, and not one wished to comment.

Ms. Marquardt moved to deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed wall signage, based on Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated February 8, 2021 as well as based on page 121, number 30, of our guidelines. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt stated this is the first commercial signage of the building and that is why we are being so careful to get this right. Ms. Marquardt stated because of the height of the building as well as the angle of the building, this signage is not appropriate because it does not because it

does not complement the adjacent buildings. Ms. Marquardt stated because of the guidelines, we should reconsider a different placement of the sign.

Ms. Besser stated the applicant photoshopped the sign on the building, which helps us see what it would look like. Ms. Besser stated she thought in moving forward with this whole line of buildings, we need to keep the signage very quiet. Ms. Besser stated she thought the color either needs to go to a softer green or maybe two-toned. Ms. Besser stated it is going to be really important we look at the coloration on these signs because it is going to be the gateway to the City.

Ms. Pearce stated she had been looking at similar buildings and that she does think the color is what is going to matter the most, as there are going to be quite a few storefronts down through here. Ms. Pearce stated that she does not believe that green is going to work. Ms. Pearce stated it could work on the door decals, the sign below the canopy, but on the front façade, there should be something classic.

Mr. Ritzen, the business owner, requested to know what if the color was white.

Ms. Pearce stated she did not think a dead white would work and stated if he got into more of a cream/mortar color, that would work.

Mr. Ritzen stated he isn't permitted to do anything outside their brand standards and that no company that has an actual brand standard can deviate. Mr. Ritzen stated typically there is brand standard color and one deviation. Mr. Mediamolle stated he could either go with his green or his white.

Ms. Pearce stated she had been looking all day and that she thinks there is an opportunity to brand the color below the canopy. Ms. Pearce stated she truly believes that this being something that looks historic as the gateway into town, and it is going to really matter.

Mr. Laster stated he would like to see more lighting examples and does agree with what has already been said here. Mr. Laster stated what we do here sets a precedent even for lighting.

Ms. Baker stated she was actually very comfortable with the placement and understands staff's comments about not wanting to place the sign on the detailing of the building but thinks in the situation where it is unique and understandable with how that is going to be, maybe an exception in this area should be considered. Ms. Baker stated that she does agree with staff's comments 2 through 6, with concerns about color and lighting. Ms. Baker stated the pin lighting is a great alternative, but we want to make sure we have warm lighting instead of a cool lighting.

Chair Roberts stated he goes along with the color situation and white would be preferred, and he states the background tends to dominate that sign. Mr. Roberts stated that if the background was

the color of the brick and a smaller background run through the middle of those letters, it would show up better. Chair Roberts stated the he agrees with Mr. Laster and would like to see more lighting examples. Chair Roberts stated placement of the sign makes sense because if it is put underneath where the building is open, there it wouldn't work.

With the motion to deny having been made and seconded, it passed 9-0.

Item 2:

Consideration of Alterations (Siding Replacement) at 309 4th Ave. S.; Jamie Desmond, Applicant.

Ms. Dannenfelsler stated she has removed herself from all conversations on this item.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of siding on the accessory building located at 309 4th Avenue S. Ms. Rose stated the single-story accessory structure includes one building portion constructed ca. 1945 (garage) and a larger modern building portion (cottage). Ms. Rose stated the building is located to the rear of the principal dwelling.

Ms. Rose stated the proposal includes the replacement of the existing wood siding with smooth cement board siding. Ms. Rose stated the siding will have a 4" reveal and will be consistent with the siding on the principal structure. Ms. Rose stated the current siding on the garage portion of the building is about 20 years old, and the siding on the cottage portion of the building is between 40 and 50 years old. Ms. Rose stated the proposal is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend the replacement of deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding, but also states that the use of smooth cement board siding may be appropriate for replacement of deteriorated wood siding on rear elevations or for new construction (p. 83, #2 and #3). Ms. Rose stated the request is consistent with the *Guidelines*' recommendation that lap siding exposure should be consistent with that on the principal and adjacent historic buildings (p. 83, #5). Ms. Rose stated the accessory structure has been substantially altered since its date of construction. Ms. Rose stated while one portion of the historic outbuilding remains, the majority of the building is now modern, and due to substantial alterations and the limited visibility of the structure, the proposed cement board siding is an appropriate material.

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

1. 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.

Mr. Desmond stated they had nothing to add but stated they needed to do work on the cottage, and they want to modernize their cottage by making it more weatherproof.

Ms. Baker moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed siding replacement. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 3:

Consideration of Fencing & Addition at 128 4th Ave. N.; Chisel Workshop, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for fencing and an enclosed addition to the principal building at 128 4th Avenue N. Ms. Rose stated proposals related to the item appeared before the Design Review Committee at its March 16, 2020, May 18, 2020, and January 19, 2021 meetings.

Ms. Rose stated the proposal includes the replacement of existing wooden privacy fencing along the western property line, the construction of wooden privacy fencing along the rear yard and eastern property line, and the construction of wooden picket fencing and gates in the primary yard. Ms. Rose stated the proposed wooden privacy fencing is seven feet in height and extends along the rear and both side yards of the property. Ms. Rose stated as proposed, the privacy fencing is 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 seven feet in primary yards (p. 59, #8 and #10). Ms. Rose stated the fencing style and materials are also consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that fence materials should be compatible with the surface materials of the building, which is achieved by maintaining the range of materials historically present in the district (p. 58, #6).

Ms. Rose stated the proposed wooden picket fencing with wooden piers extends along the primary yard of the property and ties into swing gates of the same style and materials located at the entrance to the parking area on the side of the house. Ms. Rose stated the fencing ties into a wooden pedestrian gate located in the front yard and the wooden privacy fencing located along the side yard property lines. Ms. Rose stated the proposed wooden picket fencing is consistent with the *Guidelines* for height (three feet) and style (p.58, # 4 and #6 and p. 59, #10). Ms. Rose stated the proposed swing gates appear to be consistent with the *Guidelines* but should be configured to swing inwardly and not open onto the public sidewalk (p. 59, #12).

Ms. Rose stated the addition is as follows:

- **Location:** The *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility. (p.54, #1). The proposed addition is located on the side and rear elevations of the house. Designed at a one-and-one-half-story scale, the addition roof ridge height matches that of the front-facing gable. 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.

- **Design:** 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. 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). The proposed addition is differentiated from the historic structure through the use of insets, and some material changes (foundation). The proposed roof material and siding will match the existing structure. TPO membrane roofing will be placed on a small, flat portion of the existing roof, and the remaining roofing will be composed of asphalt shingles for consistency with the existing structure. The rear elevation includes a front gable form and a shed dormer with multiple windows located on the upper half-story of the house. The window located within the gable along with those located on the dormer give the appearance of a one-and-a-half story addition on a single-story house. A reduction in the number of windows to lessen the perceived scale of the addition to the single-story historic structure would be more consistent with the *Guidelines*. For compatibility with historic equivalents, the dormer should be set back two feet from the exterior façade wall. 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).
- **Size:** The footprint of the proposed addition measures 1,024 sq. ft., or approximately 35 percent of the existing structure. 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). The original building is defined to include “all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age” (p.54, #3-4). The proposed building coverage (28%) is also consistent with the *Guidelines* (p. 55, #5).
- **Materials:** 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). TPO membrane and asphalt shingle roofing is also consistent with the *Guidelines*. The proposed windows are composed of wood and appear to have historic dimensions and profile, and the proposed style of trim boards is appropriate in light of the *Guidelines*. While the *Guidelines* would recommend the use of half-round or round gutters, the proposed K-style metal gutters are consistent with those on the existing structure.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed addition square footage, as shown on the plans, will require 12 parking spaces. Ms. Rose stated the submitted plans do not appear to reflect this requirement, and that parking requirements will be reviewed by Building and Neighborhood Services in the building permit phase.

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

1. The swing gates should be configured to swing inwardly and not open onto the public sidewalk for consistency with the *Guidelines* (p. 59, #12).
2. Approval for the gate is contingent upon approval of the site plan by the City of Franklin.
3. 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.

Ms. Rose 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 applicant shall reduce the number of windows to lessen the perceived scale of the addition to the single-story historic structure for consistency with the *Guidelines*.
3. The dormer must be set back two feet from the exterior façade wall for compatibility with historic equivalents.
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 stated he wanted the commission to take the motion for fencing into two pieces—the front being one, and the rear and side yard as the second.

Mr. McCreary stated they have the picket fencing as shown on number two which shows where we changed the scale and design of the posts based off DRC comments. Mr. McCreary stated they had some historic photos provided to them that was very helpful showing what historic corner posts looked like in downtown Franklin. Mr. McCreary stated they referenced those and that is what they are kind of showing in detail which is a wooden post with a decorative cap, and it will be a solid white post with a decorative cap on top. Mr. McCreary stated then we have the simple wood picket fence for the front yard and then we turn to the side yard which will go back twenty feet to the face of the house and will then turn into the taller fence. Mr. McCreary stated

referenced a photo being shown by projection showing the current state of the fence. Mr. McCreary explained the different types of fencing shown. Mr. McCreary requested Ms. Rose to go to page two and at the bottom right we propose a nice wood privacy fence with taller posts and finials on top. Mr. McCreary stated the fence would be seven feet tall. Mr. McCreary stated the one thing with the gates that have been changed to two swinging gates and are on page fourteen that shows when the gate is closed it looks like the rest of the fence.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there are any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed rear and side yard fencing. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions the front picket fence and swing gates for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed fencing. Ms. Baker seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt stated the picket style is consistent with other historic properties in Franklin, but what seems inconsistent based on the guidelines is the fence, and she will be voting no and she was speaking of the swinging gate.

Ms. Pearce requested to know how much length of fencing in total is along 4th Avenue.

Mr. McCreary stated 136 feet.

Ms. Pearce stated she was uncomfortable with that much picket fencing. Ms. Pearce stated she was driving today and saw quite a bit of privacy gates and the way those are handled are with the gate being differentiated, so she felt like to keep this in character with downtown, big gates like this was not anticipated in our guidelines. Ms. Pearce stated to break it up, a wrought iron could be used.

Mr. Mann stated there is house on Bridge Street that has a picket fence that runs the entire length of the front and has the swing gate and asked the applicant if that swing gate is about the width of what yours is proposed to be.

Mr. McCreary stated he would look that up.

Ms. Pearce questioned which house Mr. Mann was speaking of.

Mr. Mann stated it is at 414 Bridge Street.

Ms. Rose projected an image of the property showing the fencing.

Mr. McCreary stated they were at 20 feet, and the Bridge Street home is 16 to 17-feet wide.

Ms. Pearce stated that really helped her and noted it was not straight across but dipping back and forth.

Ms. Baker's voice cut out during her comment.

Ms. Besser stated the example showed a great option and something like this would compliment this house.

Ms. Pearce stated she was so excited about the example, which made it look appropriate, if those are the parameters of the property.

Chair Roberts stated without this example, he was against this item because the picket fence, as shown, takes away the great work done on that house. Chair Roberts stated if the owner and the applicant could mirror that, then we have a possible solution.

Mr. McCreary requested from Ms. Rose if the scalloped fence fit in with the Queen Anne style of the house.

Ms. Rose stated that the example property is a less vernacular style home than the subject property and that she would need to do more research to feel comfortable answering the question.

Mr. McCreary requested to know if Ms. Rose had access to the historic photographs that she emailed him in the past.

Ms. Rose stated not currently available for viewing but feels, depending on how the commission moves forward, she feels the commission would feel fine with the applicant working with staff.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve to modify design of fence and gate to a Victorian style that breaks up the length and has different picket heights and it be brought to staff for approval. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

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

Mr. McCreary requested to start on page one showing the existing house at its current restored state by the owner. Mr. McCreary stated the things he wanted to talk about here were the rear of

the addition. Mr. McCreary stated that we talked about last time how it would be a flat roof, so in the top right photo of this image, you can see how there is a massive flat roof that extends along the back of the home. Mr. McCreary stated there is this kind of odd little parapet that pops up here on the left side, which causes the house to have a higher profile from the side, but it is a very smooth. Mr. McCreary stated the addition in comparison to the overall footprint, it is L shaped.

Mr. McCreary requested Ms. Rose to go to page 3 and stated the overall existing house is 51-feet and 4-inches wide, and the addition we are adding on is 19-feet, 10-inches. Mr. McCreary stated that it has step backs in it and the rooflines change. Mr. McCreary stated it is a very simple addition with a simple hip gable that comes out and steps down, so from the front it is very minimal and complimentary to the existing house. Mr. McCreary stated they are back 33-feet, 4-inches back from the face of the existing home and that is back roughly 12-feet from the sidewalk, and we are way back in the backyard. Mr. McCreary stated this property is unique in downtown Franklin in the fact it is a much wider than it is deep, and we don't have a lot of room to go back, as we have maybe 12 to 15 feet to go back on the addition, and we have 35-feet on the side.

Mr. McCreary stated on the rear of the addition, he tried to dash in where the existing structure is right now to show you where the addition is expanding beyond that. Mr. McCreary stated so there is a reference point of what was there and what is being added. Mr. McCreary pointed out on a photograph where the addition is expanding and stated on the upper portion, they reduced the size of the windows, and we got rid of the gable dormers, we eliminated the window on the return, and we really tried to simplify it and compact it by shrinking the upper floor to 3-feet and 2-inches back from the floor below and to make it feel more as a shed addition. Mr. McCreary stated that low sloped roof that is existing kind of plays into that, as we are just matching what that roof slope was, and another thing to think about is when you look at the addition, there really is no view of the upper floor from any public right of way. Mr. McCreary stated you can never see the back part of the house, as it's almost like a captive parking lot in the back.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there are any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated she would not be able to support this motion and still feels that the idea of when you do an addition, you are able to remove it at a later date, and she isn't sure that is possible with this addition. Ms. Besser stated she looked back in the minutes, and her comments

stated this addition should be smaller, and yes, they did change some elevations, but the thing is when working with historic houses, we don't know how long this applicant is going to be at this property. Ms. Besser stated that whatever he does or is done to the property, that is going to be there, and she cannot support this.

Ms. Pearce stated on the drawings, there looked like there are no steps on one of the doors, but I am assuming that is a computer glitch. Ms. Pearce stated that she would like to look at the front perspective one more time.

Ms. Rose stated that the area of the missing steps is where a ramp will be.

Ms. Pearce stated she has been looking at the parge coating downtown on projects we have approved, and she wants to amend the motion to put brick foundation on the addition.

With no second, the motion failed.

Mr. Laster stated he liked to commend the applicant for working with the commission to reduce the way it looks on the front, with reducing the number of windows. Mr. Laster stated that he thinks it does help with this project. Mr. Laster stated the square footage is within our guidelines and that is why he is supporting it.

The motion carried 7-2, with Ms. Besser and Ms. Worthington voting no.

Item 4:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously Approved New Construction (Right Elevation Wall Dormer) at 149 Splendor Ridge Dr.; Chad Gore, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously approved infill principal structure at 149 Splendor Ridge Dr. (Lot 9). Ms. Rose stated the proposed alteration consists of the placement of a wall dormer at the nexus of the side-gabled form and the rest of the building. Ms. Rose stated the roofline alteration is proposed to allow for the creation of a walk-up attic space within the half story above the second floor.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that if dormers are desired, one add them only to rear or side elevations with minimal visibility and that one uses designs, materials, and scale in keeping with building character (p.82, #6). Ms. Rose stated while it is not clear how visible the alteration will be based on the materials provided, this architectural detail is not complementary to the Federal architectural style of the building or nearby buildings (p.68, #27), and the arrangement does not reinforce and maintain the roof forms of adjacent buildings, as recommended for infill buildings (p.68, #23). Ms. Rose stated further, the use of a wall dormer—in lieu of a roof dormer—is not recommended (p.82, #6). Ms. Rose stated if interpreted a third-floor wall/roof system, the application would not be in compliance with the

conditions set forth in the development's Preliminary COA, issuance by the Historic Zoning Commission in April 2018, which states the following:

1. The Historic Zoning Commission will consider overall building heights up to 39' from grade and up to 2.5 stories in scale, with an understanding that all individual building heights will be evaluated for appropriateness based on grading and context. This condition is based on the applicant's statement that no retaining wall will be used that is more than 2' in height from the street grade. A variety of building forms and heights will be required.
2. All building materials and façade design elements (including, but not limited to, building architectural features and styles, tower forms, and materials) are not considered to be part of the Preliminary COA approval and are subject to review and issuance of additional COAs by the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of building permits.

Ms. Rose stated that the Building & Neighborhood Services Department interpreted the proposal as a third-story wall.

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

1. 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.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Gore stated he was just asking the commission to make an exception with guidelines due to the lack of visibility. Mr. Gore stated he sent in some rendering views from the street and sidewalk. Mr. Gore stated it is tucked in there behind the main mass of the building. Mr. Gore stated the little dormer on there is not visible from the right of way. Mr. Gore stated he was a little surprised at BNS's interpretation of it being a third-floor wall and that it seemed like a technicality. Mr. Gore stated had Ms. Rose show a front view picture where you could not see the dormer, etc. Mr. Gore stated he did not know if there is a way to have the stairway without the wall, and it was a surprise for it to be interpreted as a third-floor wall rather than a dormer. Mr. Gore stated he is afraid there is not a way for him to inset it due to the stairs. Mr. Gore stated he hoped the commission could look at this and see it as an exception to the guidelines and was happy to answer any questions.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there are any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker moved to deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations to the previously approved new construction, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated February 8, 2021. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker stated she was very hesitated to approve anything this early into the new infill that deviates from what we said in the past.

Mr. Scalf requested to know from the applicant how access was gained to the attic prior to this. Mr. Scalf questioned if it would be a pull-down stair on the second floor.

Mr. Gore stated yes.

Mr. Scalf questioned whether this would be a considered a finished-out space at a later date.

Mr. Gore stated he did not think so, but technically, he guesses it could. Mr. Gore stated there is hardly any head space up there and no windows. Mr. Gore stated someone would have to do some serious operation to make it a viable space.

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

Item 5:

Consideration of Alterations (New Secondary Entrance) at 202 3rd Ave. N.; Keith Baker, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of the entry door and the construction of a new secondary entrance on the building located at 202 3rd Avenue N. Ms. Rose stated the house has a construction date of ca. 1994 and is a non-contributing resource to the district. Ms. Rose stated the subject property is a non-historic infill building and a non-contributing structure to the historic district.

Ms. Rose stated the proposal includes the construction of a secondary entrance on the side (Bridge St.) elevation of the house. Ms. Rose stated the purpose of the secondary entrance is to provide access to the second story of the building without an exterior staircase. Ms. Rose stated the new door will be composed of wood and the entry will include stairs and a handrail. Ms. Rose stated the applicant also requests to replace the existing metal door located at the primary entry with a wooden door. Ms. Rose stated the doors located at both the existing primary entry and the proposed secondary entry will be of the same style and material and are in keeping with the architectural style of the building. Ms. Rose stated while the *Guidelines* for entrances primarily address historic buildings and recommend against adding new openings to primary or

readily visible secondary elevations, the *Guidelines* for infill buildings support the location of entrances on both street elevations (p. 56, #2 and p. 68, #17). Ms. Rose stated though the proposed location of the secondary entrance is on a visible secondary elevation, the door is placed in an appropriate, less visible location on the elevation. Ms. Rose stated the proposed door style and materials are consistent with the *Guidelines* and are appropriate options for both entrances. Ms. Rose stated per codes requirements, the secondary entrance must include a landing.

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

1. Stairs should be composed of concrete and the railing shall be composed of wood or metal for consistency with the *Guidelines*. The landing and railing design shall be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, including the requirement for a landing per 2018 IBC. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Baker stated Ms. Rose summed it up well and was here to answer any questions.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there are any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed door replacement and secondary entrance. Ms. Baker seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated her only comment would be this is an infill done before Historic Zoning, and she thinks this is an opportunity to let the door on the side entrance read as a secondary door and differentiate from the front door of the house, instead of doing two doors just alike.

Ms. Pearce moved to add an amendment that they use the front door design similar to what is there, and it be more prominent, and then a different, secondary entrance door design, with it going to staff for approval. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser requested to see the front door.

Ms. Rose projected the photo.

Ms. Pearce stated the applicant would want some glass in both doors, and she is okay with that.

The amendment carried 9-0.

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

Ms. Pearce moved to make the motion to recess and return at 6:40 pm. Ms. Baker seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Item 6:

Consideration of Site Feature Alterations (Parking/Driveway, Walkway, Fences, Walls), Signage, New Construction (Accessory Pavilion), & Relocation (Accessory Greenhouse) at 150 Franklin Rd.; Garry Batson, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of site alterations at 150 Franklin Road, the BGA Lower Campus, in coordination with the ongoing Franklin Road infrastructure and sidewalk project, as well as the building alterations proposed as Item #7, which is specific to the proposed building alterations and associated drive aisle canopy.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed alterations are as follows:

Parking/Driveways, Walkways, & Accessibility

- A. Alterations to the vehicular circulation system through the relocation of the parking stalls in front of the historic Cox House, the relocation of most of the remaining parking to the rear of the site, and the modification of the entrance driveway widths and locations;
- B. Alterations to the pedestrian circulation system through the reintroduction of a (“ceremonial”) walkway from the sidewalk to the Cox House entrance; and
- C. The construction of an accessibility ramp at the front porch and at the side elevation entrance.

Fences, Walls, & Gates

- D. The construction of a masonry wall with steel fencing at 6’ in height, with 7’ masonry columns, along the front of the property, recessed from the property line to accommodate an easement;
- E. The introduction of operable gates at the location of the wall/fencing at the front of the property;
- F. The construction of a gate at the reintroduced (“ceremonial”) walkway;
- G. The installation of steel fencing at 6’ in height along the perimeter of the athletic field;
- H. The installation of aluminum fencing along the northern property line, to tie into the left side elevation, and
- I. The construction of a pierced masonry screen wall, at 6’ in height with 7’ columns, at the left elevation for the purposes of an outdoor classroom.

Accessory Structures

- J. The construction of an accessory pavilion within the athletic field; and
- K. The relocation of an existing greenhouse to a location adjacent to the proposed pavilion.

Signage

- L. The installation of a double-sided monument sign at the entrance to replace the existing sign.

Ms. Rose stated the school campus is the site of the ca. 1891 Cox House, listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Rose stated the Parking/Driveways, Walkways, & Accessibility should be as follows:

- A. The *Guidelines* recommend that driveways follow historic patterns, be located along rear or side elevations, and landscaped to mitigate impacts to the district's character. The proposed driveway widenings and relocation are in concert with the City's ongoing right-of-way improvements. The curb cuts are situated so that they are not located directly in front of the historic building. The fencing and trees are proposed to soften the entrance and exit locations.
- B. The *Guidelines* recommend that original landscape features and configurations be maintained and that one preserve and maintain historic sidewalks and walkways. New sidewalks and walkways should follow historic patterns of alignment, configuration, width, and materials (p.70, #1-3). As such, the reintroduction of the pedestrian walkway in front of the historic building is appropriate; the use of a less intricate brick pattern such as a running bond, however, would be in keeping with the context of the property and with the details of the historic building.
- C. The *Guidelines* recommend that ramps be located on rear or secondary elevations that are not readily visible, and one should use wooden ramps with detailing similar to that of the building. Ramps should be designed to be reversible, have minimal impact, and not involve removal of historic features (p.80, #1-2, #4). While the proposed location of the accessibility ramp at the non-historic entrance is consistent with the *Guidelines*, the proposed ramp at the historic building's front porch is not recommend unless necessary for access. Further, no information has been provided to demonstrate how the ramps will look and if historic materials on the porch will be altered to accommodate.

Ms. Rose stated the Fences, Walls, & Gates are as follows:

- D. A 6' masonry wall with steel fencing and 7' masonry columns is proposed along the front of the property for security. The wall/fencing is proposed to be recessed approximately 25-26" from the back of the planned sidewalk at the areas north of and adjacent to the

exit drive and “ceremonial” walkway; it is recessed approximately 13.5’-14’ from the back of the sidewalk at the north side of the entrance drive; it is recessed approximately 30-31’ from the back of the sidewalk at the areas south of the entrance drive.

The *Guidelines* state that fence materials should be compatible with the surface materials of the building and that compatibility is achieved by maintaining the range of materials historically present in the district. Unit size and visual and tactile textures of the materials should correspond with the main structure. Fences should not exceed three feet in primary yards. The *Guidelines* define the primary yard as the area that is 20’ recessed from the front plane of the building and forward. No metal fencing besides that made of cast iron should be utilized in primary yards (p.58-59, #4-8, #10).

The Franklin Road perimeter fencing is in the primary yard, and its proposed height exceeds that recommended by the *Guidelines*. The Zoning Ordinance allows for 6’ fencing to enclosure athletic fields, but otherwise the Zoning Ordinance requires that the proposed fencing type not exceed 3’ in height. Approval from the Historic Zoning Commission is required for all fencing, and approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals will be required for any primary yard fencing independent of the athletic field.

- E. The applicant is proposing to include operable gates as part of the front elevation fencing/wall. The *Guidelines* recommend that operable gates be configured to swing inwardly and not slide. The height of the proposed gates is not consistent with the *Guidelines* as described above, and it appears that some of the gates swing outwardly.
- F. The construction of a gate at the reintroduced (“ceremonial”) walkway is not appropriate as proposed due to its height.
- G. The applicant is proposing to install steel fencing at a 6’ height along the perimeter of the athletic field. While the style of the fencing is simpler and less massive than that proposed for the remainder of the property line, the height is not consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*.
- H. The installation of aluminum fencing along the northern property line, to tie into the left side elevation, is not entirely appropriate per *Guidelines*, as they recommend that no metal fencing besides that made of cast iron be introduced to a primary yard. A majority of this fencing section is forward of the 20’ area behind the front plane of the historic building. No specifications have been provided to demonstrate how the fencing will look. While the height is not specified, anything taller than 3’ is not recommended by the *Guidelines* until such point as it is 20’ behind the front plane of the building, and it is not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance at a height taller than 3’ until it aligns with the building façade.

- I. The construction of a pierced masonry screen wall, at 6' in height with 7' columns, at the left elevation for the purposes of an outdoor classroom is in keeping with the *Guidelines*. Unit size and visual and tactile textures of the materials should correspond with the main structure.

Accessory Structures

- J. The accessory pavilion is proposed to be located in the area indicated as the athletic field. The *Guidelines* for accessory structures are more specific to residential contexts but do note that such buildings should be behind the rear plane of the principal structure and in traditional locations behind or to the side of the principal structure. Further, they should be visually subordinate to the principal structure in placement, size, mass, and intricacy. Architectural features should complement, but not visually complete with, the character of the historic principal structure (p.64, #1-4). The proposed location is appropriate, and the design is in keeping with, but simpler than, the former residence's Italianate detailing and materials.
- K. The existing greenhouse is not historic, so its relocation may be appropriate. The proposed location, next to the proposed pavilion, is appropriate in light of Infill Accessory Building guidelines.

Ms. Rose stated signage is recommended below:

- L. The *Guidelines* recommend against the use of monument signs within residential historic districts (p.85, #9). Monument signs are not recommended for use in nonresidential districts either, though it is noted that they may be appropriate for civic or institutional properties. In nonresidential areas, monument signs are recommended to measure no more than 12 square feet for total sign surface and up to 6 feet in height, where deemed appropriate (p.120, #2, #10). The proposed sign measures 15 square feet to correspond to the size of the existing sign.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed parking and driveway alterations (A); reintroduction of the pedestrian ("ceremonial") walkway (B); rear yard pierced masonry screen wall (I); construction of the pavilion (J); and relocation of the greenhouse (K), as follows:

1. The applicant should utilize a simpler bond pattern for the walkway for better consistency with the applicable *Guidelines*.
2. A sample of the brick for both the walkway and the rear pierced screen wall must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of applicable *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. The application must meet all City requirements 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.

Mr. Wood stated the overview of the project is to enhance and beautify the campus. Mr. Wood stated and help elevate the queuing of vehicles out in Franklin Road, which has been a sore subject for a long time. Mr. Wood stated when we looked at this project a year and half ago, they wanted to see how do we gain additional area to allow that to happen, so that is where we generated the idea to move parking to the rear and allow additional queuing lane. Mr. Wood stated they are trying to move as much traffic off Franklin Lane as much as possible. Mr. Wood stated so while we were looking at that, we were looking at opportunities to enhance the campus and establish a presence in the historical context. Mr. Wood stated they were looking at colleges and schools in how they address their entrances, and a lot of them would have a combination of masonry wall fence and ceremonial entrances. Mr. Wood stated they are trying to introduce those to tie the school to the streetscape project. Mr. Wood stated we are layering in the need of the school to provide means to control access onto the property and enhance the need to talk about the security measures along the perimeter as well as renovations to the building itself and overall landscape enhancements to the side. Mr. Wood requested Ms. Rose to show the courtyard and classroom.

Ms. Rose did so.

Mr. Wood stated this particular area on the northern side of the campus is really unused, and though they have some features out there, it really stays muddy and it is not conducive to learning. Mr. Wood stated that we generated a concept to have a linear classroom with different areas for opportunities for learning. Mr. Wood stated there is an amphitheater type circular stage and whimsical seating, a tile area where art can be drawn on the floor and an art wall. Mr. Wood stated they have introduced an area for raised garden beds.

Mr. Kiser requested Ms. Rose go back to the pictures to talk about the general design. Mr. Kiser stated with how things are now, the site has kind of degraded the historical content, and our goal was to try to replicate in some form what may have occurred back in the day with a front yard and a side yard, so the idea we really pushed with our clients was the introduction to yards to the streets. Mr. Kiser stated what this did was cause a potential conflict with traffic and student movement since these are preschoolers up to fourth graders, and wanting to have that grass up front, we also had to deal with vehicular and student access crossing. Mr. Kiser stated as you can see, we have a raised access going to the building directly to the gazebo.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there are any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed parking and driveway alterations (A); reintroduction of the pedestrian (“ceremonial”) walkway (B); rear yard pierced masonry screen wall (I); construction of the pavilion (J); and relocation of the greenhouse (K). Ms. Baker seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker applauded the applicant for figuring out a way to get more vehicles on the road.

Chair Roberts and Ms. Pearce concur with the pieces shown with this part of the application.

The motion carried 9-0.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed construction of two accessibility ramps (C); and installation of aluminum fencing along the northern property line (H), as follows:

1. No information has been provided to demonstrate how the ramps will look and if historic materials on the porch will be altered to accommodate. It is also recommended that the applicant consider relocation of the proposed ramp at the front porch, as this location is not recommended per *Guidelines*.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all City requirements prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Kiser has Ms. Rose pull the plan back up. Mr. Kiser stated the elevations between the historic Cox House and the addition that is not historic, are roughly about 3 and half to four feet grade change. Mr. Kiser stated there is hope in the future to provide a ramp to connect these things to be ADA compliant, as currently there is no ADA accessibility between the Cox House and the area where the administration offices are. Mr. Kiser stated the only place to access is at the door on the northern most head end of the patio. Mr. Kiser stated given that the ramp was to land at that far corner and project towards Franklin Road, and of course meeting handicap regulations, we can easily I believe is reverse the ramp so the landing is in the same place but perhaps take it back toward the addition instead of Franklin Road. Mr. Kiser stated they are trying to abide by all ADA access for wheelchair bound folks to the Cox House. Mr. Kiser stated the second ramp that goes to the northern playground is an existing walk now and had Ms. Rose show the playground area. Mr. Kiser stated there is an existing ramp there adjacent to the building and we would be redoing the concrete there, but instead of that grass slope, we would turn that more into an amphitheater with the ramp going down the side.

Chair Roberts noted the height was never discussed.

Mr. Wood explained there is no fencing in the primary yard, fencing should be cast iron or rock but he could make the aluminum change and explained how the fence could look cast iron in the front and then move the aluminum on the back.

Mr. Kiser stated height issue is for security and explained the extra pedestrian traffic and how people have been asked to be removed. Mr. Kiser stated the fence is about four feet in height at one location and then with the posts it can go to six to seven to feet.

Ms. Baker moved to defer review of the proposed construction of two accessibility ramps (C); and installation of aluminum fencing along the northern property line (H), based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation date February 8, 2021 and defer to the March 8, 2021 meeting. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker stated her reason for deferring is she would like to have more discussion on the ramp and the fencing and feels that would warrant a DRC discussion.

The motion carried to move to defer to the March 8, 2021 meeting.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed 6' masonry wall with steel fencing, including all gates (D, E, F); 6' steel athletic field fencing (G); and signage (L), as follows:

1. If issued a COA, all fencing that is independent of the athletic fencing (D, E, F) requires consideration by the Board of Zoning Appeals for issuance of a variance.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all City requirements prior to issuance of a building permit and a sign permit, and any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Rose noted there was some project considerations listed on the staff report.

Mr. Cross stated he would not add much to what Mr. Kiser had stated but he wanted to point out that the fence being proposed by BGA solely because of the streetscape project being done and the introduction of pedestrian traffic. Mr. Cross pointed out traffic flow. Mr. Cross stated a three-foot fence would not serve much security purpose and it is the safety of the students that need to be taken into account. Mr. Cross stated the use of this property as a school not every situation can be taken into consideration from a Zoning Ordinance or Design Guidelines standpoint. Mr. Cross stated he would like the commission to take into consideration this is a school close in downtown and take the safety of our students is a paramount concern.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there are any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Mann moved approve the signage. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

Ms. Marquardt moved to defer D, E, F, and G review (proposed 6' masonry wall with steel fencing, including all gates and 6' steel athletic field fencing) especially since C and H will be deferred to the next voting meeting, she recommends the applicant attend a DRC meeting. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts stated he understands the safety issue completely, but we need a little more roadway perspective and feel of what the fence would look like.

Mr. Mann questioned whether the gates would be locked or left open all day.

Ms. Pearce asked to see the plans in a 3D complex.

The motion passed 9-0.

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations (Façade Material and Fenestration Pattern, Utilities Screening), New Construction (Building Canopy), & Signage at 150 Franklin Rd.; Micah Antanaitis, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for building alterations and covered walkway/canopy construction at 150 Franklin Road, the BGA Lower Campus. Utilities screening and signage are also proposed. Ms. Rose stated these alterations are proposed in coordination with the alterations proposed as Item #6, which are specific to the site plan elements such as the parking, driveway, walkways, fencing, walls, etc. Ms. Rose stated the school campus is the site of the ca. 1891 Cox House, listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Rose stated these proposed alterations are specific to the addition only, which is nonresidential in character. Ms. Rose stated thus, the applicable nonresidential *Guidelines* will be consulted. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its September 21, 2020 meeting.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a covered walkway with a canopy to serve as a vehicular drop-off for the school children. Ms. Rose stated the alterations include façade materials changes and fenestration alterations, specifically through the application of a three-coat stucco treatment to the right elevation of the addition, as well as the removal and replacement of windows and doors in a new configuration. Ms. Rose stated the covered walkway and canopy are proposed to measure 11' to 12' in height at the sidewalk surface and up to 16'4" at the drive aisle grade. It is proposed to be constructed of steel framing

with a three-coat stucco veneer. Ms. Rose stated the bracketing is proposed to be fiberglass, similar to Fypon. Piers are brick with a limestone base. Concrete steps with metal railings allow pedestrians to access the drive aisle. Ms. Rose stated the façade is proposed to be coated with stucco, like the canopy, and pre-finished aluminum storefront systems are proposed to be installed. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the application of stucco or drivit surfaces to historic buildings (p.113, #7). Ms. Rose stated as a non-historic portion of the building, the proposed treatment is appropriate, as it corresponds to the materials and detailing of the Italianate historic home. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also state that aluminum with dark or bronze finishes may be appropriate (p.129, #9).

Ms. Rose stated the addition to the historic house is modern, and as a noncontributing element to the site, it is not determined to add to the historic or architectural value for the period of significance currently defined for the historic district. Ms. Rose stated in the case of proposed alterations to noncontributing buildings, the alterations are reviewed in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures, including the historic Cox House onto which it is attached. Ms. Rose stated while the alterations will be visible from Franklin Road, they are limited to the non-historic form and will be more in keeping with the historic portion of the building than the existing addition's materials and form. Ms. Rose stated the applicant responded to the Design Review Committee's comments by removing the decorative bracketing from the areas that are not associated with an entry point and by lowering the height of the limestone bases on each pier.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to screen a transformer at the location where the historic portion of the building meets the addition. Ms. Rose stated the Masonry columns with limestone bases are proposed to anchor a painted 6' hardwood vertical board fence to screen the area. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that utilities be placed along rear elevations or otherwise out of view from the main street, and visibility should be further screened through landscaping or fencing (p.128, #1). Ms. Rose stated as such, the placement is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated additionally, the applicant is proposing to screen equipment that is mounted on the roof of the addition. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that roof-mounted systems be placed such that distance or elements like parapets keep them from view. Ms. Rose stated the addition has a flat roof, so the use of unobtrusive screening may be appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the screening is proposed to consist of aluminum with louvers, with "dove gray" as the proposed color.

Ms. Rose stated monument signs are not recommended for use in residential or nonresidential areas of the historic district, though it is noted that they may be appropriate for civic or institutional properties (p.85, #9; p.120, #10). Ms. Rose stated in nonresidential areas, monument signs are recommended to measure no more than 12 square feet for total sign surface and up to 6 feet in height, where deemed appropriate (p.120, #10). Ms. Rose stated the proposed sign

measures 26'-4" wide and consists of brick with limestone cap and applied pre-finished aluminum lettering. Ms. Rose stated the sign measures 3' to 3'-8" in height. Ms. Rose stated without specifications to define the sign face area only, it is unclear if the proposal meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements, though it can be surmised that the sign surface area exceeds the recommendations of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated please note that this monument sign is proposed in addition to that proposed within Item #6 at the entrance to the site.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed façade alterations, covered walkway/canopy construction, and utilities screening, as follows:

1. The brick color, texture, and profile should coordinate with that on the building, per *Guidelines*. A sample of the brick must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The aluminum storefront system must be a dark or bronze finish color, per *Guidelines*. may be appropriate (p.129, #9).
3. Rooftop mechanical screening must be recessed so as to lessen its visibility and prominence, per *Guidelines*.
4. The application must meet all City requirements prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. McLaughlin stated they had no issues with the recommendations. Mr. McLaughlin requested Ms. Rose go to a rendering showing equipment on the roof that is not screened and there are vents that come out of the roof as well and we will be moving some of those close to push them back off the rough edge and will be screening the equipment. Mr. McLaughlin stated they are working closely with KVD and Garry Batson with the site implementation. Mr. McLaughlin stated the brick for the canopy will be tied into the fencing and the site pavilion and will be a cohesive project when complete.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed façade alterations, covered walkway/canopy construction, and utilities screening. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

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

1. While the *Guidelines* noted that monument signs may be appropriate for civic or institutional properties, they recommended to measure no more than 12 square feet for total sign surface, where deemed appropriate. Without specifications to define the sign face area only, it is unclear if the proposal meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements, though it can be surmised, at approximately 79 sq. ft. in total masonry area, that the sign surface area exceeds the recommendations of the *Guidelines*.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all City requirements prior to issuance of a sign permit, and any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Lastser moved deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed side elevation monument signage, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated February 8, 2021. Ms. Baker seconded the motion, and motion to deny carried 9-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Alterations (Window) at 106 Church St.; Kate Williams, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the enclosure of a side elevation window at 106 Church St. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one preserve and maintain historic windows and their openings and one not enclose, reduce, or otherwise obscure historic windows (p.90, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated the subject building was constructed in the 2000s and is not contributing to the Franklin Historic District. Ms. Rose stated as a noncontributing building to the historic district, it is not determined to add to the historic or architectural value for the period of significance currently defined for the historic district. Ms. Rose stated in the case of proposed alterations to noncontributing buildings, the alterations are reviewed in light of the *Guidelines*, specifically in relation to how the proposed alterations would impact the character of the district and the surrounding structures.

Ms. Rose stated the enclosure of the window is appropriate, given the its lack of visibility from public viewsheds. Ms. Rose stated the proposed enclosure treatment—to match that of other façade treatments on the building that mimic window enclosures—is also appropriate and does not impact the character of the district or surrounding structures.

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

1. The brick color, texture, size, and herringbone inlay design must match that of the found on the same façade. The selected brick must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Williams stated Ms. Rose did a great job explaining it. Mr. Williams stated these Brownstones were built with these filled in facades to give a historic look that had been modified at one time. Mr. Williams stated there is a future kitchen renovation coming some months that they are wanting to do that will require using that wall space and it also would give the homeowners a little bit more privacy because now you can see into each other's windows. Mr. Williams stated that it is mainly to gain that wall space for a kitchen remodel.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window alterations. Ms. Worthington seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Other Business.

Ms. Besser stated she and Ms. Rose had talked some about this but would like to do some education in the Lancaster area. Ms. Besser explained the reasoning was due to Splendor Ridge.

Chair Roberts suggested adding to a DRC.

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Acting Secretary