

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
MAY 10, 2021**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, May 10, 2021, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

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

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Kelly Dannenfels, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Bill Squires, Law Department
 Robert Mott, Communications Department

Call to Order

Vice-Chair Pearce brought the April 12, 2021 meeting to order at 5:00pm.

Minutes: April 12, 2021

Mr. Scalf moved to approve the April 12, 2021 minutes. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Announcements:

Ms. Rose stated there will be a DRC meeting on May 17, 2021 at 4:00pm in the boardroom. Ms. Rose stated there will be a Special DRC City Hall Site Visit on May 24, 2021, to help the Planning staff and consultants for a new City Hall. Ms. Rose stated that the site visit to Harlinsdale Farm for May 18, 2021 has been cancelled and is to be rescheduled for a time in June.

VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

The non-agenda process, by design, is reserved for emergency instances. Non-agenda items shall be considered only upon the unanimous approval of all the HZC members.

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 Preliminary HZC Recommendation Request for Potential Development at the Southeast and Southwest Corners of the Intersection at Mack Hatcher Pkwy. and Franklin Rd.; Kiser Vogrin Design, Applicant.

This item was pulled from the agenda by the applicant.

Item 2:

Consideration of Alterations (Storefront) at 415 Main St.; Kari Ihle, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the alteration of glass storefront windows into a storefront entrance at 415 Main St. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also requesting approval of wall and window decal signage for the new storefront. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its April 19, 2021 meeting.

Ms. Rose stated the subject property is a ca. 1930 two-story brick commercial building. Ms. Rose stated it has a recessed entrance with large Tuscan columns and replacement glass-and-metal doors and display windows and historically, the building served as an automotive repair shop and featured open vehicle bays on either side of a central entrance. Ms. Rose stated currently, the building maintains the central entrance as a shared vestibule for two businesses. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking to create a new storefront entrance at Main St. Since the window elements are non-historic, their replacement is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that if new storefronts are required, one should maintain traditional designs and arrangements and restore remodeled storefronts to their original design or designs based on traditional storefront arrangements (p.126, #4). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend the use of copper, bronze, or painted aluminum storefronts, as well as the use of clear glass. Ms. Rose stated further, it is noted that if original bulkheads are missing, one should install new bulkheads of wood or brick, stone, or metal bulkheads that match historic brick or are painted to complement other storefront elements (p.127, #13, #16). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to utilize a metal storefront that matches the existing vestibule and windows in color

and design. Ms. Rose stated the new bulkheads are proposed to be metal with minimal detailing that complements the existing elements.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also seeking approval for wall and window decal signage. Ms. Rose stated the wall sign consists of individual letters—adhered to the building with spacers—and is proposed to be centered over the proposed storefront entrance. Ms. Rose stated the lettering is metal in material and black in color, which are consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.120, #4, #11). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that wall signs should measure no more than one square foot per linear foot of width of the storefront (p.120, #1) to order to maintain appropriate scale with the façade. Ms. Rose stated the linear spacing of the proposed lettering is approximately 4 sq. ft., which is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the letters utilize studs that allow for a flush mount. Ms. Rose stated the proposed window decal design and placement is mostly appropriate; the *Guidelines* recommend that one use light coloring for decals (p.120, #8). Ms. Rose stated the decals will not distract from the building facade or engross the window, however, as the proposed placement (at the bottom of the windows) is discrete, and the sizing is small.

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

1. The applicant shall work to place studs within mortar joints so as to avoid damage to the faces of the historic bricks, as recommended by the *Guidelines* (p.120, #20).
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if the applicate wished to speak.

Ms. Kirkman, an associate of the applicant, stated she had nothing to add and was happy to answer any questions.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed storefront alterations and sign placement. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt questioned if there was lighting.

Ms. Kirkman stated no lighting will be used on the signage.

The motion carried 7-0.

Item 3:

Consideration of Alterations (Rear Facade Fenestration) at 132 1st Ave. S.; Pauline Pons, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the second-floor rear fenestration at 132 1st Ave. S. Ms. Rose stated the proposed work includes the removal of one existing French door and two existing pairs of windows and their replacement with a NanaWall folding system of seven panels. Ms. Rose stated the replacement will fit within the same approximate opening, with brick and limestone trim proposed to be reused and reinstalled in the same layout and appearance. 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 therefore a noncontributing resource within the Franklin 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 proposed reconfiguration includes the installation of a NanaWall, which is an operable folding window system. Ms. Rose stated the design is proposed to look similar to the existing windows in mullion style and color. Ms. Rose stated the as presented, the alteration of the fenestration pattern on the rear second floor façade is appropriate, given the its lack of visibility from public viewsheds (p.90, #3). Ms. Rose stated the proposed windows are similar in rhythm, spacing, and placement to those found on elsewhere on the infill building (p.90, #5). Overall, the proposal 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 rear façade fenestration alterations with the following:

1. The brick and limestone color, texture, and size must match that of the found on the same façade.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if the applicate wished to speak.

Ms. Pons stated she had nothing to add.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

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

Item 4:

Consideration of New Construction at 143 Splendor Ridge Dr.; Chad Gore, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a two-story principal structure with garage at 143 Splendor Ridge Dr, which is Lot 8 in Splendor Ridge Subdivision. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its April 19, 2021 meeting. Ms. Rose stated Splendor Ridge Subdivision is located behind/to the west of the historic Riverview house in the Franklin Road Historic District, and it consists of nineteen (19) lots. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission considered the subdivision for issuance of a Preliminary COA at its April 2018 meeting, prior to the development's approval, so as to provide direction to the final owners on pivotal building design elements such as height, setback, scale, and massing. Ms. Rose stated the Preliminary COA further notes that all individual buildings will require consideration for their own respective COAs prior to issuance of building permits.

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 (p.66, #4). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the construction of two-story cross-gabled residence with minimal Italianate detailing and three-bay covered porch. Ms. Rose stated a single-story form is to the right of the porch. Ms. Rose stated an attached garage at the rear of the driveway; its placement is angled slightly to accommodate the lot shape. Ms. Rose stated a two-level porch is proposed at the rear elevation. Ms. Rose stated the brick is proposed to be painted gray, to match the siding. Ms. Rose stated the following:

Placement/Setback—The *Guidelines* recommend that one reinforce and maintain existing setbacks of adjacent structures (p.67, #9). The subject property is located within a newly platted subdivision, and it is one of the first buildings proposed for construction within the development. Setbacks have been defined as 15' for the front yard, 5' for the side yards, and 15' for the rear yard. The applicant has provided a conceptual streetscape in order to provide information on the proposed building's placement in context, as well as information on the topographical changes from street grade to the building's proposed grade level and its finished floor elevation (FFE). The grade change from sidewalk to FFE equates to approximately 6'. The applicant has provided a rendering to demonstrate the proposed use of tiered concrete risers, ground covering, and landscaping to achieve a softer grade transition.

Scale/Massing—The proposed scale of two stories is appropriate for the Franklin Road Historic District. It is also consistent with the development’s Preliminary COA. The use of the single-story elements—the front porch and enclosed portion to the right of the porch—softens the perceived building mass and height. The *Guidelines* recommend that “in areas where historic garages are generally detached, new garages should appear to be detached” but that “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). The applicant is proposing to attach the 1 ½-story garage form at the rear and right side of the principal structure, oriented toward the street at the end of the driveway. This configuration provides a more traditional appearance, as the garage presents a detached appearance from street view.

Height—The height of the proposal, at approximately 35’-4”, is consistent with the development’s Preliminary COA.

Materials/Architectural Features—The materials of the proposed new construction are listed as painted gray brick, cementitious lap siding of a 5” reveal and matching color to the brick, smooth cementitious paneling, wood railing, and asphalt shingle roofing with metal roofing at box bay and porch elements. Window specifications have not been provided. While paint colors are not reviewed by the Historic Zoning Commission, the *Guidelines* recommend that Italianate architecture utilize unpainted bricks or light plant-based or soil-based shades of gray, yellow, or tan (p.76). As such, the proposal is appropriate.

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).

Building Coverage—The proposed building coverage is 38.1 percent, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, including R-1, as measured by building footprint (p.67, #10).

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

1. The proposed building coverage is 38.1 percent, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, including R-1, as measured by building footprint (p.67, #10).

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

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if the applicante wished to speak.

Mr. Gore stated he would remind the commission of our prior approvals that were above 35 percent lot coverage. Mr. Gore stated that he did commit to stay below 40 percent lot coverage and that he has done that.

Ms. Rose requested Mr. Gore clarify the color of the brick.

Mr. Gore stated Dorian Gray.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction, based on the Staff Analysis and that it is consistent with houses the commission has approved previously. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated there is a lot of open space in this development as well.

Ms. Besser stated she will not be able to support this motion due to the overage on the lot coverage.

Mr. Mann stated he would support this item because we have supported these overages in the past, but he also stated that he would like to see something closer to 35 percent in the future.

With the motion having been made and seconded, the motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Besser voting no.

**Item 5:
Consideration of New Construction at 167 Splendor Ridge Dr.; Chad Gore, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a two-story principal structure with garage at 143 Splendor Ridge Dr, which is Lot 12 in Splendor Ridge Subdivision. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design

Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its April 19, 2021 meeting. Ms. Rose stated Splendor Ridge Subdivision is located behind/to the west of the historic Riverview house in the Franklin Road Historic District, and it consists of nineteen (19) lots. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission considered the subdivision for issuance of a Preliminary COA at its April 2018 meeting, prior to the development's approval, so as to provide direction to the final owners on pivotal building design elements such as height, setback, scale, and massing. Ms. Rose stated the Preliminary COA further notes that all individual buildings will require consideration for their own respective COAs prior to issuance of building permits.

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 (p.66, #4). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the construction of two-story cross-gabled residence with Tudor detailing. Ms. Rose stated the single-bay entrance is recessed, and a two-bay covered porch flanks it to the left. Ms. Rose stated a box bay is on the main body of the house, to the right of the recessed entrance. Ms. Rose stated a single-story enclosed form flanks the right elevation. An attached garage at the rear of the driveway; its placement is angled slightly to accommodate the lot shape. Ms. Rose stated a two-level porch is proposed at the rear elevation. Ms. Rose stated the following:

Placement/Setback—The *Guidelines* recommend that one reinforce and maintain existing setbacks of adjacent structures (p.67, #9). The subject property is located within a newly platted subdivision. Setbacks have been defined as 15' for the front yard, 5' for the side yards, and 15' for the rear yard.

The applicant has provided a conceptual streetscape in order to provide information on the proposed building's placement in context, as well as information on the topographical changes from street grade to the building's proposed grade level and its finished floor elevation (FFE). The grade change from sidewalk to FFE equates to approximately 5'-5". The applicant has provided a rendering to demonstrate the proposed use of tiered concrete risers, ground covering, and landscaping to achieve a softer grade transition.

Scale/Massing—The proposed scale of two stories, as viewed from the street, is appropriate for the Franklin Road Historic District and consistent with the development's Preliminary COA. The use of the single-story porch and box bay softens the perceived building mass and height.

The *Guidelines* recommend that "in areas where historic garages are generally detached, new garages should appear to be detached" but that "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). The applicant is proposing to attach the garage form at the rear and right side of the principal

structure, oriented toward the street at the end of the driveway. This configuration provides a more traditional appearance, as the garage presents a detached appearance from street view.

Height—The height of the proposal, at approximately 37', is consistent with the development's Preliminary COA.

Materials/Architectural Features—The materials of the proposed new construction are listed as brick, cementitious lap siding of a 5" reveal, smooth cementitious paneling with half-timbering, iron railing, and asphalt shingle roofing with metal roofing at the box bay. Window specifications have not been provided. At the DRC's recommendation, the applicant has simplified the timbering design on the main body of the structure.

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).

Building Coverage—The proposed building coverage is **39.4 percent**, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, including R-1, as measured by building footprint (p.67, #10).

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

1. The proposed building coverage is **39.4 percent**, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, including R-1, as measured by building footprint (p.67, #10).
2. 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.
3. The *Guidelines* stated that one should match surrounding historic masonry in width of mortar joints, size and scale of bricks, color, and texture (p.68, #32). If issued a COA, the specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. If issued a COA, the application must meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if the applicate wished to speak.

Mr. Gore stated he did not have much to say but reminded the commission of the discussion in DRC about how the Tudor Revival style and stated he did simplify the half timbering and brick. Mr. Gore stated that he addressed how the elevation gets broken up a little bit with a window infill.

Vice-Chair Pearce requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Mann moved to approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction, based on the Staff Analysis, and he added that he is going against staff's recommendation due to the commission having done so in this development before and that the lot coverage is under 40 percent. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Besser voting no.

**Item 6:
Other Business.**

Ms. Rose briefly spoke on the following receipt of Administrative COA approvals on behalf of the HZC she approved:

- Rear Elevation Signage at 99 E. Main St.; Renee Mediamolle, Applicant.
- Sandwich Board Signage at 435 Main St. Dawn Craig, Applicant.
- COA Extension for Alterations (Columbarium Construction) at 435 Main St.; Ed Triggs, Applicant.

Ms. Dannenfelsler stated they looked forward to seeing the commission for the site visit for City Hall, which is going to be a very important visit. Ms. Dannenfelsler stated they should meet at 4:30 pm on May 24th at the plaza in front of the courthouse.

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

DocuSigned by:
Jim Roberts

6/21/2021

Acting Secretary