

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

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, October 12, 2020, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker  
Susan Besser  
Jeff Carson  
Mike Hathaway  
Brian Laster  
Lisa Marquardt  
Mary Pearce  
Ken Scalf  
Jim Roberts

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

**Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the October 12, 2020, meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**RESOLUTION 2020-193**

Consideration of Resolution 2020-193, “A Resolution Declaring That The Historic Zoning Commission Shall Meet On October 12, 2020, And Conduct Its Essential Business By Electronic Means Rather Than Being Required To Gather A Quorum Of The Members Physically Present In The Same Location Because It Is Necessary To Protect The Health, Safety, And Welfare of Tennesseans In Light Of The COVID-19 Outbreak”

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve Resolution 2020-193. Mr. Hathaway 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. Accommodations have been made to ensure that the public is still able to participate in the meeting. The public may participate in the following ways: • Watch the meeting on FranklinTV.

- Watch the live stream through the City of Franklin Facebook and YouTube accounts.
- The public may call in to the conference meeting 1-312-626-6799; Meeting ID: 956 5415 3511; Password: 184211. Callers will be unmuted and given the opportunity to comment during the meeting at specific times.
- Limited viewing will be available in the lobby of City Hall to watch the live video.
- The public may email questions to [planningintake@franklintn.gov](mailto:planningintake@franklintn.gov) to be read aloud during the meeting, but not in their entirety. Comments will be accepted up until one hour prior to the meeting.
- Share your official comment with the agenda item number specified in the comment section of the Facebook or YouTube live videos.

## **Minutes: September 14, 2020**

Ms. Baker moved to approve the September 14, 2020 minutes with amendments to be made, as follows:

- Amendments
  - Mary – page 3 – “after Vice-Chair Pearce conferred with counsel...”
  - Mary – page 5 – Ms. Pearce noted “the commission is”
  - Mary – page 5 – “Vice-Chair Pearce stated she is more partial to option 2 and is in favor of the project and getting a landscape architect involved.”
  - Mary – page 5 – “Mr. Jacobson...but option 2 is perfectly preferable, if that is what is decided.”
  - Mary – page 21 – “Ms. Pearce stated she might consider adding that the items return to staff for approval.”
  - Jim – page 21 – “Chair Roberts cannot support the proposed location and feels it should be moved back further.”
  - Jim – page 21 – “Chair Roberts stated based on his view on site, he would have to say no.”

Mr. Carson seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

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

No Requests.

## **Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**

**Open for Franklin citizens to be heard on items not included on this Agenda. As provided by law, the Historic Zoning Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director for administrative consideration, or to schedule the matter for Historic Zoning Commission consideration at a later date.**

Mr. Greg Gamble stated he was the land planner for the Community Housing Partnership. Mr. Gamble stated Community Housing Partnership is proposing a development on Hillhaven Lane and what makes this property unique is it is just south of Roper’s Knob and it is just immediate east of a property that was just purchased by the Heritage Foundation for the City of Franklin and put into a preservation easement. Mr. Gamble stated the property does not have a historic

overlay, but if you are interested, we could show you our master plan at a DRC meeting. Mr. Gamble stated he would be happy to have the commissions comments and let Ms. Rose know if you would like for us to do this.

**Item 1:**

**Consideration of Alterations (Lighting for Entrance Columns) at Splendor Ridge Subdivision, located at Parsons Pl. and Splendor Ridge Dr.); Greg Gamble, Applicant.**

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the addition of light fixtures to the entry columns at the Splendor Ridge Subdivision. Ms. Gibson stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its September 21, 2020, meeting. Ms. Gibson stated the HZC approved entrance columns at Parsons Place/Splendor Ridge Drive at its February 2020 meeting. Ms. Gibson stated the approval included lighting elements on the primary sign columns. Ms. Gibson stated the applicant proposes two additional gas lanterns to be placed on the back of the secondary columns located at the interior of the entrance to the subdivision. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed lanterns are the same design as the ones previously approved by the HZC. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* speak primarily to fixtures located on buildings but recommend the use of simple fixtures that are appropriate in scale (p. 72, #2). Ms. Gibson stated the proposed light fixtures are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

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

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

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Mr. Gamble stated he was happy to answer any questions.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments and there were none.

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed lighting. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 8-0.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from the vote.

**Item 2:**

**Consideration of Fencing at 334 Franklin Rd.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of primary and side yard fencing at 334 Franklin Rd. Ms. Rose stated the existing fencing was placed without issued of the COA, and the applicant is seeking to correct the matter by replacing the fencing with styles that meets the intent of the applicable *Guidelines* and the applicable Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Ms. Rose stated the proposal involves the removal of the existing fence and the repurposing of its materials to construct a 4'-5" five-rail horse fence. Ms. Rose stated the five-rail horse fence is proposed to follow along the perimeter of the existing fence, along Franklin Road, and then turn inward toward the property along the northern border until it aligns with the façade of the log cabin (see applicant's Fence Exhibit). Ms. Rose stated at that point, a 6' wooden vertical board privacy fence is proposed. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that historic fences and wall should be preserved, and new ones should support the historic character of the district (p. 58). Ms. Rose stated wooden plank fences should not be placed in primary yards, as they should be recessed at least 20 feet from the residence's primary facade (p.58, #7-8). Ms. Rose stated while the proposed height of the five-rail fence exceeds three feet, which is recommended as the maximum height for primary yard fencing (p.59, #10), this style of fencing is common to the Franklin Road Historic District, featured along the property line elsewhere on the same lot, and supported as an appropriate fencing style for the Scenic Corridor Overlay in the Zoning Ordinance (Section 4.9.8).

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

1. The material, style, and location of the fencing is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines* and are consistent with the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, and any changes must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Mr. Gamble stated he would like to speak on the question from DRC as to how they will be transitioning from the five rail fence to the stockade fence and we will be transitioning that with a four by four post that is located behind the front façade of the log cabin and designate the difference between front yard and rear yard in this location. Mr. Gamble stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Rose pointed out the location of the log cabin on the projected screen.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments, and there were none.

Ms. Baker moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed fencing. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated she wondered if you don't want to have some kind of a transition where this goes from the six feet to the four-and-a-half feet. Ms. Besser questioned if she was missing something.

Mr. Gamble stated there is a lot of landscape and vegetation and they have been very careful to install this fence around existing trees and they have considered extending the stockade fence toward the shed, but they aren't committed to that yet and want some sort of privacy screening

from the rear yard from the adjacent property and so he thought there would be to have the four foot-six inch fence travel in a straight line along the property until it came to a four-by-four post located behind the front elevation of the cabin. Mr. Gamble stated four-by-four post would be six foot in height and would transition into the stockade fence, so you would have one fence transitioning to the other at a four by four post.

Ms. Besser asked if there could have a graduation between the stockade fence changes, so you could gradually work up to that height.

Ms. Rose stated she was not certain if the height would be permitted by the Zoning Ordinance at that point. Ms. Rose stated she would have to check on that.

Ms. Besser stated she was just concerned there was a fence at one height and then you turn and have a fence at another height, and the front fence would remain the same and side fence would change.

Chair Roberts stated the stockade fence starts way back to the front edge of the property.

Mr. Gamble stated there was a lot of landscape but would take a look at that.

The motion carried 9-0.

**Item 3:**

**Consideration of Lighting & Signage at 125 1st Ave. N.; Kristina Horan, Applicant.**

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of lighting and signage at 125 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. N. Ms. Gibson stated the wall sign consists of a 2" deep aluminum sign with mounted 1/4" aluminum letters. Ms. Gibson stated the sign is painted blue and the sign letters are painted white. Ms. Gibson stated the sign covers 20 sq. ft. of the storefront's 26 ft. width. Ms. Gibson stated illumination wiring is run inside the tubing to conceal the wiring on the sign. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed projecting arm sign measures 4.5 sq. ft. and consists of an aluminum sign face with mounted vinyl letters. Ms. Gibson stated the sign is painted blue and the letters are white. Ms. Gibson stated the sign is 2" thick and hung from a metal projecting arm that projects 4 ft. from the exterior wall of the building. Ms. Gibson stated the power to the sign is run through the projecting arm and the sign will be hung 8 ft. from the grade surface. Ms. Gibson stated the two proposed signs include lighting to provide external illumination. Ms. Gibson stated the wall sign includes black metal goose neck lights attached across the width of the sign. Ms. Gibson stated the integrated lighting causes the sign to be projecting from the building façade. Ms. Gibson stated the projecting arm sign has goose neck lights attached to the metal projecting arms.

Ms. Gibson stated the size of the proposed wall sign, 20 sq. ft. of signage on a façade with a 26-foot width, is consistent with the *Guidelines*, which state that wall sign square footage should not exceed the width of the building façade or storefront. Ms. Gibson stated the sign materials, aluminum sign with aluminum letters, are also consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated

the *Guidelines* recommend that sign colors should complement the colors of the building and that signs should include a dark background with light lettering. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed color scheme for the wall sign, blue background with white lettering, is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend that signs be traditional in appearance and the location, size, scale, and placement of signs should be selected to complement those of neighboring or adjacent buildings. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed wall sign is placed flush over the main entry, which is a typical placement location for wall signage.

Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend the use of concealed lighting or appropriate projecting fixtures that are separate from the sign itself and state that new light fixtures used to illuminate signs should be unobtrusive and have appropriate placement on the building. Ms. Gibson stated the type and location of the proposed sign lights are not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as their location on the wall sign itself is not a typical lighting location. Ms. Gibson stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its September 21, 2020, meeting, and the DRC provided favorable feedback for the integrated lighting concept as presented by the applicant.

Ms. Gibson stated the proposed projecting arm sign color scheme, blue background with white letters, and materials, aluminum panel with vinyl letters, are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the sign size and placement are also consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that projecting arm signs be a maximum of 4.5 sq. ft. and be hung 8 ft. above the grade surface.

Ms. Gibson stated the type and location of the proposed sign lights are not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, as their location on the projecting arm is not a typical lighting location, but the proposed projecting arm lighting type and location is consistent with other projecting arm signs approved by the HZC and located on the same building.

Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed wall sign and signage lighting as follows:

1. The type and location of the proposed sign lights are not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as their location on the wall sign itself is not a typical lighting location. The applicant shall work with staff to select a lighting type and location that is more consistent with previously approved wall signs on the building.
2. The signage color scheme must match the design submitted (blue background, white lettering).
3. Any changes must be returned to staff for review and approval.
4. If issued a COA, a warm light color must be used for the goose neck bulbs.
5. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit.
6. If issued a COA, mounting bolts should be installed through mortar joints rather than the face of the masonry.

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

1. The bottom of the sign panel must be hung a minimum of 8 feet from the grade surface in accordance with the *Guidelines*.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit.
3. Any changes must be returned to staff for review and approval.
4. If issued a COA, a warm light color must be used for the goose neck bulbs.
5. If issued a COA, mounting bolts should be installed through mortar joints rather than the face of the masonry.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Mr. Cianciolo stated he was the owner of the Now Massage Boutique of Franklin and appreciates all the help we have gotten from the commission and staff to get to a proposal that is exciting and something we look forward to putting up. Mr. Cianciolo stated there was some discussion at DRC about why we proposed an integrated sign for the wall sign and requested Ms. Gibson go back to the picture. Mr. Cianciolo stated you will see a real practical reason why we have proposed an integrated sign which is due to the space being very tight above the windows and before you hit the stone façade and the other reason was because we wanted to be consistent with all the other signs on the building. Mr. Cianciolo stated this does limit us to drilling only one time through the building. Mr. Cianciolo stated he would like to have the signs approved as is but will work with staff to come up with something suitable.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments, and there were none.

Chair Roberts stated they would do the motions in two motions with the wall sign first.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed wall signage and signage lighting. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker stated staff conditions state that the light conditions are not consistent with the guidelines and will need to be moved so what is being presented tonight won't be completely approved because we are asking them to move the lighting to a place that is more typical. Ms. Baker stated the way she reads this as she looks at the Guidelines is it talks about lighting being unobtrusive and having an appropriate place on the building, and she thinks what is being proposed is actually quite unobtrusive and does have appropriate placement on this building specifically due to it being an infill project. Ms. Baker stated she would support a motion removing condition one and allowing the lighting to be placed as proposed.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the amended motion, and the motion carried 8-1, with Ms. Besser voting no.

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

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed projecting arm signage and lighting. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

The motion carried 9-0.

**Item 4:**

**Consideration of HVAC Placement/Screening at 236 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. N.; Marla Shuff, Applicant.**

Ms. Gibson stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement and screening of HVAC units at 236 3rd Ave. N. Ms. Gibson stated the proposal consists of the placement of HVAC units on a metal platform that will be mounted to the south side exterior wall of the approved rear addition. Ms. Gibson stated the units will be mounted to the platform with support brackets. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed location of the platform allows for the placement of the units to be set back from public view and screened by landscaping. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend that utilities be placed and screened in order to minimize their impact on the district and to use placement, landscape, or fencing to hide utility units. Ms. Gibson stated the property is located in the floodplain and the HVAC units must be placed above the Base Flood Elevation. Ms. Gibson stated there is not adequate space to place the platform on the rear elevation of the addition. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed placement location is screened from public view by the historic building and landscaping and permits access to the units for repair. Ms. Gibson stated while the proposed placement is not typical, the floodplain constraints on the lot do not allow for an alternative placement. Ms. Gibson stated due to the floodplain constraints and topography changes, the proposed placement is the most appropriate option.

Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed HVAC placement and screening, as follows:

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

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Ms. Albert stated Ms. Gibson adequately portrayed their item.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments, and there were none.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed HVAC placement and screening. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include landscape screening to come back 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 motion carried 9-0.



**Item 5:**

**Consideration of Partial Demolition (Rear Porch) & Addition at 808 W. Main St.; Don Burke, Applicant.**

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 808 W. Main St., as follows:

- Demolition of the rear porch and storage area
- Two-story rear addition

Ms. Gibson stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee at its July 20 and September 21, 2020, meetings.

Ms. Gibson stated the brick veneer existing dwelling was built in the late 1980s and remodeled around 2000 to include Neoclassical-style architectural features, including a two-story, full-width porch with square columns. Ms. Gibson stated the property is non-contributing to the historic district. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed addition consists of the demolition of the existing rear screened porch, pergola, and storage area and the construction of a two-story rear addition. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the demolition of historic buildings and structures. In this case, the property is a modern home built in the 1980s and noncontributing to the district. Ms. Gibson stated the demolition is limited to the rear porch, storage area, and pergola and the demolition will not have an adverse impact on the district. Ms. Gibson stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed partial demolition as follows:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Mr. Powell stated he wanted to say thank you to all of the commission for their service. Mr. Powell stated it is an unusual situation with this house and is probably the only form like this in town and it is just a cube or a rectangle. Mr. Powell stated they wanted to add on to the back and want a continuous roofline to keep it in the Greek Revival style. Mr. Powell stated at DRC it was suggested to drop the roofline down, and personally, he thinks it will look funny if we do that. Mr. Powell stated you would have to step in the sides too and it just doesn't fit the house. Mr. Powell stated it is a non-conforming house it would be much better if we are allowed to continue with the same roofline in back and front.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments, and there were none.

Mr. Hathaway move to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed partial demolition. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 9-0.

Ms. Gibson stated as proposed, the addition extends from the roofline of the existing house by an additional 7 ft. and 9 in., making the overall building length 66 ft. and 5 in. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation includes working wood shutters and a differentiated fenestration pattern from the existing dwelling and also located on the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation is an entry portico with a wrought-iron canopy, columns, and railing and a standing seam metal roof. An existing downspout indicates the area of separation between the existing house and the proposed addition. Ms. Gibson stated the rear elevation will include a two-story, Greek Revival-style porch and additional architectural elements meant to imitate the detailing on the house's façade elevation. Ms. Gibson stated the west bay of the proposed first story rear porch will be enclosed and will include Chevron-patterned panel infill beneath paired double-hung windows. Ms. Gibson stated the area of the addition perpendicular to the rear porch addition is proposed to be enclosed in brick on the rear wall and paneling on the side (west) elevation. Ms. Gibson stated the siding used on the west elevation will match the existing siding on the house and the location of the trim board indicates the location of the addition. Ms. Gibson stated the brick used for the addition will be painted to match the existing dwelling.

Ms. Gibson stated the addition represents an increase of 306 sq. ft. to the existing 2,077-sq. ft. building footprint and the proposed lot coverage is 32%. Ms. Gibson stated while the property is non-historic, the addition is still reviewed in light of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* state that enclosed additions should support the historic character of the district and recommend that enclosed additions be placed on rear or obscured elevations. Ms. Gibson stated furthermore, the *Guidelines* recommend avoiding approaches that unify the existing structure and new construction into a single unified whole. Ms. Gibson stated differentiating methods, such as roof breaks, insets, offsets, and material changes should be incorporated into the design to separate existing construction from new construction and additions should be compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building. Ms. Gibson stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that the square footage of additions be limited to no more than half of the existing footprint and that maximum building coverage should not exceed 35%. Ms. Gibson stated the proposed addition is consistent with the *Guidelines* for placement, footprint size (15%), and lot coverage (32%), but the design does not conform to the recommendations for differentiating new additions from existing structures. Ms. Gibson stated while the design utilizes a different fenestration pattern on the addition and the trim board on the west elevation is added at the location of the addition, these features do not conform to the methods the *Guidelines* recommend for differentiating forms. Ms. Gibson stated a differentiating method, such as a roof break, inset, offset or material change would be more in line with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Gibson stated the purpose of this differentiation is to have the existing and new construction read as two different forms and present the appearance of having evolved over time and additionally, reducing some of the massing of the proposed rear porch would be more consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend that additions be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, forms, materials, and details of the building.

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

1. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department, including but not limited to underground utilities, prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. If issued a COA, any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to staff or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Mr. Powell stated he felt they covered it previously in their statement.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments, and there were none.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions the proposed addition of project 7363 due to the non-contributing nature of this modern structure and modern addition, which is a modest 306 square feet. Mr. Laster stated if this was a contributing structure, he would agree with staff and the guidelines. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion and stated she agrees with everything Mr. Laster stated.

Ms. Baker stated at DRC she expressed concern about elongating the roof, but after going by the structure a few times, she actually feels comfortable about lengthening the roof but her concern is with infill development. Ms. Baker stated we have asked them to present ideas or designs to us to look as if they have been developed over time and tell a story over time. Ms. Baker stated if that request is being made for infill development, she feels that same level of request should be made for non-contributing buildings. Ms. Baker stated she would like to see some form of break or the appearance of some development over time here. Ms. Baker stated we have asked this of other applicants and would like to be consistent.

Ms. Besser stated she could not support the motion, as she thinks that when we start making these kinds of exceptions, we are setting a precedent.

Ms. Pearce stated she was having some trouble with this just because we do seek to have things change over time, and the conflicting part of this is if this came in now as an infill as a whole, would we approve it. Ms. Pearce stated maybe but feels conflicted with everyone else's comments.

Chair Roberts stated he thinks what has been proposed fits perfectly within the neighborhood and agrees with Mr. Laster and is in favor of this motion.

The motion carried with a 7-2 vote, with Ms. Baker and Ms. Besser voted no.

#### **Item 6:**

**Consideration of Partial Demolition, Addition, & Upper-Level Addition at 1336 Adams St.; Rob McKelvey, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of a ca. 1980s addition from the principal structure, the construction of two enclosed additions at the rear of the principal structure, one of which is proposed to tie into the half-story upper level. Ms. Rose stated the applicant received a COA for the scope of work at the May 9, 2016, Historic Zoning Commission meeting; the COA has since expired.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the demolition of historic buildings or structures if they retain architectural and historical integrity (p.52, #1). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to remove a 385 sq. ft. modern addition (ca. 1980s) at the rear of the residence. As a non-historic addition, its removal from the remainder of the residence is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building and be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building. Ms. Rose stated the original building is defined to include “all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age” (p.54, #3-4). Ms. Rose stated the historic building must be clearly identifiable, and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition, as through approaches that unify the existing structure and new construction into a single architectural whole (p.54, #2). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility, noting, however, that rear, or side elevations may not always be appropriate for additions, as some historic buildings have visual prominence from many vantage points (p.54, #1). Ms. Rose stated the family room addition (approx. 419 sq. ft. footprint) is intended to be situated in the same general area as the sunroom addition that is proposed for removal. Ms. Rose stated the addition features a bedroom on the upper level that is designed to be massed behind the existing roof and hidden from the Adams St. view shed. Ms. Rose stated a shed dormer is also proposed to follow for ceiling height between the gabled roof of the proposed addition and the existing gable at the rear. Due to this location, the shed dormer will not be highly visible from the intersecting street, Gist St. Ms. Rose stated further, the family room addition is inset from the original portion of the house, and because of this, the addition is clearly identifiable from the original form.

- **Materials**—The materials of both proposed additions (siding to match existing, asphalt shingles) are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Window and door specifications have not been provided.
- **Footprint Analysis**—The footprint of the proposed new construction, minus the square footage of the sunroom addition proposed for demolition, measures approximately **22 percent** of the historic structure, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend limiting the square footage of additions to no more than half of the footprint of the original building (p.52, #3).
- **Lot Coverage Analysis**—The proposed total building coverage on the lot (including existing construction and the proposed addition) is approximately **14.8 percent**, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* also recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.52, #4).

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed partial demolition and additions with the following:

1. 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. Siding must be wood or a smooth board cementitious material to match the existing.
3. The foundation material must match that of the existing house.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the item.

Mr. McKelvey stated in 2016, we were applying for a similar COA, and the only change which has triggered the slight change in elevation is noted in the previous application, and we were providing an addition on the right side that would help hide the shed dormer at the rear but given the change in scope for this application, and had Ms. Rose project the rear elevation, you can see the unhatched gable to the left is lower so that necessitated us tying the side of that shed dormer into that roof pitch. Mr. McKelvey stated the change in the form and in order to provide some symmetry or balance we matched that detail on the right side of the shed. Mr. McKelvey stated in terms of the removal of the shed that was on the original back elevation we needed to accommodate existing stairs.

Ms. Rose pointed out a portion of the portrayed photo that would be to extrude a gable form outward.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizen comments, and there were none.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed partial demolition and additions. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser requested clarification on the rear elevation, asking that when you are looking at the photographs on the applicant submittal, where there are six photographs, if the rear elevation is in the second row in the middle.

Chair Roberts stated yes.

Ms. Pearce stated what she can't understand from the pictures the relationship between the proposed dormer and the existing gables.

Mr. McKelvey stated it is from an architectural standpoint that roof element you see shingled in the elevation isn't necessary we could element that and stated let me double check. Mr. McKelvey stated they have actually set the second-floor wall back some from the lower wall in order to help with the massing and it is not one continuous wall in the middle. Mr. McKelvey stated so that is what is requiring that roof element between the first-floor window and the second-floor window in the dormer.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if the window goes in.

Mr. McKelvey stated window is flush with the entire dormer face.

Ms. Rose stated that she thinks that Ms. Pearce is asking how far the dormer sits from the wall.

Mr. McKelvey stated the first floor to the second floor, he believes it sits back about a foot.

Ms. Rose stated could it be a smaller window as another solution.

Ms. Pearce agreed.

Mr. McKelvey stated yes.

Ms. Rose stated she felt the window was smaller before.

Mr. McKelvey was based off the next window down to work with proportions and sizes.

Ms. Pearce moved to have the window between the two gables be smaller to re-work the roof between those, and it must come back to staff to work out the details. Ms. Besser seconded the amendment, and the motion carried 9-0.

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

**Item 7:**

**Consideration of Alterations (Foundation Elevation, Roofing/Siding/Window/Entrance Replacement, Porch Construction, Chimney Removal, HVAC Placement), Rear Deck, & Upper-Level Addition at 319 N. Margin St.; Chris Jones, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 319 N. Margin St., as follows:

1. ***Foundation Elevation***—The applicant is proposing to elevate the entire existing structure out of the floodplain approximately 3’7” inches above the current grade in order to elevate it one (1) foot above Base Flood Elevation. The applicant is seeking to rebuild the porch in a slightly new configuration due to the elevation of the overall structure.
2. ***Exterior Alterations***— The plans (developed for a previous owner) indicate the demolition of two chimneys, though the applicant stated to staff that it is his intent to maintain the foremost chimney and only requests to remove the rear chimney. The applicant is also seeking approval for the replacement of several items on the exterior of the structure. These alterations include the removal of aluminum siding, the replacement of the siding on the front and side elevations with wood lap siding, and the replacement of the siding on the rear elevation with cementitious siding; the replacement of non-original windows and the repair of the original four-over-over wood windows; and the replacement of the metal roofing material in-kind.

3. **Rear Deck**—A deck with a simple railing is proposed to be added to the rear.
4. **Upper-Level Addition**—The applicant is proposing to add to expand existing upper-level space through the use of a hipped addition on the back side of the gable.

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 amount of investment into the property triggers substantial improvement value, which, in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, requires that elevation of the entire structure to no lower than three (3) feet above the base flood elevation if the structure is to be used for a residential use. Ms. Rose stated the structure is located within an Office Residential (OR) base zoning district, which allows for certain nonresidential and residential uses. Ms. Rose stated since the applicant wishes to use the structure as a residence, the elevation of the finished floor elevation to a level no less than three (3) feet above Base Flood Elevation meets the life safety requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Rose stated the applicant will be requesting consideration of a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals in order to maintain the building's historic status. Ms. Rose stated Section 17.6.5 of the Zoning Ordinance states that the Board of Zoning Appeals may hear and decide requests for variances from the requirements of Section 17.6, Floodplain Protection (in this case, to elevate the structure three feet above Base Flood Elevation), and specifically, variances may be issued for the repair and rehabilitation of historic structures upon a determination that the proposed repair or rehabilitation will not preclude its continued designation as a historic structure AND the variance is the minimum necessary deviation from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in order to preserve the historic character and design of the structure. Ms. Rose stated this practice follows the recommendations of the National Flood Insurance Program, of which the City is part. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has provided two annotated photographs to demonstrate how the building will look 1) elevated to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, at three feet above Base Flood Elevation, and 2) how the building will look elevated to meet the minimum required to meet the nonresidential use regulations for the base zoning district, at one foot above Base Flood Elevation.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* do not comment on the raising/elevation of historic structures and only comment on foundation height compatibility as related to infill construction. Ms. Rose stated the proposed foundation height, at approximately 3'-7" from current grade level and demonstrated in the bottom photograph of the applicant's submittal, will offer relative consistency with the height of the porch level of the adjacent structure. Ms. Rose stated elevating the structure an additional two feet above Base Flood Elevation, as demonstrated in the top photograph of the applicant's submittal, would be substantial out of context with the porch levels of the other buildings on the block face and would require a significant change to the porch—with additional risers, a landing—all of which may create significant enough mass to overwhelm the subtle character-defining features of this vernacular duplex structure.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one preserve and maintain original foundations (p.62, #1). Ms. Rose stated the front elevation has very little, if any, exposed foundation at the side and rear. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to utilize a block foundation, though the exact block type is not specified. Ms. Rose stated the use of a parge-coated block would be compatible with the building, the adjacent structure, and the district.

Ms. Rose stated as part of the overall elevation of the structure, the applicant is requesting to alter the porch slightly from its existing configuration by adding a railing, orienting the steps to the left, situating the porch on piers, and enclosing it with lattice. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that one should preserve and maintain the location and configuration of original porches and that railings should not be installed unless required for safety or access reasons (p.78, #1; p.79, #16). Ms. Rose stated the elevation of the structure requires the addition of the railing, and the reorientation of the steps will lessen the perceived height of the foundation. Ms. Rose stated in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the railing should be wood (p.79, #8), though cedar may be the option that is most appropriate, as the railing will need to follow the risers down into the floodplain area (wood is not a permissible material in the floodplain, with cedar being the exception). Ms. Rose stated the use of masonry piers and floodproof lattice are historically appropriate, architecturally appropriate for the character of the vernacular residence, comparable to the detailing seen on the neighboring structure, and will lessen the massing that could be created by the additional height of the porch.

Ms. Rose stated the exterior alterations consist of the following:

- **Chimneys**—The applicant has indicated to staff that it is his intent to maintain the foremost chimney as a character-defining feature (centered between the two entrances on the front side of the side gable) and only requests to remove the rear chimney, located on the rear of the side gable, due to structural issues. The *Guidelines* state that if chimneys are collapsed, one should reconstruct them to match their original appearance, if known. If not known, one should use designs and materials typical for the age and style of the building (p.51, #3). As such, the proposed work is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. The chimney is located at the rear of the house, lessening the impact of the alteration to the public viewshed.
- **Siding**—The structure is clad in synthetic siding, and previous investigations by staff indicated that no wood remains portions of the synthetic materials. The *Guidelines* also support the removal of synthetic siding and the restoration of a building's appearance through the restoration of original siding materials (p.83, #3-4). The applicant is proposing to utilize wood siding on the front and side elevations and to use cementitious siding on the rear. The *Guidelines* state that use of smooth cement board siding may be appropriate for the replacement of deteriorated wood siding on rear elevations.
- **Windows**—The structure features a variety of window types currently. Restoration of existing windows is appropriate and encouraged. The applicant is proposing to repair all original windows—which have been identified as a four-over-four wood light configuration—and is seeking approval to replace all non-original windows on the building. The *Guidelines* state that original windows and window openings should be preserved and maintained, and new windows should match the historic materials found on the building, with a true or simulated divided-light and double-hung appearance (p.90, #4-5). Window specifications have not been submitted.



- **Roofing**—The *Guidelines* recommend that one retain historic roof shape and materials, and if partial or wholesale replacement is needed, one use materials whose composition and appearance matches the historic materials (p.82, #1, #3). The proposal to replace the existing metal roofing with metal is appropriate, though the type of metal has not been specified. 5V metal roofing would be most appropriate for this vernacular style structure.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility, noting, however, that rear or side elevations may not always be appropriate for additions, as some historic buildings have visual prominence from many vantage points (p.54, #1).

Ms. Rose stated the proposed addition is located on the rear elevation of the residence and rests on the back side of the side-gabled form. Ms. Rose stated it does not extend past the exterior wall. Ms. Rose stated a hipped form, it insets from the existing house, and its ridge height measures 8” lower than the existing ridge height. Ms. Rose stated the proposed metal roofing and wood siding (side elevations) and cementitious siding (rear elevation) materials are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55).

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed foundation elevation, porch/siding/window/roofing/chimney alterations, and upper-level addition with the following:

1. The proposal to limit the foundation height elevation to one foot above Base Flood Elevation is more sensitive to the architectural qualities of the contributing structure and presents the least amount of adverse impact to the contributing status of the historic structure and to the context of its overall historic district. The plan set must be amended to clarify the materials to be utilized, including parge-coated block, stone piers, floodproof (cedar) railing, and floodproof (cedar) lattice porch enclosure, prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. While the removal of the rear chimney is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*, the chimney is located at the rear of the house, lessening the impact of the alteration to the public viewshed.
3. 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).
4. All historic windows must be preserved and maintained in accordance with the *Guidelines* (p.90). Replacement windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of wood. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval, in light of the applicable *Guidelines*, prior to installation.
5. The HVAC placement has not been demonstrated on the plan set. The applicant may work with staff to determine if the proposed placement and screening qualifies for Administrative COA approval.
6. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a Building Permit, including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. In new developments and for off-site lines constructed as a result of, or to provide service to, the new development, all utilities, such as cable television, electrical, gas, sewer, telephone, and water lines shall be placed underground (ZO 16.1.3).
- b. Per the City of Franklin Zoning Ordinance, porches are required to be a minimum of 6' in usable depth. Please show the dimensions on the floor plans.
- c. If the structure is proposed to be used as a single-family home and not as a live-work unit, please remove the labeling of "live-work" from the plans.
- d. The applicant shall obtain a floodplain development permit prior to any disturbance of the FFO.
- e. Three (3) elevation certificates will be required for the project—one (1) with building permit application, one (1) at foundation inspection, and one (1) at final inspection. These elevation certificates must be completed by a Certified Floodplain Surveyor.
- f. Flood vents are required on at least two walls. One square inch of opening per one square foot of enclosure is required.
- g. All electrical/plumbing/HVAC shall be elevated above base flood elevation.
- h. The water service will be required to be relocated.
- i. Per City of Franklin Municipal Code, driveways shall be a minimum of 5 feet from the property line. A Hollywood-style driveway may be a viable solution, however.

Chair Roberts requested to know if the applicant wished to speak on the first portion.

Mr. Jones stated he had nothing to add, that Ms. Rose had covered everything.

Chair Roberts thanked Mr. Jones for the pictures.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to speak, and none requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed foundation elevation, select exterior alterations, and upper-level addition. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated we have lost so many working cottages downtown, and this is a particularly exciting project.

Mr. Laster requested to affirm staff's recommendation as to the foundation elevation of one foot above board because all of us can see this single-story house can handle the three-foot seven-inch foundation and still retain its historic character. Mr. Laster stated at the zoning-required height, it would look out of place at five-feet seven-inches. Mr. Laster stated the other factor of his comfort level is the State recommends one foot above is safe, and this structure did not flood in 2010. Mr. Laster stated he did have a question about the windows, and he was just curious that on the west elevation we see an additional window but not on the east elevation.

Ms. Rose stated yes, there is an additional window on the west elevation and not the east elevation.

Mr. Laster wondered if that window was necessary.

Mr. Jones requested Ms. Rose to go back to the overhead view and stated that should be on the bedroom side of the top floor, and that should be the reason for the egress/ingress purposes, and on the other side is a bathroom.

Ms. Rose stated it was necessary for egress purposes.

The motion carried 8-0, with Mr. Hathaway recusing himself.

Ms. Rose stated a deck with a simple railing is proposed to be added to the rear. Ms. Rose stated while the proposed square footage increase is a bit unclear, the plans indicate that the existing building coverage on the subject property is 42.6 percent. Ms. Rose stated it appears the building coverage proposed by the rear deck would be increased to 47.7 percent. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, including OR, as measured by building footprint (p.55, #5). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* do support the placement of porches or deck on rear or lesser visible elevations, however. Ms. Rose stated the proposed materials are not indicated. 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 (p.54 #3). 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 it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed rear deck with the following:

1. The total building coverage, including that proposed by the addition of the rear deck, is 47.7 percent. The *Guidelines* recommend that lot coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, including OR, as measured by building footprint (p.55, #5).
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.

Ms. Marquardt moved to defer the deck discussion to the next voting meeting on November 9th. Mr. Laster seconded the motion and invited the applicant to the next DRC meeting.

Mr. Jones stated that deck is not a make or break to this project.

Chair Roberts explained to the applicant they could come to the next Monday DRC, or it could be dropped if they do not wish to pursue it.

Ms. Rose noted there are exit doors that go off to the sides, so there will need to be some sort of accommodation, whether it is landing steps or stoop, etc.

Ms. Pearce stated she is all for deferring it and suggests the applicant come to DRC.

The motion carried 8-0, with Mr. Hathaway recusing himself.

**Item 8:**

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

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item.

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 applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its September 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 the 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. Ms. Rose stated 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 1 1/2 stories is appropriate for the Hincheyville Historic District. Ms. Rose stated the massing of the proposal, however, is not consistent with the context of the district. Ms. Rose stated the residence is proposed as two primary masses as viewed from the street—a main principal form and a front-loaded, two-bay garage. Ms. Rose stated most of the massing incompatibility is due to the proposal to attach a two-bay garage to the left side of the structure, which is visible from vantages from street view. 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.

Ms. Rose stated utilization of one of the two options below may help lessen the massing incompatibility and render more compatibility with the character of the historic district:

- 1) The 1-½ story garage could be detached, creating two individual structures. While most of the lots in Fair Park are configured in such a manner as to limits their abilities to accommodate a detached accessory structure well, the subject property appears—from the site plan—to be able to accommodate the space. While the detached accessory could

not be placed entirely behind the rear plane of the principal structure, it can be recessed behind the front plane (similar to the proposed placement, or more recessed) and will lessen the massing of the form significantly.

- 2) The 1-½ story garage could be lowered to a single-story garage. This will lessen the massing created by the roof structure and help reinforce a more subservient relationship between the garage and the principal form.

Ms. Rose stated the recession of the attached garage is not a viable option, as it would not mitigate the massing incompatibility in its entirety, and the presence of the single-story screened porch behind the garage helps serve as a lesser-massed transitional piece between the new construction and the historic buildings.

Ms. Rose stated the height of the proposal, at 29'-1", may not be entirely consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated while the *Guidelines* 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, they 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 30'. Ms. Rose stated the approved Fair Park Ct. construction heights are 32'-8" (Lot 4) and 29'-11" (Lot 5), and the additional building on the block face, located at 322 11<sup>th</sup> Ave N., measures approximately 36'.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed materials of the proposed new construction are listed as cementitious lap siding, cementitious panel, architectural shingle roofing, shake siding in the front gable area, standing seam metal for the porch and dormers, and brick foundation, all of which are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated shingle and window specifications have not been provided.

Ms. Rose stated the proportion and rhythm of window openings are 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 proposed building coverage is 39 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 massing of the proposal is not consistent with the context of the Hincheyville Historic District. Most of the massing incompatibility is due to the proposal to attach a two-bay garage to the left side of the structure. The *Guidelines* recommend that "in areas where historic garages are generally detached, new garages should appear to be

detached” (p.68, #22). The Hincheyville Historic District features more detached accessory structures than attached garages.

2. The height of the proposal, at 29’-1”, may not be entirely consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.66, #4-5).
3. The proposed building coverage is **39 percent**, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.67, #10).
4. 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).
5. If issued a COA, the shingle specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
6. 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 on the first portion.

Mr. Hathaway stated he would start with the massing stating they met at DRC and had some great comments, and one comment was lowering the roof of the garage and eliminating the dormer that was on the front. Mr. Hathaway stated they did lower the roof approximately one-foot, eight-inches and eliminated the dormer on the front and moved around to the side to get the egresses out of that space. Mr. Hathaway stated in terms of the building height, he knows there is a lot of concern of the comparison of Fair Street, but if you go down Fair Street there is not a lot of visibility to this site from Fair Street, but with a two-story home as the lot size here will require to make it a viable home site, you have to be in the twenty-eight or twenty-nine feet range. Mr. Hathaway stated when we had this originally approved back in 2018, we were at 29-foot, 10-inches in height as an approved plan for this lot. Mr. Hathaway stated they accessed after multiple conversations that we reduced that to the 29 feet, 1-inch to reduce as much as we can so as Ms. Rose spoke eliminated the windows on the rear of the house so there is not that concern with privacy from the rear to the back lot. Mr. Hathaway stated they are now 29 feet-1 inches away from the grade to the top of the roof, and we have made an attempt to reduce as much as possible. Mr. Hathaway stated also in the percentage of the lot coverage the previously approved lot adjacent to us lot 5, was approved at 39 percent and we have worked to keep it at that or less, so we are also at 39 percent. Mr. Hathaway stated these lots are much smaller as what is on Fair Street while the 39 percent, we are requesting is not a huge amount above the 35 percent we are asking for a variance from that guideline.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to speak, and none requested to speak.

Ms. Baker moved to deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated October 12, 2020. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker stated she appreciates the changes that have been made from DRC to what has been presented tonight and sees Mr. Hathaway heard what we had to say and made some changes based on that. Ms. Baker stated the massing is still not there and has received a lot of comments from folks on Fair Street and the Historic District and she doesn't think she can comfortably approve the plans that have been submitted in light of the feedback she has received from citizens.

Mr. Laster stated staff's comment under option 1 might be a solution that the board could support, or it could be a denial where the applicant would like to come back before DRC and come to November's meeting.

Ms. Pearce stated she liked the idea Mr. Laster just laid out, and her concern is the scale and the monotony of the scale in Fair Park, as compared to other areas.

Ms. Marquardt stated she had a comment concerning staff comment regarding the attached garage. Ms. Marquardt stated she agrees the massing could be minimized a little bit, but at the same time, when you look at the adjacent properties and those garages somewhere along the line, Historic Zoning approved those. Ms. Marquardt stated to her the attached garage is consistent with the adjacent properties. Ms. Marquardt stated the reason she will vote to deny is because of the increase to the 39 percent versus the 35 percent.

Chair Roberts stated the massing concerns him with a story and a half garage.

The motion to deny carried 8-0.

**Other Business.**

**Adjourn.**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Secretary