

Historic Zoning Commission Meeting
April 11, 2022
5 p.m.
Franklin City Board Room

Commissioners Present:

Lisa Marquardt
Josh Denton (arrived at 5:15)
Mr. LaMarinel
Brian Laster
Jim Roberts, Chair
Mary Pearce (left at 7:50)
Kathy Worthington

Staff Present:

Randall Tosh, Building Official, Building & Neighborhood Services
Amanda Rose, Preservation Planner, Planning & Sustainability
Kelly Dannenfelser, Assistant Director, Planning & Sustainability
Victoria Hensley, Planner, Planning & Sustainability
Bill Squires, Assistant City Attorney, Law

Chair Roberts called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Chair Roberts asked if there was a motion to approve the lengthy February 14, 2022, minutes.

Ms. Rose explained that the board should expect meeting minutes for March and April to be in a format they are more accustomed to seeing. The Planning and Sustainability Department is short-staffed and are working through the best solution the issue.

Commissioner LeMarinel made a motion to approve the February 14, 2022, minutes, seconded by Commissioner Worthington. Vote: 6-0.

Announcements

Ms. Rose stated there will be a DRC meeting on April 18, 2022. The meeting agenda will consist of 6-7 items and will be posted and emailed by Tuesday or Wednesday.

Chair Roberts stated that now is the opportunity to place non-Agenda items on the Agenda, and there were none.

Chair Roberts asked if anyone from the public would like to speak about items not on the agenda, and there were none.

Item 1. Consideration of Historic District Design Guidelines

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose, Preservation Planner. Ms. Rose stated that the Historic District Design Guidelines are ready for formal approval by the HZC and for approval of BOMA at the May meeting. Ms. Rose stated that review of the guidelines began in the fall of 2020. An important component of this review was public

outreach and input from the public. The DRC included the public by advertised open office days where the public was welcomed into office, a public survey, stakeholder meetings with DRC and outreach through social media. Ms. Rose stated that one result of the survey pointed to the importance of the compatibility between the guidelines and building standards.

Ms. Rose went on to highlight the goals of the review which include updated graphics, inclusion of the adopted 2019 zoning ordinances, updated design guidelines and the documents ease of use. The improved framework of the document addresses each component thoroughly making it more intuitive to the user. Ms. Rose shared a chapter of the new guidelines to point out how each chapter, depending on the type of building, will address placement & orientation, building form, demolition, roofs, etc. specifically.

Ms. Rose explained the meeting schedule:

- 1) April 11 – HZC Formal Recommendation for Final Draft
- 2) May 10 – BOMA Work Session Discussion
- 3) May 24 – BOMA Meeting for Formal Approval Request

Ms. Rose discussed revisions to the final draft that were discussed based on the DRC March Meeting.

- 1) Better clarification of scale relationship between the principal building and accessory structures
Ms. Rose stated that additional information and clarification were provided in the Modern Features area to address roof top landscaping, railings, and furnishings. It is recommended that if any of the features are used it should not be visible from the front.
- 2) Staff simplified the guidelines that address reflective/glazing/opaque window treatments in the commercial building section.
- 3) Staff clarified or reworded the recommendation for transitional height, massing, and scale for new Civic Buildings. It was a matter of changing the language use to convey the recommended guideline.

Ms. Rose pointed out that she was thankful for the helpful comments by the committee to make the design guidelines concise.

Additional Note: Ms. Rose explained that a statement was added to the design guidelines that would allow the staff to make administrative clerical revisions, as long as they are not substantive, regarding typos, font, headers/footers, table of contents, amendment of graphics, word corrections, typographical errors, amending graphics and supporting explanations based on approved document text and adding or correcting references.

Ms. Rose ended by stating she is happy to answer questions and hopes to receive a favorable recommendation from the committee.

Chair Roberts asked if there was any public comment about the proposed Historic District Design Guidelines.

A motion was made by Commissioner Laster to approve the Historic District Design Guidelines draft to BOMA, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the document is much easier to read and use and thanks everyone for all the hard work.

Chair Roberts followed by agreeing with Commissioner Pearce and remarked about the time and effort spent by the staff on the guidelines.

Chair Roberts stated we have a motion to approve favorable Recommendation to Board of Mayor and Aldermen for adoption of the document. Vote: 6-0.

Commissioner Pearce suggested Ms. Rose provide a photo comparison of downtown Franklin before historic zoning and after historic zoning to show BOMA the differences in downtown and around the city. Ms. Rose reminded the commissioners about the BOMA work session and invited them to attend in support of the new Historic District Design Guidelines.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) APPLICATIONS

Item 2: Consideration of Alterations (Accessory) at 214 4th Ave. N.; Camille Moore, Applicant.

Staff Presentation by Victoria Hensley. Ms. Hensley stated the applicant is seeking a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to a non-historic garage. The one bay garage with lap siding is located at the end of the concrete driveway and is visible from 4th Avenue North. The applicant met with the DRC in March to present the proposed changes. Those changes include removal of the existing garage door and replaced with 2 sets of double hung windows and a craftsman style door. Other proposed changes include 3 sets of double hung windows on the interior side of the garage or right elevation and 2 sets of double hung windows on the left elevation. Also, the applicant proposes an HVAC unit and an external hot water heater. The staff believes placement of the HVAC and hot water heater are appropriate as neither can be seen from the road, and this follows the guidelines. The same roof, gutters and down spouts will be used. The same lap siding will be used to patch and repair the area needed. The window and door specifications provided by the applicant do follow the recommended guidelines. The staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions.

- 1) The lap siding used for the patch and repair will match the existing material and reveal.
- 2) The applicant must have approval from the Neighborhood & Services department prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 3) Should changes to the approved plan be made, the applicant will be required to present the new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Applicant Speaker Camille Moore. Ms. Moore stated that she agrees with all the recommendations of the planning staff. She further complimented the attention to detail that the staff and commission give to the historic buildings of Franklin.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to make a comment, there were none.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the commission.

Commissioner Pearce made a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness for alterations at 214 4th Avenue North, with conditions. Commissioner LeMarinel seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts asked for discussion, and there was none. Vote: 6-0.

Chairman Roberts stated the drawings provided were very well done.

Ms. Rose took a moment to thank the applicant and her daughter for their willingness to learn about the historical standards while going through the application process over the last year.

Item 3: Consideration of Addition (Principal) & New Construction (Accessory) at 215 Lewisburg Ave.; 906 Studio Architects, Applicant.

Staff Presentation by Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated the request for a certificate of appropriateness is requested for an addition to the principal building and new construction of a 1.5 story 2bay accessory structure. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant received approval for demolition of a non-historic structure, removal of synthetic siding and removal of a porch at the March commission meeting.

The remaining portions seeking approval are for new construction. Ms. Rose stated that the addition to the principal building should not be more than 50% of the principal building. The applicant has made changes to meet form guidelines. Other modifications include larger windows that are consistent and complement the rest of the building. A bay structure has been removed that would have accommodate a fireplace. The applicant has made modifications to the original plan, but the addition measures 58.3% which is 8.3% larger than the principal building and is not consistent with the guidelines that state the footprint should not be more than 50% of the historical building. The materials proposed are appropriate. Ms. Rose went on to say the applicant requested an addition of windows to the historic side of the principal house. Ms. Rose stated that generally the guidelines do not support adding windows to the historic building if the elevation is readily visible. The staff believes the addition of the windows are appropriate because of the placement of the building on the lot and the deep set back. The staff supports the addition of the windows because the portion of the building is not a readily visual secondary elevation. Ms. Rose stated that a garage is proposed at the rear of the property. After the commission's recommendation in March, the applicant moved the garage so that it is 40 feet from the rear of the principal building. The applicant has deleted a window from the front facade and is utilizing a vent look to help diminish the appearance of the scale of the structure. The applicants propose a carriage style door, composition shingle roof, standing seam at the dormer and a stucco coded foundation that is consistent with the principal structure. The proposed building measures 784' footprint and the height would be 1 foot 8 inches shorter than the principal building. Ms. Rose pointed out that cumulatively the footprint of the new structure only covers 10.5 % of the lot which easily conforms to the recommendations.

Ms. Rose stated that there would be 2 motions for the commission to consider:

The first motion pertains to the addition to the principal building of the proposal. Ms. Rose stated that the staff does not recommend approval of the proposed addition because the addition measures more than 50% of the principal building footprint. Ms. Rose went on to say that if a Certificate of Appropriateness is passed, all the windows and doors must have historic profile and dimensions and presented to staff before a building permit could be issued. Also, any other changes to the approved plan must be resubmitted to the staff or the commission for approval.

The staff recommends approval of the garage, with conditions of the windows and if any changes occur to the approve plan, the applicant will need to submit the new plan for review and approval of the planning staff or the commission.

Chair Roberts asked Ms. Rose to restate the parts of the proposal that have been approved.

Ms. Rose stated that the portions approved; 1) demolition of rear porch 2) carport demolition 3) removal of synthetic siding from the garage.

Commissioner Josh Denton arrived – 5:15 p.m.

Applicant Speaker – Matt Smith, 906 Studio Architects. Mr. Smith asked the Commission to consider approval of the new construction based on the unusual size of the lot with relationship to the house. It is a small house on a large lot. He also stated that the team worked hard to bring down the figures of the garage size from 70% to 58%. Mr. Smith stated that the owner agreed to remove one upstairs bedroom that improved massing of the building.

Public Speaker: Gail Haddock, 213 Lewisburg Avenue. Ms. Haddock mentioned the unusual sizes of the homes along Lewisburg Pike. She thanked the applicant and the commission for their consideration of her concerns. Ms. Haddock requested that the proposed windows on the blank façade of the principal building not be approved for privacy reasons.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any other citizens that would like to make a public comment, and there were none.

Chair Roberts clarified Ms. Haddock's address in relationship to the property under discussion.

Ms. Haddock provided a short history of the property of 213 Lewisburg Pike that was owned at one time by the Sparkman's who had the jewelry store on Main Street. Ms. Haddock stated the building was a garage apartment and that the main house was never built.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion for the addition to the principal house.

Commissioner LeMarinel made a motion (#1) to not approve the staff recommendation because of the lot size and that an overage may be warranted, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated he would like to have discussions about the windows.

Ms. Rose noted that the applicant proposed windows (blank facade location) to create a bedroom. This would require a 5 square foot opening an egress window. Ms. Rose stated that if the window was removed from this part of the building, the room could no longer be a bedroom.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she supports the use of windows because they are needed, and privacy can be created in other ways.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked Mr. Tosh if the room had been used as a bedroom in the past would it be grandfathered in?

Mr. Tosh stated that since the space is a newly created bedroom, enforcement of an emergency escape route would be necessary.

Commissioner Denton asked if there were any existing windows in the room.

Ms. Rose explained that the left side does not have windows.

Commissioner Denton stated that it appears there is a window facing Lewisburg Pike and asked if those windows would meet the ingress/egress qualifications.

Mr. Smith stated the windows are older and he did not have exact measurements of the window and would need to measure them.

Commissioner Denton asked for further clarification on exactly how many windows exist in the room. It appears there are 3 windows in this room. He followed up by stating that it may not be necessary to approve the new windows regarding ingress/egress if the existing windows can provide the appropriate ingress/egress.

Ms. Rose further stated that she was not made aware of the need for an ingress/egress until this evening. The existing windows in the room may not meet the requirements. The applicant would need to provide this information to staff for a determination to be made.

Ms. Rose stated that the staff did not make a recommendation on the windows based on egress, but on the guidelines that state windows should be put on lesser elevations to compliment the fenestration of the rest of the house. The staff does recommend the windows based on the design guidelines.

Chair Roberts asked for confirmation of a window on the back side of the building.

Mr. Rose noted that the window can be seen as a part of the room on page 3.

Commissioner Pearce added that she made her judgement based on the need for the egress.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that windows would be an improvement to the blank facade elevation.

Chair Roberts asked for any additional comments.

Commissioner Denton asked Mr. Smith if the room was previously used as a bedroom.

Mr. Smith said yes.

Commissioner Denton stated that this may be a question for codes regarding the existing windows.

Mr. Tosh stated that if the existing windows do not meet the ingress/egress requirements, then it would be necessary for the proposed windows to meet the requirements.

Mr. Smith stated that if the proposed new windows are not required to meet the ingress/egress requirements, the sill height of the windows could be changed to match the front windows. As proposed, the windowsill height is lower than the front windows sills.

Ms. Rose explained further that if the existing windows meet the requirements of the ingress/egress, the height of the windowsills would match the height of the front windowsills.

Chair Roberts asked Commissioner LeMarinel if he could make an amended motion to clearly state what commission would or would not be approving.

Ms. Rose confirmed that the applicant does want and is asking for the new windows on the part of the principal building (left elevation) that currently has a blank facade. Installation of the new windows would follow the design guidelines for an addition, if built today.

Chair Roberts asked if Commissioner Denton would like to help clarify an amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Denton amended the motion to include the removal of the proposed windows because the ingress/egress is not required, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Chair Roberts asked for any discussion on the amended motion, and there was none.

Chair Roberts asked for a show of hands in favor of removal of the two left side windows.

Vote: 6-1, Commissioner LeMarinel voted no.

Chair Roberts stated that the main motion is to approve the addition to the principal building without the 2 windows, as amended. Overall Motion #1.

Vote: 7-0

Ms. Rose reviewed the details, as previously presented, of the Accessory Structure prior to the vote.

Mr. Smith stated that modifications were made based on the staff recommendations.

Commissioner Laster made a motion to approve the new accessory structure construction with conditions of staff, seconded by Commissioner Denton.

The Chair asked for discussion.

Commissioner Laster thanked the applicant for his work with the staff and his consideration of staff recommendations.

There was no further discussion.

Chair Roberts asked for the vote on motion #2.

Vote: 7-0

Item 4. Consideration of New Construction at 107 Splendor Ridge Dr.; Chad Gore, Applicant.

Staff Presentation: Victoria Hensley. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a two-story principal structure with a garage. The applicant met with the DRC at the March 2022 meeting to discuss alignment of the first and second floor windows after the material break, as shown on the right elevation. Additionally, the applicant added a 4-inch furr in the wall at the material break by the kitchen area. Ms. Hensley stated that the Splendor Ridge subdivision was given a preliminary COA by the Historic Zoning Commission at the March 2018 meeting prior to final approval. The preliminary approval was given to provide developers with general design guidelines of height, setback, scale and massing. The 2-story home is proposed to have an Italianate influence. The 2-bay garage is recessed 66 feet from the front facade. The materials are consistent with the guidelines which include brick, cement siding with a 5" exposure, past stone headers above the windows, shutters, iron railing, brick foundation, brick chimney and asphalt shingle roofing. Ms. Hensley stated that all the materials are consistent with the guidelines for the Franklin Road Historical District. The staff does not recommend approval to the HZC because the building coverage measurement guidelines

have not been met (38.4%). Additionally, if a COA is approved the proposal must meet the specifications of historical windows in profile and dimension and consist of wood or a material resembling wood and must be approved by the Preservation Planner or HZC prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant must also meet the guidelines of the Building and Neighborhood Services department prior to issuance of the building permit. Finally, the applicant must seek review and approval from the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission if there are any changes to the approved plan.

Applicant Speaker: Chad Gore. Mr. Gore stated he represents Mike Ford Builders. Mr. Gore addressed the building coverage issue by pointing to an illustration of open space, plotted into the development map. He stated that when considering the entire site, there is a 13% coverage. He also mentioned the 4" offset of the floor plan ends up being an 8" offset due to the use of brick on one side of the house and siding on the other side. He stated the material and roof changes align with recommendations.

Chair Roberts asked for citizens comments, and there were none.

Chair asked for a motion from the board.

A motion was made by Commissioner Marquardt to approve with conditions, as the proposal is consistent with the rest of the development, and there is plentiful green space in the development, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Chair Roberts asked for discussion on the motion.

Commissioner Laster complimented Mr. Gore on the design of the window hoods in cast stone transitioning to the caps for the lap siding. Commissioner Laster asked if the dormer on the rear elevation was considered a wall dormer.

Mr. Gore stated that, yes, it is a wall dormer.

Commissioner Laster posed a question to the staff about historical guidelines for new construction relating to dormers.

Ms. Hensley stated that the historical guidelines do not speak directly to a dormer if it is on the rear elevation with the garage attached.

Ms. Rose stated under the current guidelines, for a semi-detached accessory building, the guidelines do not address specifically the type of dormer to be used. If the garage was detached, the guidelines would address the type of dormer to be used.

Commissioner Pearce asked if the applicant could comment on the dormer on the back elevation, specifically if the dormer could be raised.

Mr. Gore stated that if the gable was stretched the window there would not be a need for the dormer.

Ms. Rose stated that the roof shape has the appearance of a 1.5 story, but with the wall dormer the appearance becomes more like a two story. Ms. Rose pointed out that the staff would prefer the plan to stay the same with the wall dormer rather than altered. She went on to say that that decision would be left to the Commission to decide.

Chair Roberts asked for the vote.

Vote: 7-0

Item 5: Consideration of Alterations (Cooler Placement, Deck Stair Realignment) at 110 4th Ave. S.; Don Burke, Applicant.

Staff Presentation: Victoria Hensley. Ms. Hensley stated the applicant is seeking a COA for a deck stairway realignment and the installation of a cooler at the rear façade at 110 4th Avenue South. Currently, there is a deck and stairway in the location of the proposed cooler site. The guidelines state that rear elevations should be kept simple in appearance. The applicant proposes relocation of the stairway(portion) up to the first landing to begin at the sidewalk rather than under the deck. The material proposed for the stairway is the same pressure treated wood that the original stairway is constructed of. The guidelines recommend use of landscape screening to block utility or other equipment from sight. The placement of the cooler under the stairway provides screening from the street view and partial screening from the parking lot. The applicant proposes use of a 1 by 6 pressure treated fence of similar screening material that will allow the cooler to be seen. It is recommended that the HZC approve the placement of the cooler and the realignment of the stairway, with conditions, as follows. Ms. Hensley stated that prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department. Condition number two would require the applicant to present a new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC, if any changes are made to the approved plan.

Applicant Speaker Don Burke, representing Jim Crider. Mr. Burke stated that the proposed changes will simplify the back elevation and make the area invisible as compared to the existing visibility. He stated that like materials would be used to blend with the existing wood and that the cooler would be behind the proposed screening.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment, and there were none.

A motion was made by Commissioner Worthington to approve with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Chair Roberts asked for discussion, and there was none.

Chair Roberts asked for the vote.

Vote: 7-0

Commissioner Laster requested brief break. Meeting to resume at 6:10pm.

Item 6: Consideration of Partial Demolition (Principal), Alterations (Principal: Roofline, Siding, Windows), Relocation (Accessory), New Construction (Accessory) at 324 3rd Ave. S.; Brandon Hutcheson, Applicant.

Staff Presentation: Victoria Hensley. Ms. Hensley stated that this application for the COA has multiple components.

- Principal building: partial demolition of a non-historical addition, alteration of the roof line, alteration of windows, and removal of synthetic siding and replacement with lap siding
- Outbuilding – the relocation of the Historical accessory and partial demolition of the addition of the Historical accessory.
- New construction of a 3 bay accessory building

Ms. Hensley stated she would present the details in sections beginning with the principal building. The proposed demolition of the non-historical addition measures 367 square feet at the rear of the principal building. The exact age of the addition is unknown, and therefore, the demolition of this area would not affect the district's historical character and does meet the guidelines. The proposed removal of existing synthetic siding and replacement with lap siding follows the historical guidelines. The guidelines recommend siding replacement of not more than 25 % of façade's square footage. If significant damage can be demonstrated, the guidelines recommend the new lap siding should have the same exposure and historical equivalence. The proposed alteration of the front fenestration by adding 3 new windows and window openings would not be recommended by the guidelines. The applicant would need to provide evidence that a different fenestration existed at one time. However, replacement of non-historic windows would be appropriate. The proposed alteration of the roof line by 24" would keep the roof 12" below the ridge line of the historic building, but because of the extent of the increase the alteration would be visible from the street. The historical guidelines recommend retaining the historical roof, in shape and materials.

The proposed rear addition of the principal building has a 30" inset from the existing house which is consistent with the guidelines. A covered porch would connect the historic building to the new addition. The DRC recommended the applicant not intersect the porch roof with the saltbox roof line of the historical building. The guidelines state that an addition to a historical building cannot be more than 50% of the historic building footprint. The proposed addition measures 45% of the principal building footprint. The lap siding for the addition would match the siding of the house in exposure and historical equivalence.

Ms. Hensley recommended approval of the partial demolition of the principal building, and removal of the synthetic siding to the Historic Zoning Commission, under the following conditions.

- The applicant would need to provide photographs of the partial demolition inside and outside the building for Commission Records, prior to demolition.
- If wood siding exists under the synthetic siding, the applicant should minimize replacement of no more than 25 % of the façade, unless significant damage exists. The applicant should submit a wood replacement analysis to the Preservation Planner prior to work commencing.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present the new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hensley recommended denial of the roof alteration and fenestration pattern of the principal building, to the HZC. If a COA is granted, the following conditions would need to be met.

- The windows should have historical profile and dimension and consist of wood or other composite material that has the look of wood.
- The window specifications would require approval of the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present the new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hensley recommended approval of the addition to the principal building to the HZC with the following conditions.

- The new siding must match the siding of the historical building and must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historical Zoning Commission.
- The window specifications would require approval of the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present a new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Applicant Speaker Brandon Hutcheson. Mr. Hutcheson stated that everyone in the planning office had been extremely helpful, and he appreciated the guidance. Mr. Hutcheson stated a concern about the roof line differences between the staff analysis and his analysis.

Ms. Rose was able to pinpoint the application page that listed the number of inches the roof would be raised.

Mr. Hutcheson stated he misunderstood or made a mistake and that the correct measure was 24.”

Chairman Roberts asked for comments from the public, and there was none.

A motion (#1) was made to approve with conditions the partial demolition and the siding removal by Commissioner Marquardt, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Chair Roberts asked for discussion, and there was none.

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on motion #1.

Vote: 7-0

A motion (#2) was made to deny the alterations to the roofline and the fenestration pattern by Commissioner Laster, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Chair Roberts asked for discussion.

Commissioner Pearce requested the applicant work closely with the staff if a different fenestration pattern (front façade) appeared once construction begins.

Commissioner Laster discussed the increased height of the roofline and how an additional 12" doesn't add much more head space. He also discussed the age of the addition to the principal building and the style of the windows. Commissioner Laster stated he believes the addition is post 1950.

Commissioner Denton asked the staff for clarification of factual evidence on the age of the windows.

Ms. Rose stated that the addition is considered pre 1972 as defined by the Sanborn map, but the exact date or time period is not known. Ms. Rose noted that the windows on the addition are different than the windows on the principal building.

Commissioner Pearce stated that construction, once begun, may reveal a great deal of information regarding the original fenestration.

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on motion #2.

Vote: 7-0

A motion (#3) was made to approve with conditions the additions to the principal building by Commissioner LeMarinel, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Chair Roberts asked for discussion.

Commissioner Laster asked if the rise in the roof would require changes to the addition.

Mr. Hutcheson stated he did not think so but would discuss with the architect.

Ms. Rose stated that the staff would feel comfortable reviewing this topic with the applicant to ensure the intent of the commission is met.

Commissioner Denton further pointed out the existence of other roofline inconsistencies.

Chair Roberts stated that the applicant should review the inconsistencies with staff and return to the commission for discussion, if necessary.

Commissioner Pearce made an amendment to motion (#3): Applicant must work with staff on the rear addition design to resolve any issues caused by the denial of the proposed roofline alteration, seconded by Commissioner Denton.

Chair Roberts asked for any other discussion, and there was none.

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on the amendment to motion (#3).

Vote: 7-0

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on the main motion as amended (Overall Motion #3).

Vote: 7-0

Chair Roberts asked Ms. Hensley to present the next portion of the applicant proposal also included in Item #6, location: 324 3rd Avenue South.

- Outbuilding – the relocation of an Historical accessory building and partial demolition of the addition of the Historical accessory building.

Ms. Hensley stated that the applicant would like to demolish the lean-to addition of the historical building. According to the Sanborn map, the lean-to addition of which the age is unknown, was not part of the historical building in 1950. In this case, the removal of the building would not adversely affect the districts historical character. The applicant would like to relocate and maintain the historic outbuilding at the back of the property that would allow room for construction of a driveway. The historic outbuilding would still be visible from the street which is customary for this type of historic building. The guidelines do not recommend relocation of the historic outbuilding unless this is the only way to preserve the building. Documentation from an engineer has been provided by the applicant stating that relocation of the historic building is feasible, but a new slab foundation would be necessary due to the deterioration of the outbuilding floor.

Ms. Hensley stated approval of the partial demolition of the lean-to is recommended to the commission with the following conditions. If a certificate of appropriateness is issued, the applicant would be required to meet the conditions.

- The applicant would need to provide photographs of the partial demolition inside and outside the building for Commission Records, prior to demolition.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present a new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hensley recommended denial of the relocation of the historic outbuilding to the HZC with the following conditions. If a COA is issued, the applicant would be required to meet the conditions.

- The foundation elements must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present a new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Chair Roberts suggested that Ms. Hensley continue her presentation of the new construction of the 3 bay accessory building.

Ms. Rose explained that due to the size of the existing historical outbuilding, the new accessory construction could not be issued a building permit until the commission approved the partial demolition of the lean-to. Ms. Rose also noted the zoning ordinance states that a minor accessory building, 200 square feet or less, may exist on the same lot as a larger accessory building such as a garage. Demolition of the lean-to portion of the outbuilding would need to be approved by the commission so that the outbuilding would qualify as a minor accessory building of 200 square feet or less. If demolition of the lean-to is approved by the commission, then discussion of the new construction 3 bay garage can proceed and be considered for a building permit.

Mr. Hutcheson stated that the relocation would allow the same view of the outbuilding from the street as the original location of the building. The most feasible parking plan/driveway for the site involves the relocation of the outbuilding.

Commissioner Denton made a motion (#4) to deny the relocation of the historic outbuilding. No second was made. The motion failed.

Commissioner Marquardt made a motion (#5) to approve with conditions the partial demolition of the accessory structure, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Denton stated his concern about the age of the lean-to and the potential historic significance of the lean-to.

Mr. Hutcheson stated that two engineers were consulted for recommendations regarding the lean-to portion of the proposal. Both engineers agreed that demolition would be the recommendation based on the condition of the lean-to and how it was constructed.

Chair Roberts stated that this is not the first-time partial demolition of a potential historic structure has been approved.

Commissioner Laster pointed out that the guidelines address this issue of demolition when the integrity of the historic building has diminished over the years. Although, Commissioner Laster agreed in principle with Commissioner Denton.

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on motion #5.

Vote: 6-1, with Commissioner Denton voting no.

Commissioner Laster made a motion (#6) to deny relocation of accessory structure, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Laster asked Mr. Hutcheson about dimensions between the buildings.

Mr. Hutcheson did not know specifically, but he remarked that room would allow for a small car to clear the building.

Chair Roberts estimated the space around 12-15 feet based on documents provided by the applicant.

Commissioner Pearce stated that movement of the historical outbuilding would place it out of context and would be sitting on top of pavement. She further suggested a reconfiguration of the driveway.

Mr. Hutcheson stated that reconfiguration of the driveway would require additional percentage of the lot and it would take away a larger portion of the yard.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked why the driveway could not be configured on the other side of the yard. The grade of the yard was stated as the main reason that the driveway was not proposed on that side of the yard.

Ms. Rose noted that a curb cut would be necessary requiring approval from the state. Ms. Rose also noted that the guidelines for historical properties recommend the driveway follow the same path as original driveway.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she approves of the relocation of the outbuilding because it would still be visible from the street. She also pointed out that asking a homeowner to reconfigure the property to a degree that it does not make sense. The driveway, as proposed appears to be the best option.

Commissioner Denton stated he agreed with Commissioner Marquardt and that the relocation of the building would possibly improve the preservation the building.

Chair Roberts stated wholeheartedly he agrees with Commissioner Marquardt's sensible points.

Ms. Rose stated that if the driveway is a shared driveway, then it may be possible to widen the driveway. Ms. Rose also reminded the applicant to consider the guidelines of the Building and Neighborhood Services department regarding turn radius and other applicable codes.

Commissioner Denton asked the applicant if a new foundation for the outbuilding would be necessary if the structure was not relocated.

Mr. Tosh confirmed that if the outbuilding did not incur any changes, then the BNS department would not have additional requirements or codes for the building.

Mr. Hutcheson reiterated that two engineers independently recommended a new foundation whether the historic building is relocated or not.

Mr. Tosh stated he reviewed the engineering reports thoroughly and explained that the wood floor of the outbuilding had come in contact with soil, resulting in erosion of the wood. The slab foundation recommended by the engineers would better preserve the building.

Chair Roberts asked for the vote on Motion (#6)

Vote: 2-5 (with Commissioner Laster and Commissioner LeMarinel voting for the motion, and everyone else voting against).

Commissioner Marquardt made a motion (#7) to approve with conditions the relocation of the accessory structure due to the scope of the overall project, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Pearce stated her concerns about the building maintenance.

Chair Roberts asked commissioners to raise their hand to vote on motion #7.

Vote: 5-2, (with Commissioner Laster and Commissioner LeMarinel voting "No.")

Chair Roberts stated that the last component of this application for 324 3rd Avenue South involves new construction of an accessory building.

- New construction of a 2-bay accessory building

Staff Presentation: Ms. Hensley stated the applicant proposes construction of a new 2-bay accessory building to be located at the rear of the property. The 2 bays will be visible from the street. The proposed rear location of the accessory building and the 1 story scale follow the recommended guidelines. The proposed material is lap siding and is recommended to match the exposure of the principal building. Ms. Hensley stated that the new

construction of a 2-bay accessory building is recommended for approval to the commission, with the following conditions.

- The windows should have a historical profile and dimension and consist of wood or other composite material that has the look of wood.
- The window specifications would require approval of the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present a new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Chair Roberts asked for comments on the proposed new accessory structure.

Mr. Hutcheson stated that the new accessory construction required a larger footprint to match the 1 story scale of the principal building.

Chair Roberts asked for citizen comments.

Chuck Rose, 335 4th Avenue South. Mr. Rose stated he is the backdoor neighbor of the property under discussion. Mr. Rose expressed his concerns about the increase in development in downtown Franklin for the purposes of short-term rentals.

Commissioner Worthington made a motion (#8) to approve with conditions the construction of the new accessory structure, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Laster expressed concerns about encroachment into the rear and side setbacks.

Ms. Rose clarified that the side and rear setbacks for both accessory buildings is 5 feet.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted that what is shown on the proposal documents could be the overage of the roof plan.

Ms. Rose stated that the eaves might need to be adjusted a few inches to allow for the 5-foot setback.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked about the recommended ratio of the footprint between the principal building and the accessory building.

Ms. Rose followed up by explaining the historic guidelines govern mass, scale, setback, and location on the property. The zoning ordinance addresses the footprint ratio between the principal and accessory buildings. The accessory building footprint cannot be more than 50% of the principal building footprint. Ms. Rose also pointed out that it would be up to the commission to decide if the ratio of the principal building and the accessory building for this property meets the design guidelines.

Commissioner Pearce and Chair Roberts both stated concerns about the mass, scale and context of the proposed new construction. The new construction is too large and appears to be a house in the backyard.

Chair Roberts plainly stated he could not support the new construction for these reasons.

Mr. Hutcheson noted the large size of the yard.

Commissioner Denton asked for the width of the accessory structure compared to the home. It was determined that the proposed accessory structure would be 3 feet narrower than the home.

There was no further discussion.

Chair Roberts asked the commissioners to vote on motion #8 by raising his or her hand.

Vote: 2-5, with Commissioner Marquardt and Commissioner Worthington voting yes, and everyone else voting no.

Chair Roberts stated another motion was needed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Marquardt (#9) to defer review of the new construction of the accessory building to the May 9th Historic Zoning Commission, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Denton asked Mr. Squires if there could be any legal ramifications such as automatic or default approval, if action is not taken on the deferment.

Mr. Squires stated he did not know of a legal reason for a default approval.

Chair Roberts stated that typically the applicant appears at the next voting meeting.

Commissioner Pearce stated that when a specific date is stipulated for the applicant to appear, the applicant must appear. Typically, applicants are anxious to move forward on the project.

Ms. Rose suggested the commission provide specific feedback to the applicant to address the concerns and to make appropriate changes to the plan. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant would have the opportunity to meet with the DRC prior to the May HZC meeting.

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on motion #9.

Vote: 7-0

Item 7. Consideration of Alterations (Windows, Doors, Storefronts, Architectural Features) at 230 Franklin Rd., Bldg. 8 (the Factory at Franklin); Centric Architecture, Applicant.

Commissioner Denton recused himself from this item.

Staff Presentation by Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the proposed alterations will focus on Building 8 at the Factory.

West Elevation of Building 8 – Page 3 of the Application

- Applicant requests removal of a non-historic corrugated shed to the right of the historic factory element. The age is unknown, and the context of the shed appears non-historical. The removal is appropriate, according to the design guidelines, as removal does not compromise the integrity of the historic Factory or the historical district. Once the removal is complete, the applicant proposes placement of a store front and a window in the 2 openings that were used to access

the shed from the inside of the factory. The store front and window would have the historical equivalence and consistency of the historic factory windows.

- The applicant proposes removal of the corrugated metal cladding and roof of the front historic element to expose existing structure.
- On the left of the historic element, the applicant proposes lowering the sill height of the historic window to create an opening for a glass door, as recommended by the DRC. Originally, the applicant proposed complete removal of the windows.

South Elevation of Building 8 - Alley Side – Page 4 of the Application

- **Left of Center.** The applicant proposes a new Clerestory window, previously filled with brick, to match the existing Clerestory windows. The applicant proposes adding 3 store fronts under the existing Clerestory windows with the addition of new entrances. A rowlock sill will be placed between the Clerestory window and the entrance to ensure preservation of the windows. The guidelines state new entrances should be added on the rear elevations and designed simply. The addition of new entrances is appropriate as long as doors are installed at existing exterior grade.
- **Center – Existing Storefront.** The applicant proposes alteration of the existing storefront by removing the non-historical elements, removal of the soffit and the installation of windows with historical profile consistent with existing historical windows. The wing wall and the existing track will be maintained. The guidelines support removal of non-historic elements, as well as preservation of the architectural and historical features.
- **Right of Center.** The applicant proposes 4 new storefronts or window walls under the existing Clerestory windows. The existing functional sliding doors are historical and will be maintained. A gap revealed two openings of painted non-historic cinderblocks. The guidelines support removal of non-historic masonry. The new entrances are appropriate according to the guidelines if doors are installed at existing grade. The applicant proposes adding 7 openings requiring removal of masonry. The guidelines recommend maintenance of historic masonry. Staff would recommend the applicant remove some of the proposed openings.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed application is recommended with conditions.

- Alterations to select windows on the West Elevation are not supported because the guidelines recommend preservation and maintenance of original historic windows and must be removed from the proposal.
- The staff recommends removal of 2 of the 7 openings, specifically the window walls, proposed on the South Elevation of Building 8 on the alley side, right of center.
- The applicant would need to meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department before the issuance of a building permit.
- If changes are made to the approved plan, the applicant would be required to present a new plan to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Applicant Presentation: Gina Emmanuel and Benton Smothers. Currently, the Factory is operating like a mall with a main entrance to access stores or restaurants from the inside. Ms. Emmanuel stated the intent of the proposal for building 8 was to create storefronts that can be accessed from the outdoor space around the factory. Building 8, at the rear of the Factory site, seemed to be the most logical and appropriate building to create small storefronts for retailers or galleries.

Chair Roberts asked for citizen comments, and there were none.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion and, if possible, make it a single motion.

A motion was made for approval with conditions by Commissioner Marquardt, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Discussion

Commissioner Laster asked specifically about the existing floor plan of the alley. Mr. Smothers explained that currently the single entrance limits the pedestrian traffic. Commissioner Laster expressed his concerns about the multiple openings that take away from the historical significance. He asked if there was a way to access the store fronts from the inside.

Mr. Smothers went on to say that the outdoor entrances would create more exposure for potential retailers. The ability to access the storefront from the outside as opposed to a single entrance mall style will not only create more pedestrian traffic but more successful businesses.

Chair Roberts explained that the purpose of the plan was to create more desirable storefronts for potential retailers. The preservation of the historical windows, improvement of the historical element on the west elevation and the light provided by the glass doors all contribute to a much improved visual and functional historic site.

Commissioner Laster stated that the commission may be missing something in preservation of the West Elevation.

Commissioner Pearce stated the proposed changes to the west elevation are more profound than everyone may realize.

Commissioner LeMarinel suggested giving up masonry to keep the historical windows may be a preferred option to keep the design rhythm consistent.

Chair Roberts stated he likes what he sees in the proposal and pointed out that the commission should expect to see similar proposals in the future for other buildings on the Factory property.

Ms. Emmanuel pointed out that a single entrance is not going to be desirable or attract retailers to the Factory.

Commissioner Worthington asked how the applicant would address the window issues on the West Elevation that are not recommended by the staff.

Ms. Emmanuel stated that Building 3 and 12 windows were approved and are in a more visible location. The historic guidelines do not support alterations to the historic window openings, but the commission may choose to approve or disapprove in certain situations.

Ms. Emmanuel stated that each of the Factory buildings windows differ slightly, but the approach used to address the use of the building and the historical significance are the same.

Commissioner Pearce was not feeling well and stated she needed to leave the meeting. 7:50 p.m.

Commissioner Marquardt requested more information about the openings on the west elevation once the shed is removed. Ms. Rose stated that the wall openings had already been compromised. The applicant proposes to fill the boarded-up openings with a store front and window would have historical equivalence and consistency of the historic factory windows.

Commissioner Laster asked if the conditions regarding the West Elevation could be reviewed again.

Chair Roberts read the window conditions, from staff, for the West Elevation.

- Alterations to select windows on the West Elevation, left side, are not supported because the guidelines recommend preservation and maintenance of original historic windows and must be removed from the proposal.

It was noted that an approval by the commission on this matter would remove any alteration to the windows on the left side of the West Elevation.

Commissioner Worthington again asked how to approach this issue of non-recommendation of window alterations from the staff.

Ms. Emmanuel stated that approval for window alterations on building 3 and 12 was given even though staff did not recommend approval.

Chair Roberts reviewed the staff recommendation of the South Elevation of Building 8, right of center

- The staff recommends removal of 2 of the 7 openings, specifically the window walls, proposed on the South Elevation of Building 8 on the alley side, right of center.

Chair Roberts supports the West Elevation proposal as it stands.

Commissioner LeMarinel amended the motion to approve staff conditions 2-6 only, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Ms. Rose compared the window dimensions of building 12.

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on the amended motion.

Vote: Commissioners LeMarinel, Roberts and Worthington – YES
Commissioners Marquardt and Laster – No
3-2

Chair Roberts asked for a vote on the main motion.

Vote: Commissioners Roberts, LeMarinel and Worthington – YES
Commissioners Marquardt and Laster – NO
3-2

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner LeMarinel, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Vote: 6-0

Meeting Adjourned at 8:06 pm

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joe T. Roberts". The signature is written in dark ink on a white background.