

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 13, 2021**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, September 13, 2021, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Susan Besser
Brian Laster
Josh Denton
Mary Pearce
Jim Roberts
Ken Scalf
Kathy Worthington

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelly Dannenfeler, Planning & Sustainability Department
Victoria Hensley, Planning & Sustainability Department
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department

Call to Order

Chair Roberts brought the September 13, 2021 meeting to order at 5:01pm.

Minutes: August 9, 2021

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the August 9, 2021 minutes. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster stated he had an amendment to make and moved to amend the minutes on page four paragraph four there should be the word “vapor” before blasting.

With the motion having been made and amended, the minutes carried 6-0, with Mr. Denton abstaining from the vote due to not being present at the August 9, 2021 meeting.

Announcements:

Ms. Rose stated there are two upcoming DRC meetings on September 20, 2021. Ms. Rose stated one is at 3:00 pm which is a special called meeting to discuss the upcoming Franklin Grove project and at 4:00 pm we will resume our regularly scheduled meeting.

Ms. Rose stated item number two has been withdrawn and will not be discussed this evening.

Ms. Dannenfeler stated she wanted to talk about the special DRC meeting scheduled for October 4th and stated the topic will be the preliminary master plan for the new City Hall. Ms. Dannenfeler stated it is opportunity for the DRC to review the overall form, heights, scale and massing. Ms. Dannenfeler stated the master plan was released to the public today and can be viewed at www.completethesquare.com.

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.

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:

Zoning Ordinance Annual Update/HPO Rezoning Recommendation Request for 264 Natchez St. (Merrill-Williams House) and 446 11th Ave. N. (McLemore House); City of Franklin, Applicant.

Ms. Dannenfesler stated this is annual update to the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Franklin and there are a couple updates that are related to historic preservation. Ms. Dannenfesler stated the first two of the list of three is just an update for your information and you won't be voting to make a recommendation on that tonight but it does relate to historic preservation so we wanted to bring that up as we bring the HPO rezoning request to you for consideration tonight. Ms. Dannenfesler stated the first one is a change to the preliminary HZC recommendations the Historic Zoning Commission reviews development plans in the HPO and makes recommendation at an early stage to the Planning Commission and BOMA and we would like to incorporate rezonings specifically related to the HHO, which is the Hillside Hilltop Overlay District and the SCO, which is the Scenic Corridor Overlay District when there are nearby historic resources that may be impacted by a rezoning. Ms. Dannenfesler stated the second one is to extend the expiration for Certificates of Appropriateness, which are currently one year with a six-month administrative extension to a two year to give more flexibility to the applicant due to finding it takes longer in this time with construction demands. Ms. Dannenfesler stated two years would reduce the administrative burden on staff but still allow for the six-month extension.

Ms. Hensley stated we have two proposed rezonings to the Historic Preservation Overlay District for the McLemore House and the Merrill Williams House. Ms. Hensley stated in recognition of the property's historical significance the property owners of these two individual properties have worked with city staff and requested the properties be re-zoned and placed within the HPO. Ms. Hensley stated first up is the McLemore House which is located at 446 11th Avenue North in the Hard Bargain neighborhood and it was constructed around 1880. Ms. Hensley stated the McLemore House was constructed by the formerly enslaved Harvey McLemore and descendants of Mr. McLemore remained in the house until 1997 when the Heritage Foundation of Franklin and Williamson County as well as the Williamson County Habitat for Humanity purchased the lot. Ms. Hensley stated today the African American Heritage Society has converted the historic house into the McLemore House Museum. Ms. Hensley stated next up we have the Merrill Williams House which is located at 264 Natchez Street in the Natchez Street National Register Historic District. Ms. Hensley stated this house was constructed around 1881 and Moses Merrill a formerly enslaved man acquired the property the house stands on and then in 1892 he sold the house to the ANC

Williams family. Ms. Hensley stated Williams was a prominent African American businessman in Franklin and the house stayed in the Williams family for generations. Ms. Hensley stated today the African American Heritage Society is fundraising to secure the house and to create a heritage center in the Natchez neighborhood.

Ms. Hensley stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission make a motion to recommend approval to the FMPC and BOMA for the proposed HPO District rezoning.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment on this application and request. No one wished to make any comments.

Ms. Pearce recused herself from this application.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there was motion.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve a recommendation of the rezoning of these two properties to FMPC and BOMA. Mr. Laster seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0, with 1 recusal of Ms. Pearce.

Item 2:

Consideration of Preliminary HZC Recommendation Request for Emeline Acres Subdivision proposed at the Southeast and Southwest Corners of the Intersection at Mack Hatcher Pkwy. and Franklin Rd.; Kiser Vogrin Design LLC, Applicant.

Withdrawn by the applicant.

Item 3:

Consideration of Demolition (Accessory) at Bicentennial Park, located at 200 & 214 N Margin St.; City of Franklin, Applicant.

Ms. Rose provided some background on the project by noting that on February 18, 2021, the southern portion of the existing pavilion structure collapsed. Ms. Rose stated that as the portion fell, the southern portion of the structure pulled away from the remaining portion of the pavilion and damaged portions of the remaining structure. Ms. Rose stated that upon the City's request, the consultant (Barge Designs) performed a site visit to observe the damage, and based on conversations with the City, the City requested to replace the collapsed portion of the structure with a building type that is like the existing structure and utilize existing foundations where appropriate. Ms. Rose stated that the replacement design was approved by the HZC during its June 14, 2021 meeting. Ms. Rose noted that by late Spring, the City contracted the demolition and removal of the collapsed portion and that the City also worked with the consultant to do a full structural analysis to better understand how the new structure would attach to the existing one.

Ms. Rose stated that the City is seeking approval for demolition of the pavilion. Ms. Rose noted that TTL of Nashville performed a structural steel analysis by reviewing each column, rafters, connections, rafter peak connections, anchor bolts and structural framing, and Ms. Rose summarized the report, as follows:

- Thirteen frames have significant damage from the snow collapse.
- All framing bolts need must be replaced and non-code compliant to connections.

- Multiple twisted or bent steel columns must be replaced.
- Rafters and peak connections were damaged and pulled from original connections.
- There are missing or damaged bolts.
- There is column anchor bolt embedment and corrosion.
- The structure is not structurally stable in its current condition and should be blocked from public access immediately.

Ms. Rose stated that the Guidelines recommend against the demolition of historic buildings or structures and state that demolition only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the demolition criteria met, as listed (p.102, #1-2). The criteria are listed as follows:

1. The first criterion by which demolition may be considered by the HZC is that of **Architectural and Historical Integrity**, specifically, if a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character.
2. A second criterion by which demolition may be considered is that of **Unreasonable Economic Hardship**, specifically, if denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the HZC.
3. A third criterion is **Public Safety and Welfare**, specifically, if the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure or building.
4. A fourth criterion by which demolition may be considered by the HZC is that of **Structural Instability or Deterioration**, specifically, "if the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect" The Guidelines state that "such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition." The Guidelines also recommend that "there should be a separate report which details future action on the site.

Ms. Rose explained that City Engineering and Parks met with consultant to discuss the report and next steps. Ms. Rose stated that the consultant found that the existing structure is currently beyond a retrofit-type project, as originally planned before the collapse, as the snowfall/ice load created residual stresses with significant damage throughout the entire structure. Ms. Rose explained that because of this, the City is seeking approval to demolish the entire structure immediately, as it is not safe for public to access.

Ms. Rose further commented that due to the structure's association with the former Georgia Boot factory and the project being close to 100% design, the City is seeking to replace the structure with a fabricated steel structure to replicate the existing one and to provide the community with a rental event space and park for years to come. Ms. Rose noted the concrete slab is proposed to remain, and she explained that the commissioners have been provided the architectural specifications that indicate proposed future action on site (in keeping stylistically with previous approval from HZC).

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

Mr. Laster moved to allow the demolition of the structure. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster requested to know what would go back in its place.

Ms. Abdulrahman stated they would like to replace it with a similar structure that will be a prefab metal building and requested Ms. Rose project the plan.

Chair Roberts stated didn't we approve this before.

Ms. Abdulrahman stated what was approved was the portion that had collapsed, and we took that out.

Chair Roberts stated redoing the other was before it was determined that it needed to be demolished.

Ms. Abdulrahman stated yes, and when we rebuild it will match and look uniform.

Mr. Laster stated the reason he asked that question had to do with the way the building was constructed before as the Georgia Boot. Mr. Laster stated it had that deep V in the center which caused the problem when we had the snow event and I was just wondering if we build it back like that it just seems like we are asking for more trouble. Mr. Laster stated this is an opportunity to build something more advantageous to the public.

Ms. Abdulrahman stated they would definitely follow the new updated rules and regulations to make it safe for the public and we will try to keep the historic character.

Ms. Pearce stated she hoped there would be some photographs of it as it stands now just for the sake of history and the other thing is I have had several people out there over the years to look at it for potential uses and it may be an opportunity to do some amendments to the small slab section to make it more user friendly.

Ms. Abdulrahman stated so to make it accessible to load and unload to the small portion.

Ms. Pearce stated yes.

The motion carried unanimously.

Item 4:

Consideration of Alterations (Masonry) at 255 4th Ave. S.; My Father's House, Applicant.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with no recommendation at this time due to the applicant providing staff with information related to new chemical paint removal tests. Ms. Rose stated based on a recommendation provided by staff, the applicant contacted a Prosoco representative and as of this time, staff does not have information about the exact product used. Ms. Rose stated an exhibit demonstrating the results has been provided by the applicant and is included as Exhibit 4.

Chair Roberts turned it over to the applicant.

Mr. Paez stated he contacted Ms. Deborah Brooks, who is the representative from Proseco and they gave him some samples on the sixth of this month and together with a couple of neighbors we applied the product and did the testing. Mr. Paez stated you can see the picture in the older part of the building and explained

they let it sit for an hour and then applied water pressure. Mr. Paez stated we applied a test on the newer part of the building, and you can see the picture. Mr. Paez stated on the right you can see the picture. Mr. Paez stated they basically did the same but added something that I didn't add before was that we put up two coats of the Prosecco sap trip. Mr. Paez stated his conclusion, which you can see the results, we have to put a lot of pressure on the brakes to remove the paint and he thinks the product is very effective but it has a lot of cracks and crevices so to remove the rest of the paint you have to apply more pressure and that is probably the hard part of this process to remove the paint and have the results that we want. Mr. Paez stated basically in light of the results we consider that if you allow us to paint, we will work that out with you and listen to your recommendations.

Ms. Rose clarified what is seen on the screen right now is the result of two layers of the safe strip chemical peel with some removal by water pressure so a water pressure washer. Ms. Rose stated the painting of the brick is not recommended by the guidelines but the guidelines also recommend against further damage to the brick so it would be staff's assessment that if the commission chooses to paint or not further remove the paint, seen in the below photograph, it would be recommended against because it would be staff's opinion due to the texture and pitting of the brick that if a 100% removal is attempted to be achieved it would cause damage to the building.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any citizens who wished to comment on this application.

Mr. Chuck Rose at 4th Avenue South spoke in favor of the church being painted and explained a cost analysis.

Chair Roberts stated he would entertain a motion from the commission.

Mr. Scalf moved to allow issuance of a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed masonry alterations to allow it to be painted due to the associated cost and it will not achieve the desired results. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts requested the subcommittee report what they found out from last time.

Ms. Pearce stated in the middle of all this she got breakthrough Covid so that kind of stopped what she could get done but she did have a conversation with Mr. Michael Lee who did not get there because the man that would have done it and give them a price was out of town. Ms. Pearce stated he has done paint removal in Hohenwald on two buildings downtown successfully. Ms. Pearce stated the man said if the church would choose to use volunteers, he would use a different chemical peel and said it would be effective. Ms. Pearce stated he felt like with a couple of skilled people that the lower part could be done by the volunteers but then higher up would require someone getting on scaffolding to do it, but felt it was doable. Ms. Pearce stated she did go by the church and made observations that it appeared to her that spray painting will require taking out a good bit of the established landscaping and she did notice that there are windows that look like they are about to fall out and hopes that will be considered and there are also places where there isn't any mortar. Ms. Pearce stated if it is spray painted that would need to be addressed. Ms. Pearce stated she reached out to Ms. Besser who got some information by getting on a list serve.

Ms. Worthington stated she spoke with a manufacturing rep regarding the chemical process and he had recommended a couple of products and she forwarded that onto Ms. Rose. Ms. Worthington stated she went to the site to observe what was done and thought it was acceptable based on not deteriorating the brick

any further. Ms. Worthington stated behind the bushes nothing has been done to it so the original brick is there so whatever treatment ends up happening you know there is the condition behind the brick so removal of the paint would have the appearance of what the very first photo was and showed the photo.

Ms. Besser stated she put the question to the National Alliance for Preservation Commissions' listserv and the responses she got from her colleagues was that their particular municipality would ask them to remove the paint and they felt like that was what we should be asking to be done. Ms. Besser stated she did go to the site and did notice the window concern. Ms. Besser stated she would not be able to support the motion because she feels it is best to remove the paint.

Mr. Laster had Ms. Rose pull up on the screen a picture he had sent to her of the 1970's Franklin downtown look. Mr. Laster explained the commissions role in the community and how the commission came about. Mr. Laster stated that he knows we have found two methods so far and appreciates Mr. Paez working with the commission. Mr. Laster stated one was being the vapor blasting and the guidelines say don't paint unpainted masonry but it also states to not harm the masonry so we find that vapor blasting method could potentially harm the masonry so that is going to be hard to support and the chemical method right now because of the deeply textured nature of the brick is also going to take time and expense but at this point he must support the guidelines in this and it seems to him that this can be done with the cooperation of the community of volunteers as well as financial resources and help. Mr. Laster stated that is his comment and he did talk to several people about paint removal and some said it was going to be more time consuming to remove the paint because of the deeply textured part of the brick and it will be a challenge.

Chair Roberts requested to know if there were any more comments.

Ms. Worthington requested to know if there has been consideration to leave the annexed building as painted and have the paint removed from the historical building.

Mr. Denton stated he was very sympathetic to the cost but with that said the guidelines are in effect. Mr. Denton stated what he has not heard from anybody is we know that painting the brick can have negative implications on the brick so when I hear comments that doing more could damage the brick I am hearing you know from the guidelines and from Ms. Rose that painting the brick can have a negative effect on the brick long term and what I have not heard from anybody is which is worse. Mr. Denton stated he has not heard any expert advice coming to this commission and that concerns him. Mr. Denton stated he has concerns supporting the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated she was going to say to the point of which damages the brick most the ones done like you all did on Labor Day, everything that she has been able to read about different information's on painting brick and it is not damaging to the brick to do it in a softer way using an approved chemical. Ms. Pearce stated she would say that painting it especially when there are water issues could be very damaging to brick.

Mr. Denton stated he thinks the case being made is an extraordinary one for the commission in my view given the guidelines and so he would expect to see the applicants advocating that it is more difficult or more damaging for it to be removed versus painting.

Chair Roberts stated you just heard Mr. Rose up here talk about the sample they did with strict water pressure on the primer and it didn't come off that brick. Chair Roberts stated he could not in good conscience think that taking that paint/primer off that building chemically and just having it in that state is

going to be a better solution than painting the building over that primer that has already been applied. Chair Roberts stated this is the first time we have had a cost other than the price that we had obtained from the company that did the vapor blasting to compare to. Chair Roberts stated he is in support of the motion to paint the building and explained about the guidelines and where they are with this project and he thinks we need to move on and give these folks an answer that allows them to go on about the business that they are in which is operating the church.

With no more comments the motion was voted on by roll call with the motion failing with 2 yes votes and 5 no votes.

Ms. Pearce made a motion that the church be allowed to paint the addition over the primer and to remove paint from the historic portion as seen on the screen photograph. Ms. Worthington seconded the motion and the motion carried 5 to 2, with Chair Roberts and Mr. Scalf voting no.

Ms. Pearce explained her reason for her motion.

Item 5:

Consideration of Alterations (Entrances, Windows, Awnings) at 236 2nd Ave. S.; Lines Inc., Applicant.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed alterations, with the following conditions:

1. The new entrance door specifications, as well as the manufacturer's window specifications, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. 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.
 - Project Note: Expansion into the entire structure has not been approved at this time, as required parking requirements have not been met to date.

Mr. Trent Sullivan introduced himself and stated they attended the DRC which helped them a whole lot with reframing and presenting to you today. Mr. Sullivan stated with regard to the door and the door placement it is more about the form and function and when he says that it is the doors placed in that position to allow for ingress and egress to meet life safety code. Mr. Sullivan stated it is not like he is designing an interior of a home and just rearranged the interior to make it work. Mr. Sullivan stated the placement of that door has to be in about that exact location in order for us to meet guidelines for travel distance and life safety. Mr. Sullivan stated the other thing is they tried to mimic the size of the windows to the existing historic portion of the home and then we also tried to pick up on that same rhythm throughout the façade.

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

Ms. Besser moved to approve with conditions in written analysis a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed alterations. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated she had a question for clarification and requested to know if the door we are discussing is it at the top of the plan to the right.

Mr. Sullivan stated yes.

Mr. Laster requested to know about the current layout seen if it is the original layout and you are making changes to the interior.

Mr. Sullivan stated there are interior modifications being made.

Mr. Laster stated if there are interior modifications being made it isn't possible to place an egress door in another location on that side of building that is down from the historic addition.

Mr. Sullivan stated there is a door further down, but an additional door has to be placed and the separation of those doors has to be as far apart as possible.

Mr. Laster stated so if the door were placed near where that current window is that is on the newer addition how far would that be from the other door and would it meet code.

Mr. Sullivan stated he did not think it would.

Chair Roberts requested to know if they already had a permit for the interior work.

Mr. Sullivan stated yes.

It was noted the permit has been submitted for review not approved yet.

Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to say that the historic window and portion of the house cannot be used for an ingress/egress door on the right elevation. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated because the permit is in for review, we have not verified whether that exterior door would be needed for life safety or not at this point.

Chair Roberts requested to know if it would be better for this commission to defer the right elevation approval until we find out a little more information and deal with the left elevation only.

Ms. Rose explained there are about three different options to choose from. Ms. Rose stated one was to approve as proposed, the second being to approve an alternative location for an egress door on the right elevation pending a conversation between Planning staff and BNS staff to determine life safety requirements and the third option would be to defer and you could approve the left elevation if you so desire.

Mr. Scalf requested to ask the applicant a question and stated he was looking at the right elevation and there is a transition from brick to looks like painted brick, the door that you are proposing that single left leaf

door on the right hand side is that in the existing structure. Mr. Scalf stated so the slope of the roof there is part of the original structure.

Mr. Sullivan stated it was.

The pastor of the church that owns the current building stated it was not part of the original structure and explained the 1820's home is the A-frame home and so there was an addition off of that and that addition was the first addition and the second addition came out then third addition came out and so forth. The pastor explained there have been multiple additions on to the back. The pastor stated where the window is was part of the first addition and he had no idea when that was done. The pastor explained the inside of the building and how you would follow the brick of the historic home down a hallway to the addition.

Mr. Scalf stated that part of the home could be a historic structure too.

Ms. Rose stated the brick and then the siding were done at the same time as part of a long addition and Mr. Clark is correct that this was done at some point in between.

Mr. Laster stated if you look at the other side of the building you will see on the left side of the building you will notice the shed roof that comes off so it could be that in the past it was a porch. Mr. Laster stated it is part of the historic structure because it is not a modern addition and the window that is on the right side is a historic window in fact the mortises for the original shutters are still there. Mr. Laster stated what it appears has happened is when they added to the back a modern addition for some reason they needed some extra space and they bumped the brick out and covered over that original shed roof on the side and that is why you are seeing that bump out and it actually comes out further than the window so it looks like a veneer that has been put on the other brick and that may be why you are thinking that is part of the newer addition.

The amendment to the motion carried 6 to 1 with Ms. Besser voting no.

Ms. Pearce moved to offer an amendment that the applicant is allowed to come back to staff if another egress is needed that can be done in the modern-day addition with staff approval. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

With the main motion having been made and amended twice the motion carried 7-0.

Item 6:

Consideration of Alterations (Dormer Construction) at 728 Fair St.; Chisel Workshop, Applicant.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed dormer construction, as follows:

1. The applicant is encouraged to explore options for operable skylights or similar windows that do not change the roof shape or character-defining features of the building. Additionally, the applicant is encouraged to explore options for adding an egress access from the rear of the roof form, in conformance with the Guidelines.
2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to the issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes to the

approved plans must be returned to staff or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. McCreary stated when we met last time we had shown this particular house, pyramidal style, with dormers on either side and we are coming back again with dormers as proposed that are smaller in scale and she knew that was a concern. Ms. McCreary stated this is a very rough rendering but she wanted to place it in here because a lot of times we have these discussions before that the flat elevations are really hard to read, so these dormers proposed are different from last time as they are smaller in scale and actually a little bit lower on the elevation. Ms. McCreary stated these dormers are as small as we can make them to still meet egress in that existing bedroom that is up there. Ms. McCreary stated that is their primary goal to get an egress on an existing bedroom that is in that area. Ms. McCreary stated they did look at skylights and did study the property on Fourth Avenue that we discussed before and one of the major differences is when you have an egress skylight window and an asphalt shingle roof the asphalt shingle roofs are typically darker and your skylights are darker so it does aesthetically blend in with its surroundings. Ms. McCreary stated the other part is that the flashing on these skylight windows are black and roofs again are typically black, and they can sit a little bit more flush so our biggest concern is from an aesthetic standpoint if we move to skylight window. Ms. McCreary stated they have a green metal roof and the black metal pieces from a skylight would show. Ms. McCreary stated from her client's perspective she would prefer a dormer from an aesthetic standpoint.

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

Mr. Laster moved to deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed dormer construction, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated September 13, 2021. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster stated he had several questions and number one would be can't the black flashing off the skylight be painted the same color as the roof.

Ms. McCreary stated it actually has some rubber to it not just the metal. Ms. McCreary stated the metal could be painted, but the rubber could not.

Mr. Laster stated he had another question in regard to the course of a very low pyramid roof and what is the head space in the bedroom.

Ms. McCreary stated you can walk in it and you can get a fair amount in before you hit the side walls and stated it has two twin beds up there now. Ms. McCreary stated the ceiling height is not incredibly tall because of how it opens, and it is a little deceiving which is the reason we originally asked for a bigger dormer for a little more head height. Ms. McCreary stated at this point we are happier with the smaller scale because it is not as much as getting some head height in there as it is just having a means of egress. Ms. McCreary stated the stairs go up in the living room along that right side of the wall and turn up and it is open a little bit there so you have got all the head height through the middle it is just really small modest bedroom.

Mr. Laster requested to know if there was any way to do the skylight on kind of the back side of that because one reason he says that is if a child is in that area and could get out onto the roof and then could be on the lower roof quickly and then out so it would be a safer situation.

Ms. McCreary stated she did add a roof plan this time and there is not a lot of room there is only a couple of feet between the pyramid top and the roof below. Ms. McCreary stated the roof below comes in really high and that is actually a double height space in the interior of the portion and so that is completely open to the rear of the house so we wouldn't think there is enough room for them to get a skylight in that area that would meet egress.

Mr. Laster stated you don't think you could get one there.

Ms. McCreary stated she was sure of it just because of how the shape of that second floor rear wall is coming in like almost where the ceiling height is coming, so we can't actually get the dormer on the addition part of the roof because all of that second floor lives on the inside of the pyramid and there is just not enough space there.

Mr. Laster stated he could imagine due to it being a low-pitched roof.

Ms. Besser requested to know the actual head room of the second floor.

Ms. McCreary stated that was a great question and she can stand in it and she is five foot two inches. Ms. McCreary stated it vaults to the pyramid and then slopes down to four and half feet on the outside walls.

Ms. Besser stated, so it does meet codes.

Ms. McCreary stated yes besides it not meeting egress.

With the motion having been made the motion carried 6-1, with Chair Roberts voting no.

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations (Window Repair & Replacement) at 238 Public Sq.; Chisel Workshop, Applicant.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the select window repair and replacement with the following conditions:

1. The Guidelines support the preservation and maintenance of original windows, as original and/or historic features are important to the character and historic fabric of the building.
 - a. Front: It is recommended that all front facade windows be approved for replacement.
 - b. Side: It is recommended that side facade windows #2-5 be approved for replacement and side facade windows #1 be approved for repair.
 - c. Rear: It is recommended that the HZC support the applicant's request for repair.

2. 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 Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. McCreary stated we talked about this in the DRC meeting that was in July and we did go back and study the windows more and took some more window pictures and details. Ms. McCreary stated she spoke with a Missy Dean, who is very knowledgeable about windows. Ms. McCreary stated they discussed the windows and they also met with Jeremy Lee, with Lee Restoration. Ms. McCreary stated Mr. Lee has done countless replacement and repairs in town and he is always my guy when we are repairing windows because he has so much knowledge. Ms. McCreary stated they walked through the project and one of the considerations on these side windows in particular was due to the top being wavy glass. Ms. McCreary stated they discussed if they could keep the top and do a new bottom sash and that was determined to not be feasible from my understanding from Mr. Lee. Ms. McCreary stated the only piece that is original on these side windows is the top sash and some of the wavy glass. Ms. McCreary stated so what has happened is the only piece that is original on these windows on the side is the top sash and some of the wavy glass and the bottom wood part. Ms. McCreary stated the wood part has deteriorated and in order to get the top part operable and keep it historic is to do a new bottom sash on the inside which is either going to be not desirable and we will have sash liners, sash packs or we will have to fake it and the windows would no longer be operable. Ms. McCreary stated it was Ms. Dean and Mr. Lee's opinion the windows be replaced with Marvin windows which will be custom built because of the arch top and would be full wood windows, which the pictures show.

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

Mr. Scalf moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the select window repair and replacement. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster requested to see a picture of where the windows had been slashed and put back together.

Ms. McCreary pointed out on the photo projected on the screen where it had been slashed and noted there was a photo on page 7 and suggested Mr. Laster look on page 10 as well. Ms. McCreary stated page 10 was the best place to see it and pointed out where the window was slashed and explained which piece was historic.

Mr. Laster stated he wanted to address some of the windows in the photographs and stated he noticed there is some paint that is peeling and requested to know if it could be lead paint.

Ms. McCreary stated she would not know the answer to that, but it could be due to age of the windows.

Mr. Laster stated so those are older than the 1990's you think based on the survey and those may have been replaced in the 1990's.

Ms. McCreary stated pieces of them have been replaced, but the trim work has not.

Mr. Laster stated if you were to replace the windows you said they are custom windows.

Ms. McCreary stated they would be custom windows.

Mr. Laster requested to know if they would fit the window opening or would the window opening be made to fit the window.

Ms. McCreary stated they would fit the window opening.

Discussion ensued on Ms. Dean and Mr. Lee.

Mr. Scalf moved to amend the amendment to have the shop drawings for the custom windows to be provided to staff for review to make sure the opening is being maintained. Mr. Denton seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if there were still two windows that had the old wavy glass besides the one you are going to repair and if so, is it possible for those to be repaired. Ms. Pearce stated she hates to see us lose the old glass.

Ms. McCreary stated that was part of the consideration when she walked through with Mr. Lee and we looked at it very carefully and this is based off his recommendation and experience of what is feasible and what is very difficult. Ms. McCreary stated some in such bad shape that coming out you would lose parts of it anyway.

Mr. Laster stated he had another comment and stated he has walked in front of that building and observed it and what I have observed from the exterior is it looks like all except the sixth window, the sashes appear to be original and they match the windows on the first floor in the arch and profile. Mr. Laster requested to know if there would be a way to keep and repair the upper sashes and replace the lower sashes. Mr. Laster stated Ms. Pearce mentioned a couple of windows, I think may be on the front, may be original.

Ms. McCreary stated none on the front are original and there is no wavy glass on the front.

Mr. Laster stated he has seen some of the stops and profiles in late 19th century homes here in Franklin as windows so what I was thinking is if you could take some of those and put them as the bottom sashes, then you could take the ones you had to replace the bottom sash on and you could have custom made.

Ms. McCreary stated from what she understands when we are trying to do that with these windows it was in Mr. Lee's historical work on windows, these particular windows would be very difficult to do that to and get the gap correct on the new bottom windows to have them operable without them sticking out given what kind of situation they are in.

Ms. Pearce stated she feels like in this situation operable is always preferred but I have never seen a business window open on Main Street.

Mr. Laster stated custom windows can be custom made to fit the application. Mr. Laster stated he did not how there would be a gap when you use wood which can be made bigger or smaller.

Ms. McCreary stated it she thinks it has to do with the track system and she also thinks it would be the consideration going in is that if we are making new sashes for the bottom and we are trying to fit that existing opening we are probably looking at plate glass for that as opposed to insulated glass or we would

have to use a very thin insulated glass because the moment you add the insulated glass your sash is actually a little bit thicker than what a historic is and so I think that is probably where some of that is coming from. Ms. McCreary stated if they do look at reworking and putting in new bottom sashes then we will be looking from an energy standpoint and the goal here is to also help with the energy and heat gain that we have going on in that so that was a prime driver that started all this.

Mr. Laster stated the guidelines speak against making window changes to original windows based on energy costs.

Ms. McCreary stated she understands.

Mr. Laster stated you could add a storm window to the inside or the exterior as well as you mentioned you can get a thin insulated glass that will fit historic windows and it is done routinely.

Ms. McCreary stated she understands.

Chair Roberts took a vote on the amendment made and the amendment carried unanimously 7-0.

Mr. Laster stated he had an amendment and move to amend the motion to keep and repair the arch top window sashes located on the West side of the building designated as numbers five, four, three, two and one on the applicants survey and replace any bottom sashes determined to be modern replacement window. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Ms. Rose stated she wanted to clarify this means that as motion is amended twice and made the four windows on the front would be replaced, the one on the rear would be repaired and then the one number six on the side would be replaced and then on one through five you would repair all the top sashes and the bottoms would be repaired and maintained if determined to be original, otherwise replaced.

With the main motion having been made and amended twice the motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of New Construction at 173 Splendor Ridge Dr.; Mike Ford Builders, Applicant.

Ms. Hensley presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed new construction with the following:

1. The proposed building coverage is 39.9 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. The proposed placement of the attached garage is not entirely consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines.
3. If issued a COA, the windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.

4. If issued a COA, the awning should be removed over the side porch door.
5. If issued a COA, the lap siding on the second story should be changed to brick or the applicant must utilize a slight change in building form to justify the material change.
6. If issued a COA, the application must meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any changes to the approved plans must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for approval prior to work commencing.

Mr. Gore stated he had a few comments based on staff's recommendations and stated the building coverage is something we have talked about before and have included at the request of the DRC some illustrations that have been included on prior approved submittals. Mr. Gore stated the illustration being shown is showing the entire development and illustrates the permanent open space included with the development and calculates with the entire open space around the development. Mr. Gore stated if we were to build out all of these lots to a 40 percent coverage there would be only 13 percent of building coverage over the entire site. Mr. Gore stated this was the same illustration we have had other approved applications and he hopes that the commission will consider the same way on this application. Mr. Gore stated number two is the placement of the garage and most of the previous applications in this community have pretty much the same building footprint and therefore there is a limited variation and massing on the rest of the building. Mr. Gore stated this application and the one previous to it on lot five have almost the same massing and the garage is pulled forward a little bit farther and we worked through some changes to that massing on the previous application for lot 5 and after some modifications you guys did approve that one. Mr. Gore stated this application matches the roof massing and building massing that went along with that previously approved application and there are modifications to the front in material modifications that don't change the massing of the building itself that hopefully in your eyes will show that garage massing to be detached enough in appearance so that it will be approvable. Mr. Gore stated they are fine with number three in terms of the comments. Mr. Gore stated number four the awning should be removed over the side door is not a deal breaker for him, but it does help us a lot in waterproofing that door. Mr. Gore stated he would like the commission to consider making an exception for that. Mr. Gore stated number five with the lap siding and brick again is not a killer for him, but we have had that successfully approved by zoning in the past. Mr. Gore stated he saw the roof changing in roof shape as a change in massing and an appropriate place to change materials. Mr. Gore stated he thinks especially on the left elevation it helps to break up what would otherwise be a large mass of brick.

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

Mr. Scalf moved to approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction at Lot 13 because it is consistent with what we have approved at this location previously. Mr. Laster seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts stated the conditions would be as follows:

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 awning should be removed over the side porch door.

3. If issued a COA, the lap siding on the second story should be changed to brick or the applicant must utilize a slight change in building form to justify the material change.
4. If issued a COA, the application must meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any changes to the approved plans must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for approval prior to work commencing.

Ms. Besser stated she was not in favor of the motion and has been consistently opposing this because of the 40 to 35 percent rule. Ms. Besser noted the applicant is bringing forward excellent designs and it is not the designs I am disapproving but the lot coverage.

Mr. Laster stated he had a question for the applicant and requested to know regarding the awning, where we see the right elevation can you tell me if that is north, south, east or west.

Mr. Gore stated it was west.

Ms. Pearce stated the other elevation where the piece of wood was or the woody part on the east elevation, I do agree with staff comments that it be brick

Ms. Rose stated it was on both elevations.

Ms. Pearce stated the other one has a solid brick wall and requested to know if we allow so much brick expanse without some kind of break.

Ms. Dannenfels stated there is not a requirement that brick be broken up.

Ms. Pearce stated okay.

Ms. Rose explained more with the guidelines.

Mr. Scalf stated he would like to know from the applicant, who is showing a brick roll lock at the second-floor level, so he is assuming probably at the depth of the masonry is a plane change that is right to the siding.

Mr. Gore stated that it is right.

Mr. Scalf stated he guessed what we need to determine is should that entire thing be siding, and you have the two forms on either side of the side or should it be brick all the way up.

Mr. Gore stated if it helps what you described is something, we have done on other applications and done successfully and he didn't know if it matters to the commission to mix it up a little bit up and down the street.

Mr. Scalf moved to amend the motion to require the area between the two forms to be siding down to the water table on both elevations. Ms. Worthington seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if the brick selection could come back to staff for approval.

Ms. Rose stated the brick is always submitted to staff for approval.

The amendment passed unanimously 7-0.

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

Item 9:

Consideration of Alterations (Principal) at 724 Fair St., Aaron Rietveld & Kevin Coffey, Applicants.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposal with the following conditions:

1. Roofing—Replacement of shingle roofing with metal roofing is not recommend unless historical documentation suggest that metal is the original material.
2. Entrance—The proposed replacement of the existing glass doors with solid wood doors and the addition of divisions to the existing side lights may not be consistent with the Guidelines, which recommend that one preserve and maintain original entrance elements, such as doors, transoms, side lights, and surrounds. The existing entrance elements do appear to be historic, but it is not clear if they are original. It is recommended that the HZC make a determination of age (original or non-original) and consider for approval accordingly.
3. Windows
 - a. The replacement windows must be wood and have historic profile and dimension, per Guidelines. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - b. The shutters must be wood, appear operable, and be sized to fit their respective openings. The specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - c. The adjustment of the window opening at the front elevation of the ca. 1920 portion of the structure, in order to match the rhythm and sizing of the adjacent window, is not in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines, which recommend that one preserve and maintain historic window openings. Unless historic documentation suggests that the window opening has been altered from its original state, the rhythm and spacing of this section of the structure, though asymmetrical, should be preserved for its historic and unique character.
 - d. Notes on the plan set indicate that window configuration may change in accordance with internal layout. Any alteration to the window or door configuration, as shown on the approved plan, must be returned to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. Wood—In accordance with the Guidelines, replacement should be limited to only severely deteriorated areas, with to no more than 25 percent of the façade’s total square surface to be

replaced. The siding replacement plan must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to work commencing.

5. The application must meet the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any changes to the approved plans must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for approval prior to work commencing.

Mr. Coffey stated he wished to comment on a few of staff's comments and stated he would start with the front door. Mr. Coffey stated he knew in the DRC we talked about pretty extensively and we are 99 percent sure that is not the original door it has different hardware on it than you would see in a Federal style and our thought is that it may have been replaced in the 1920's. Mr. Coffey stated they did an addition on the right, but I don't know that it was replaced then or not it could be a little bit older. Mr. Coffey stated there have been subsequent remodels and window changes and we do have a photograph from the 1940's, I think 1948 that already shows the front windows modified and the addition is on the right side. Mr. Coffey stated the porch was already done with the little skinny columns, with the original windows and the main portion of the house having been taken out and they were framed in to make smaller openings. Mr. Coffey stated they know within 95 percent certainty that happened at some point. Mr. Coffey stated if you look at the pictures of Federal style houses, just in general, it is very rare to see a full glass front doors and glass side lights without some bullion definition to them. Mr. Coffey stated you might find an example here and there that didn't have that so really what our approach is to basically to just replace leaving the whole frame around the door with all of the vintage mill work, replacing the side light itself and then doing a solid door. Mr. Coffey stated just down the street is an example of a solid door with the side lights and the molds in them and then the transom is almost identical to this. Mr. Coffey stated typically they go all the way across or they have just the little square on each side but to just walk through Franklin you will see eight or nine examples of it and that is really our approach on the front door. Mr. Coffey stated they are making some moves to try to bring this back to its Federal roots and to me doing that includes the front door. Mr. Coffey stated we want to change the porch to make it more proportional with better columns, add the shutters, leave the arrangement of the windows and just replacing to the original window size which he thinks is all in keeping with bringing back the Federal style of the main portion of the house. Mr. Coffey stated the window on right addition he doesn't think that is a hill they are going to die on or anything. Mr. Coffey stated what they could do with that is a little bit of forensics on the inside and look to see if there was an original frame that was slightly bigger that had maybe been modified at one time and if we go in there and see that it is not there we will just keep it the size that it is. Mr. Coffey stated when it comes to windows, we would probably replace these with a shop-built window and my go to for that is Mr. James Dunn at Advantage Millwork. Mr. Coffey stated Mr. Dunn knows more than all of us put together about this stuff. Mr. Coffey stated he would defer to that about moldings because he has got all the cutting knives everything to make anything and go to the full masonry like we talked about in the other meeting. Mr. Coffey stated the roofing question is interesting so none of the roofing on the house is original and to me roofing is a thing used to unify a structure even with different elements and I think that the hierarchy of the elements on this is strong enough to carry the day without worrying about whether the roofing changes or if the roofing needs to be replaced. Mr. Coffey stated to him it makes a lot of sense to make the roofing uniform and they want to do that. Mr. Coffey stated they want to do a new metal roof on the whole thing. Mr. Coffey stated if it is shingle, we have to reroof it anyway. Mr. Coffey stated he would take any questions.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens requested to speak on this item and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts stated they would take this in pieces and would start with the metal roof. Ms. Pearce stated staff stated if there isn't evidence of a metal roof don't do it, correct.

Ms. Rose clarified there is not a bit of historic roofing on this house and explained her point on the roofing comment.

Mr. Coffey stated it is the owners desire to do metal on all of the house to unify it and have one material.

Ms. Pearce stated she would support metal on the oldest portion of the house but shingles on the addition for the reason that it was built in pieces and to make it read in pieces. Ms. Pearce stated she did not see unifying as a goal in this particular circumstance.

Mr. Scalf stated he would support metal for the porch roof due to the shallow pitch and it would not support shingles.

Ms. Pearce agreed.

It was noted there is a metal roof currently on the house now.

Mr. Laster requested to know if the metal roof was standing seam.

Mr. Coffey stated yes.

Mr. Laster questioned if it was turned metal where you have short sections going up or is it long panel.

Mr. Coffey stated he thought it was long metal and not a turn metal.

Mr. Laster stated he would support metal.

Photographs were projected of the portions of the roof and explained by Mr. Coffey.

Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to propose the 1920's roof addition and the low pitched gable be done in shingles and all the rest be done in metal. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion and the motion carries unanimously 7-0.

Chair Roberts stated the front elevation would be next.

Mr. Laster stated this is going to be a dramatic change for that street for the better and Mr. Laster explained why. Mr. Laster stated to replace these windows that had been replaced before with what is more like the original windows would have been, is totally appropriate.

Chair Roberts stated let's talk about the doors next.

Ms. Besser stated she thinks what Mr. Coffey has proposed for the door is what she would support because she thinks if you are going to take a house and you are trying to restore it that the doors, the solid doors, with the pane sidelights are what we would have had. Ms. Besser stated it seems to her that the doors are the first thing you see on a house and it seems to be a shame to not do the doors.

Ms. Pearce stated she would support the applicant on this because we have lost so many Federal buildings in Franklin.

Mr. Denton questioned the age of the door and Ms. Rose explained it was definitely a historic door and you know with this being such a unique building it is not very typical to Federal in any way shape or form right now and she commends the applicant.

Discussion ensued on the door age.

Chair Roberts stated he was open to an amendment for the doors.

Ms. Besser moved to amend the motion to accept the applicant's door proposal, replacing them with solid doors and replacing the existing sidelights with multi-pane sidelights to be approved by staff. Mr. Scalf seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Denton voting no.

Discussion ensued on the gutters.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include approving with staff comments and with the gutters coming back to staff for approval.

Mr. Scalf requested to know if there are going to be gutters on the front porch.

Mr. Coffey stated likely, yes.

Mr. Scalf stated he would want to make sure that the downspout resides between the shutters on the front façade and not down the columns.

Mr. Scalf moved to amend the motion to have the gutters at the porch have the downspouts located against the front façade of the house. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously, 7-1.

Mr. Laster questioned the flood plain and Ms. Rose explained.

With the main motion having been made and amended several times, the motion carried unanimously, 7-1.

Item 10:

Consideration of Rear Addition at 408 Main St., Remick Architecture, Applicant.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the addition, with the following conditions:

1. Both options are recommended for approval.

2. The Guidelines recommend that brick colors complement the dominant existing colors of dark red and similar hues (p.113). The applicant must provide a sample of the proposed brick to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The new addition 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.
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including the following:
 - Inclusion of a 1-hour rated U.L. design gypsum board on the underside of the new stairs
 - Inclusion of secondary emergency overflow drains
 - Meeting of required parking standards

Mr. Moore stated they were seeking to get approval on these options here so that we can move forward with the construction for the Red Pony. Mr. Moore stated the Red Pony has been down for a long time and would like to get them up and running as soon as possible. Mr. Moore stated they have worked with Ms. Rose and she has been very helpful with making modifications and adhering to the Guidelines. Mr. Moore stated he would speak to the addition and stated we are maintaining that rear wall and just trying to add back to what he had and make it more appealing and usable for him. Mr. Moore stated as far as the upstairs and downstairs go it is purely function, leaving his coolers in place that had been there prior to the fire and leaving it as some storage area.

Mr. Moore stated as we work through the zoning having these two options approved would be great and helpful to us. Mr. Moore stated it would be helpful to continue construction and at that time determine which option we could proceed with and of course with Ms. Rose's help.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens requested to speak on this item and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve both options with staff's comments. Mr. Denton seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalf stated he had a question and requested to know on the supplemental drawings if it was a non-conditional space on the first floor.

Mr. Moore stated, yes sir.

Mr. Scalf stated versus the other one that is fully a conditioned space.

Mr. Moore stated, yes sir.

Mr. McConnell stated the reason was for two reasons, one that is where the origin of the fire was and you had access to it prior to and the other was we had a emergency stairwell that emptied into the alley where that now comes out into a safer area. Mr. McConnell stated he would say about the two options that with the enclosure it requires seven parking spaces in perpetuity forever on a deed within 1200 feet which is almost nonexistent in downtown Franklin. Mr. McConnell stated he was asking for a variance eventually

and stated he had forty-two parking spaces at 108 Bridge at the McConnell House so he will have to see if that is even an option. Mr. McConnell stated if not we will go with an unconditioned and see if we can get a variance approved then a fully conditioned.

Chair Roberts requested to know if that is why you want to do the both options.

They stated yes.

Ms. Rose stated option B could be retrofitted so it could be that they build this and enclose it later.

Chair Roberts requested to know about the statement of if the addition will allow for maintenance of the historic building's rear wall and stated he was assuming that if he was on the inside that new addition I am looking at the old wall as he is looking when he goes to the restaurant he is looking at the brick walls everywhere.

The applicants stated yes sir.

Ms. Pearce stated the question she has is if you do it with the parking, they will just be open.

Mr. Moore stated the parking is off site completely.

Mr. Denton stated technically it will be safe for your purposes and screens, but it is not conditioned so you don't have to.

With the motion having been made to approve both options having been made and seconded the motion carried unanimously, 7-1.

Item 11:

Consideration of Alterations (Window Placement) at 317 Main St.; Lines Inc., Applicant.

Ms. Hensley presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed window alterations with the following conditions:

1. The new windows must match the existing windows in profile and dimension. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The new windows must have the same cast stone headers and sills to match the existing windows.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Trent Sullivan and Ms. Emma Fisk were present to present the item.

Mr. Sullivan stated he thinks this one is pretty simple, and we are trying to replace brick windows with real windows, and we agree with staff comments.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens requested to speak on this item and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Scalf moved to approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed window alterations. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalf requested to know what the space is you are opening up into.

Mr. Sullivan stated one is a break room and the other is office space.

The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Item 12:

Consideration of Alterations (Rooftop Windscreen & Shade Structure) at 231 Public Sq.; Lines Inc., Applicant.

Ms. Rose presented the staff report with a recommendation that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed alterations, with the following:

1. The Guidelines state that modern roof elements should be installed, if desired, so they are not visible from the street (p.119). The proposed alterations will be highly visible at a pivotal downtown intersection.
2. The proposal to add fire bowls to the rooftop does not require issuance of a COA.
3. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including the following:
 - Please provide BNS with Structural Engineered plans for the retractable awning structure along with the tempered glass panels to confirm compliance with uniform design load factors, wind, snow, roof, etc. in Chapter 16 of the 2018 IBC.
 - Please provide BNS with Mechanical plans indicating all details regarding the gas lines for the fire bowls.

Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Fisk were the applicants who represent this item.

Mr. Sullivan stated they were here to discuss this project with the commission and get your recommendations. Mr. Sullivan stated with the windscreens our client is aware of the five requirements in the guidelines and it seems that the guidelines we are up against is visibility from the street and what we are seeking to have clarity on what does visibility from the street mean. Mr. Sullivan requested to know if that is from standing, is it from riding in a car, from a seated view or how far away from the building, so we can design appropriateness. Mr. Sullivan stated visibility is why they are proposing glass for a windscreen to be less visually impacting and we have had subsequent discussions since this proposal was

placed and they would like to lower these panels to be 48 inches above the parapet and 60 inches wide. Mr. Sullivan stated that would need to be resubmitted to you and he understands but 6 feet is actually very limiting for us to construct a glass and have it be frameless, which is the design intent, so that you would not see vertical risers and then with regard to the shade structure this was a solution as opposed to them putting a pop-up tent that they could put up and take down over and over.

Ms. Rose stated that would not be permitted by Zoning.

Mr. Sullivan stated this would be a furniture item and he didn't think furniture could be restricted. Mr. Sullivan stated this is a proposal to have something more elegant and more defined.

Chair Roberts requested to know if Ms. Dannenfelter wished to comment.

Ms. Dannenfelter stated they would want to confirm that with our Building and Neighborhood Services Department because umbrellas aren't permitted on rooftops because they could fly away and pose a public safety danger.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens requested to speak on this item and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce moved to defer this item due to this being something she would hope the applicant would come to DRC for since it is a big deal and we haven't done anything like this so I would move to defer this item to the next meeting and suggested they come to the October DRC.

Mr. Scalf seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts stated he was totally against any kind of windscreen glass on top of the parapet wall. Chair Roberts stated based on this presentation it would be an overall 10 feet above the base floor of the roof. Chair Roberts stated the problem he has with it is where you asked about visibility, is in the late afternoon especially coming up with the West sun on that glass you got a problem and it doesn't make any difference whether it is 6 feet or 10 feet above or if you lower it down some it is still going to be an issue so I am opposed to any kind of windscreen.


Discussion ensued on it being out of character for downtown.

With the motion to defer on the table the motion carried unanimously, 7-1.

Other Business.

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

999F56A2F2B94C2...
Acting Secretary