

**City of Franklin
Meeting Minutes
Historic Zoning Commission**

October 10, 2022

5:00 p.m.

Franklin City Hall Boardroom

Commissioners Present:

Susan Besser
Josh Denton
Brian Laster
Tyler LeMarinel
Mary Pearce, Acting Vice-Chair
Lisa Marquardt
Kathy Worthington
Absent: **Jim Roberts**

Staff Present:

Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability
Randall Tosh, BNS
Bill Squires, Law Department (at dais)
Jeana Hendrix, Law Department
Emily Huffer, Planning & Sustainability

CALL TO ORDER

Acting Vice-Chair Pearce called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes: September 12, 2022

- Motion to Approve
 - Commissioner Laster
 - Commissioner LeMarinel
- Motion carried 7-0

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Ms. Rose announced a new staff member, Emily Huffer
- Ms. Rose announced 10/17 DRC meeting
- Ms. Rose announced that the HZC will be working toward using an online program called Civic Clerk that BOMA uses. It is a program that has a repository and is easily accessible to the public. Staff will be reaching out to each of you for a training time setup.

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.

There were none.

CITIZEN 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 HZC 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 HZC consideration at a later date.

There were none.

CONSENT AGENDA

The items under the consent agenda are deemed by the commission to be routine in nature and will be approved by one motion adopting the staff comments as part of the approval. The items on the consent agenda will not be discussed. Any member of the commission or the public desiring to discuss an item on the consent agenda may request that it be removed and placed on the regular agenda. It will then be considered in its printed order. **Staff recommends that items 1-3 be placed on the consent agenda.**

- Motion to approve Items #1-3
 - Motion to Approve
 - Commissioner LeMarinel
 - Commissioner Marquardt
 - Motion carried 7-0

COA APPLICATIONS

Item 1: Consideration of Alterations (Walkway) at 903 W. Main St.; Jenny Haarbauer, Applicant.

- Approved on consent

Item 2: Consideration of Alterations (Walkway) at 402 Bridge St.; Amanda McCreary, Applicant.

- Approved on consent

Item 3: Consideration of Alterations (Roofline) at 724 Fair St.; Jeff Rietveld, Applicant.

- Approved on consent

Item 4: Consideration of Wall Construction at 805 W. Main St.; Bernie Butler, Applicant.

- Staff Presentation. Amanda Rose. The application is a request for a seven-foot-tall brick privacy wall along the left side of the property at 805 West Main Street. The subject property is adjacent to the Arlington building. The request is being presented by the owner of the Arlington at 725 West Main Street. The intent of the wall, according to the application, is to provide security for the Arlington building and to provide screening for the residents of the subject property. The applicant is proposing that most of the wall be constructed on the subject property where the easement prevents it from being constructed on the Arlington site. The guidelines recommend that one design fences and walls to be compatible with the architectural style of the building and to support the historic character of the district. The proposal is to construct a brick wall. Based on the chosen material, one should use proportions, heights elements, and levels of opacity like those seen in the district. Privacy walls and fences can measure up to seven feet in height and may be supported in rear yards, which are defined as being located no closer than 20 feet from the plain of the building's front façade. Because of the building's unique "y" shape and orientation, the proposed privacy wall is located 25 feet from its front corner. This would be consistent with the design guidelines. The style of the wall appears to be designed to match the character of the Arlington building. This is not technically the property onto which the wall is proposed to be constructed. The design of the property and privacy screening should relate to the style of the circa 1830 Y-Shaped historic residence onto which the wall is proposed to be constructed. This may be achieved by utilizing a brick that matches the brick that would be seen on a historic residence. The applicant could also

provide privacy with a wood fence with vertical boards. Ms. Rose noted that all structures including walls and columns should be located outside of the sanitary sewer easement. It appears that part of the request is to connect the wall back to the Arlington building with a gate or other connector. This is not something that the city can support because it would be crossing over a sanitary sewer easement. The request for the wall is on the Ligon property, the adjacent property, and a portion on the subject property. This cannot be supported. It is recommended that the Commission approve the wall construction on the subject property with the conditions that the wall either have brick that matches the circa 1830 residence on the site or that in lieu of a wall that the applicant choose to utilize a vertical board wooden privacy fence appropriate to the historic building onto which the wall is proposed to be constructed. No construction associated with the Arlington site itself is approved as part of the COA. If the Commission chooses to approve the application, all requirements of the city must be met prior to work commencing.

- Applicant Speaker: Bernie Butler, 2300 Fox Haven Road. Mr. Butler stated that from the beginning a brick wall was planned to be down the property line of Arlington. The apartments were built over a sewer line that had to be moved to the other side of the property. Because of the sewer easement, the wall must be built on the Ligon property, with an easement. There has been some discussion about sharing the property line because of the distance from the sewer. Mr. Butler restated that the intent is to build a seven-foot wall much like the one by Mike Hathaway's office on 906 Main Street. It is a narrow non-descript wall that does not draw attention. Mr. Butler ended by stating that the wall would be a good privacy wall for Ligon property and for the Arlington building.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Commission.

MOTION 1

- Motion for Approval with conditions
 - LeMarinel
 - Laster

Discussion:

Commissioner Marquardt asked Ms. Rose to confirm the appropriate guideline chapter for walls and fences.

Ms. Rose commented that chapter 7 covers walls and fences.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the limit of the height recommended is three feet.

Ms. Rose stated that we are looking at two properties. A privacy wall height can measure up to seven feet. Anything above three feet is considered privacy height, as long as it's recessed at least 20 feet from the front wall of the façade. This is a unique, shaped building so the interpretation of where the façade begins can differ. The applicant measured from the corner. The Commission may find it more appropriate to measure from the front wall (behind the porch). The applicant indicates that it's 25 feet back from the Arlington, which is not the property onto which the wall is proposed. Ms. Rose stated that it was about 17 feet back.

Commissioner Denton asked who the owner affidavit came from.

Ms. Rose confirmed the owner's affidavit came from the subject property. The owner of the property onto which the wall is being installed.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked about the pedestrian gate as it is shown(graphically). It looks as if piers are used. It's understandable that permanent structures can't be in the easement.

Mr. Butler stated that the problem is not the fence but the piers for the columns that hold the gate. It was said that there could be a fence wood structure post with a gate. Mr. Butler stated that he cannot construct the brick columns to match the brick wall.

Ms. Rose stated that what is shown is the guidance she received from one of the city engineers. Staff did not receive any sort of elevation that indicates what that section would look like, and it is recommended to not include this area as part of the application. This section could not be the privacy height because it is not 20 feet back from the front wall of the property. The Commission could separate this section from the seven-foot privacy wall portion of the application. If the seven-foot wall is approved, then the other portion could be approved administratively if the location is 20 feet back from the front wall.

Commissioner Laster asked if condition number two removes that entire discussion.

Ms. Rose confirmed.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked staff if there were any visuals to show what the fence would look like.

Ms. Rose stated that the only visual was the one provided in the application documents. Ms. Rose provided the visual illustration for the Commission to see.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked staff if the responsibility of maintenance would be the Arlington even though the wall is on neighboring property.

Ms. Rose stated that is a civil issue and independent of the city. The current discussion is that the guidelines recommend that fences and walls match the architectural style of the property which they are being supported.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he doesn't have any problems with approving the privacy wall.

Commissioner Marquardt pointed out that it is recommended the applicant consider a vertical wood privacy fence. Ms. Marquardt asked the applicant what his response is to the recommendation.

Mr. Butler stated that a building is meant to stand for years, and a wood privacy fence would not stand for as many years. The goal is to construct a beautiful privacy wall that will stand for many years like many of the privacy walls in downtown Franklin. There would be very little maintenance required. The property owners, the Ligons, do not want a wooden fence. It is their preference to have a wall constructed.

Commissioner Marquardt asked about the context of the neighborhood and if Mr. Butler could point out a similar property that would be of a similar context.

Mr. Butler stated that there are walls all around the Hincheyville district. The only people who will see the wall under discussion will be the Lignons and the residents of the Arlington building. There will be landscaping on both sides of the wall. From start to finish, the wall will measure about 216 feet. The project is incredibly expensive, but it is a good permanent solution for both property owners.

Ms. Rose recommended that staff's conditions be considered that the wall be constructed of brick or a material that has brick texture, color, quality, and that matches that of the historic house on the property. Ms. Rose asked the Commission to make a statement for the record if someone feels differently. Ms. Rose explained that she believes the applicant's intent is to use a color that matches that of the Arlington building.

Commissioner Denton asked Mr. Butler if there were any objections to matching the brick color to the home.

Mr. Butler stated that he would object to a brick color matching the Ligon house.

Vice-Chair Pearce recommended changing the color word to blend so that staff would have the opportunity to review and approve the color.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that blend is a much better word to use to address the intent of staff comment.

Vice-Chair Pearce suggested that someone may want to offer this change as an amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Worthington asked Mr. Butler about the elevation that shows the brick wall with additional fencing. "Is the fencing, other than the wall, new and part of the proposal?"

Mr. Butler stated that the aluminum security fence wraps around the back of the property on the property line, but not on the Ligon property.

Ms. Rose suggested that staff address the security/aluminum fence administratively if that is something the Board prefers.

Mr. Butler responded by explaining he understood that it could not be decided administratively because the security fence is on the Ligon property.

Ms. Rose stated that she understood that the fence was not on the Ligon property.

Mr. Butler explained that the fence is on the subject property.

Ms. Rose stated that staff could manage the details of the security/aluminum fence administratively, but staff does not have enough details to decide at this time. The security/aluminum fence would need to be reviewed separately.

Commissioner Worthington explained that she mentioned the fence because the two fences were connected. Ms. Worthington also asked if the brick would be a solid brick.

Mr. Butler stated that the brick would be solid and noted an area in Franklin that could provide a perfect example of the brick wall.

Ms. Rose was able to show the street view of the brick wall on the overhead screen.

Mr. Butler further noted that there would be no limestone and there would be a six-inch block between the two brick forms.

Ms. Rose provided the street view of the subject property on the overhead screen.

Mr. Butler stated that the wall would begin after the hedge row, move back toward the parking garage and behind Hank Brockman's building, now owned by Lawrence Welk's grandson.

Commissioner Laster asked if the actual grade from the Ligon property will come over to the Arlington building or will the grade stay the same as shown in the street view.

Mr. Butler explained that the property grade comes up at both entries of the Arlington building. There is a sidewalk that goes down beside the building, as well.

Commissioner Laster commented/asked if the area should be filled in.

Mr. Butler answered by saying that it had not been filled yet, but it will be before the wall is built. The grade will slope down some toward the Arlington building but not to the degree shown in the street view.

Ms. Rose noted that the foundation exposure seen in the street view of the construction will not be exposed as much once the wall is built. If approved, the grade will not match exactly, but it won't be far off.

Commissioner Worthington asked staff about condition number 1 that the brick used must match the architectural character of the principal building...does this mean the architectural character of the historic homes?

Ms. Rose stated that this goes back to the topic of "blending" as part of the wording for the color of the brick. Even though the wall will be closer to the historic home than the Arlington building, the color would pull from the brick color of the historic building as opposed to the more matte color of the Arlington building. Although this is a technicality, from the street view, the wall will appear more like it belongs to the historic property than the neighboring property.

Commissioner Worthington asked if the intent of the new wall is to be the same brick as the Arlington building?

Mr. Butler answered that the intent of the brick was to match the Arlington building since that is who is paying for the wall. Mr. Butler pointed out that the only brick on the 1830's house is the wing walls and the front part of the original house but not the part that was added on the back of the house. The wall would be built closer to the wood portion of the house and not by the brick part of the house

Commissioner Worthington stated that it is a large new element being added in this area. “How does it relate to both structures?” “How do we qualify the color and texture of the brick?”

Commissioner Denton stated that he would not support the construction of the wall if the brick color matched the Arlington building. The wall will be on historic property. When determining approval or disapproval of a project, landscaping or other types of camouflage are not part of the considerations that the Board uses to determine appropriateness. Commissioner Denton stated that he agrees with the term “blending.”

Commissioner Laster stated that he thought the amendment to the motion should state that the proposal should be heard by staff for review and approval of the brick color.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION 1

- the wall’s brick shall be consistent and blend with the historic home and return to staff for approval
 - Denton
 - Besser
 - Amendment to motion carried 7-0

- Motion, as amended, passed 7-0

Item 5: Consideration of Demolition (Accessory Structure) & New Construction (Accessory Structure) at 436 Boyd Mill Ave.; Matt Smith, Applicant.

- Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for the demolition of a non-historic carport and for the construction of a one and a half story two bay accessory structure. The applicant attended the DRC meeting in August to discuss the proposal. Ms. Rose stated that the proposal relates to chapters five and ten of the Historic District Design Guidelines. The demolition of the non-historic carport is supported by staff. It does not have historical integrity; therefore, the removal is appropriate. The proposal is to replace the non-historic carport with a new structure to serve as a garage and additional square footage. The proposed garage addition is about 31 feet back from the main portion of the house. There was a small addition approved by the commission recently that has been constructed. Ms. Rose referred to the application illustrations to show the proposed location of the new accessory structure. Looking at the site plan, Ms. Rose pointed out the proposed location of the new accessory structure in relationship to the house. The location is approximately 94 feet back from the front wall of the principal building and is oriented with its garage doors facing the street, all of which are supported by the guidelines. In staff’s opinion the new structure is not visually subordinate in scale as the house itself is a one and a half story structure. The guidelines do allow for the construction of a one and a half story garage so long as it is specifically subordinate in other ways. The proposal includes a height change which is a difference of three feet six inches. The applicant provided benchmarks at which the height was measured and is provided in the staff report documents. The height is measured at the front corner of the principal structure which is the front corner of the sunroom element. The height was measured at this point at 25 feet six inches. The location at which the proposed garage height is measured is at the front wall, right corner. The benchmark location is important because of grade changes and our methodology of approval, then ultimately

building/construction permitting. The footprint measures 1,234 square feet which is in keeping with the guidelines and the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, generally. The footprint of the proposed accessory structure is less than 50% of the principal building and can be supported by staff. The details and ornamentation are less elaborate than the character of the historic building and can be supported. The proposed materials include a cementitious lap siding with a reveal to match the addition to the principal building. At the rear of the principal building, the addition's original form is brick with a reveal that is wider than typical. The new structure reveal is proposed to match. The proposal does not include details about the garage doors or window specifications yet. The other materials include carriage style doors, composition shingle roof and a stucco foundation all supported by the guidelines. The window style is more in context with the addition than the style of the historic portion of the house and, in the situation, is appropriate. The cumulative lot coverage is not an issue on the large site. The proposed new construction added together with the existing construction measures 8% use of the large lot.

It is recommended the Commission approve the proposal with conditions:

- 1) The carport should be photographed satisfactorily for commission records.
 - 2) The height of the accessory structure measures at least three feet six inches lower than the average of the principal structure as measured for the location provided by the applicant.
 - 3) All the new windows should have historic profile and dimension and must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - 4) The garage doors specifications must be submitted for the same types of considerations, as well.
 - 5) The application must meet all the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department.
 - 6) Any alterations made to the approved plan must be submitted to staff or the Commission for a reconsideration of the COA.
- Applicant Speaker: Matt Smith, 906 Studio Architects. Mr. Smith explained the uses that the new accessory structure would serve. The owners would like to build an accessory building that has a two-bay garage, exercise area, pool room, small bathroom/laundry and a guest area for visitors. The goal is for the accessory building to complement and be subordinate to the main house.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION 1

- Approval with conditions of new construction
 - Laster
 - LeMarinel

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Besser stated that there is a gabled roof dormer on the house, but a shed roof dormer on the garage. Ms. Besser asked if this is how the accessory building should be finished, regarding design.

Mr. Smith stated that he tried the gabled dormer on the accessory structure, and it appeared to emulate the main house as a miniature version which he wanted to avoid.

Ms. Rose stated that Mr. Smith provided this information before the DRC meeting. Ms. Rose agreed that the shed roof dormer was a better option as it didn't cause the eye to move more toward the overall ridgeline.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that she understood the overall height of the house is three feet lower than the overall height of the home with no consideration of the grade.

Mr. Smith stated that taking the grade into consideration, as you can see on page six of the application documents, the goal is to compare the 25'6" in absolute terms. The height from grade is 25'6" for the house and 25'6" for the accessory building. This is two feet in absolute terms. When taking the grade into account, we arrive at the 3'6" number.

Ms. Rose added that the garage is two feet shorter measured on the same grade, but three feet shorter with the grade change incorporated. Mr. Smith stated that the measurements may be understated and that it may be that the perceived height difference is closer to five feet.

Commissioner Denton confirmed/asked if the overall footprint of the main house is 2,590.

Mr. Smith answered yes.

Commissioner Marquart stated that according to the design guidelines the first-floor square footage needs to be less than 60% of the lower level. Does the proposed percentage 59.07% include attic space?

Mr. Smith stated that when looking at the plan of the second floor you will see attic space on the side of the study and the bedroom, however, the space is not inhabitable. The area could be expanded in the future but as of now the area is very small.

Ms. Rose answered Commissioner Marquardt's question by stating that the attic space has been lessened and the applicant does not include the attic space as part of the 59.07%. The guidelines are not clear on this topic. At the August DRC meeting the topic was discussed whether the attic space should be inclusive in the 60%. Because the guidelines are not clear, it would be up to the Commission to set a precedent on whether to include attic space as part of the 60% (of the first-floor square footage) measurement. The intent of the guideline is to limit the size and height of the upper floor and by doing that, the recommendation is that the second floor should not be more than 60% of the bottom floor square footage. This forces the use of dormers instead of a wall going straight up. The intent of the guideline isn't fully met in staff's opinion, but it isn't "not" met. According to the BNS guidelines/codes, the area would not be considered habitable.

Commissioner Denton stated that one wall measures seven feet ten inches tall. If Mr. Tosh could speak from a code standpoint on this issue for clarity, it would be helpful. What is the lowest measurement of a knee wall to be considered habitable space?

Mr. Tosh explained that once a wall reaches 60 inches in height, it is habitable. Any measurement below 60 inches is not considered a habitable space.

Ms. Rose used the applicant illustrations to point to the area beside the study that appears to be habitable.

Mr. Smith explained that if he had wanted to maximize this area, he could have moved the study wall out 18 inches, but there wasn't a need for the space. Also, one needed to be mindful of the square footage limits.

Commissioner Denton pointed out that from a codes perspective the walls could be pushed out from the seven feet ten inches or six feet eight inches, the area could be considered habitable. Is this correct?

Mr. Tosh confirmed that Commissioner Denton was correct.

Mr. Smith mentioned that the owners are tall people and for obvious reasons don't prefer short walls.

Commissioner Denton asked what the percentage would be if the walls were pushed out to the five-foot mark in the attic space?

Mr. Smith stated that if he pushed each side out one foot this would be 16 square feet which would possibly come in under the 60 % maximum.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that consistency in "how the calculations" are achieved must be decided. Specifically for garages and outbuildings that are one and a half stories. This rule becomes even more important for a four-square two-story home to create a two-story garage. It will be a challenge to get 60% upstairs. There needs to be a rule that limits the scale of the second-floor space.

Ms. Rose noted that in most of the base zoning districts, in the historic districts, the zoning ordinance limits accessory structures to no more than a story and a half. It's not likely a request for a two-story garage, even if considered subordinate by the design guidelines, would be supported by the zoning ordinance.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that the overall size of the building, whether attic space counts or not, contributes to the massing of the building.

Commissioner Denton advised the Board to be careful about how applicants calculate square footage space. A wall can be pushed in here or there creating habitable space if the wall measures 60".

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that there is the bearing height that is not really at the top of the floor system creating extra volume above garages and extra height above windows. Commissioner LeMarinel cautioned about being careful and thoughtful about how high the second floor bearing wall is. It appears to be 3 feet.

Mr. Smith stated that the roof is not bearing directly on the floor system as there is a knee wall there to minimize it according to the 60% rule. Mr. Smith explained that after discussions, he understood the area as habitable space and proceeded based on his understanding that the attic space would not be counted.

Ms. Rose stated that the DRC did not really give direction one way or the other because this is the first time an application has been reviewed since the new guidelines have come into effect.

Ms. Rose asked Mr. Smith if the overall ridgeline could be lowered.

Mr. Smith stated that the ridgeline had been lowered as much as possible for the functions to work. The property owners would not be comfortable with the ridgeline any lower.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that during the DRC meeting it was discussed that the garage be moved over more behind the main house.

Mr. Smith indicated the owners did not want to compromise space that is designated for a pool in the future. Looking at the site-plan, the garage does sit behind the house and the photo composites confirm this.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that a proper motion is on the table.

Commissioner Marquardt asked if 59.07% included the attic space and what would the percentage be if the attic space is included.

Mr. Smith stated that the attic space is not included and to add the attic space would push the percentage above the 60 % maximum. Given the slope, a seven-foot wall will quickly be within a couple of feet and uninhabitable. There could be room for a few boxes but not “real” space.

Ms. Rose also stated that as the slope drops off, the area quickly becomes uninhabitable. The study walls could be bumped out two feet but beyond that the space would not be inhabitable. Ms. Rose thanked the Commission for their insight in bringing this potential issue forward. It really is very difficult to review because of the intent of the guidelines. The intent is to have more subservient accessory structures.

Commissioner Denton noted that this is something new the Commission is having to deal with. The code states that five feet is considered habitable space, but when taller walls are built that is fine, but builders should understand that the wall could be expanded down to five feet for habitable space.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that in working in the city of Belle Meade that the standard is everything from five feet or taller is considered habitable. It’s a fair way to say to applicants that this is what the code considers, and we will count it as habitable space.

Commissioner Denton stated that until a clear process in calculating habitable space vs. uninhabitable space is determined, he would have a hard time supporting the proposal.

Commissioner Pearce asked Commissioner Denton if he would like to offer an amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Denton stated that he did not have enough information to support the amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Besser stated that a deferral may be the best option.

Commissioner Denton stated that this topic and the response from the Commission is going to set a precedent for many projects moving forward.

MOTION 2 – OVERRIDES MOTION 1

- Deferral of project to November 14, 2022, HZC meeting
 - Besser
 - Marquardt
 - Guidance from commission: Percentage of second-level square footage should include areas inside the 5' knee walls so that the commission can relate this area to the applicable second level guidelines
 - Motion 2 passed, 7-0

Item 6: Consideration of Alterations to Buildings (Partial Demolition, Additions, Rooflines, Windows/Doors), Alterations to Site & Setting (Parking, Landscaping, Lighting, Walkways/Driveways, Walls/Fences, Grading), Relocation of Existing Accessory within Site, & Relocation of Building onto Site at 423 S. Margin St.; Stephanie Stewart, Applicant.

Commissioner Josh Denton recused himself from this item

Vice-Chair Pearce asked Ms. Rose how she would like to proceed with item number six.

Ms. Rose stated that the agenda listing is very long because it is the staff's role to communicate every request by an applicant thoroughly so that the public can understand what is going on. This item is a major rehabilitation project which incorporates a lot of things and why the caption is so long. Sometimes it is best to break up the request but most of the requests are very specific to the main structure of the house. I recommend that the parts be broken up by the Winstead House, its additions and the relocation of two structures. One structure is to be relocated onto the site and the other structure relocated within the site. Then, discussion of the fences and wall separately from that.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that there would also be motions to a building that exists on the site.

Ms. Rose stated that she has not provided separate motions for everything, but one collective motion. It may be determined that independent motions may be needed.

- Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose.

Introduction

Ms. Rose stated that the applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for a series of work for 423 South Margin Street, formerly known as the O'More College of Design. The subject property includes the circa 1845 Winstead House, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places for Significance and Architecture. The property also includes the circa 1895 historic structure identified by the applicant as the Haynes-Berry Home. The structure incorporates elements of a masonry Queen Ann style. The historic accessory building identified as the Smokehouse is also on the site as a non-contributing carriage house. The entire property is part of the Franklin National Register Historic District and is immediately adjacent to the Lewisburg Avenue National Register Historic District. The applicant appeared before the July DRC to discuss the most recent version of this proposal. The applicant requested voluntary feedback from staff and the Tennessee Historical Commission which is the state's Historic Preservation Office. The state Historic Preservation Office is the state level preservationist that provides expert guidance on projects on the National Register. The local jurisdiction requires that the guidelines be met. The guidelines are based on the Secretary of Interior Standards and can be more thorough and descriptive. The staff is appreciative that the applicant sought this guidance.

Unfortunately, the information did not reach the applicant until the day that the application materials were due. The applicant wanted the Commission to understand that some of the changes may have already been implemented into the plan had they received the comments sooner.

Parking, Walkways and Driveways

The applicant has significantly reduced the number of hardscape areas proposed on the front lawn. This reduction is in keeping with the guidelines which state that traditional lawn areas should be maintained and not replaced with significant landscaping or hardscaping. The guidelines note the layout of new sidewalks and walkways should take placement of historic trees into consideration and from the materials provided by the applicant, it does not appear that many trees are being removed to accommodate the pedestrian path. As for parking and driveways, Ms. Rose referred to the applicant illustrations to show the location of the proposed drive aisle onto Lewisburg Avenue. This is a proposed new drive; it is similar to the location of the existing driveway. The applicant removed a proposed circular driveway that is not supported by the guidelines, lessening the number of hardscaped areas. The removal of a 1940 historic stone wall along Lewisburg Pike is proposed to accommodate a drive aisle location as required by the City of Franklin. The retaining wall location is to be relocated within a few feet of the existing wall. The wall location will be discussed further in the application. The guidelines recommend that parking follows historic patterns and that they minimize the visual impact of parking by following those patterns by locating them along the rear or side elevations. The building's parking for nonresidential uses for residential buildings should be located behind the building and should be further screened off site. All parking is now located to the rear and is believed to be behind the front facade of the historic building and therefore meets the intent of the guidelines.

Grading Alterations

The guidelines recommend that one avoids significantly altering or grading the topography of a property. The property and building should not be altered in such a way to be different than what is character defining of it historically. The grading plan has been altered to lessen impacts to the front lawn. Overall, significant grading is still proposed in the area immediately in front of the Winstead House. This creates a more formal landing as shown in the document illustrations. There is a request to infill the grading to allow for a maximum three-foot-tall retaining wall and to install a refurbished iron fence that is three feet high. The formal landing space is an extension of the porch. The proposal is altering the experience of this area significantly considering the Secretary of Interior Standard and the Historic District Design Guidelines. This portion of the proposal cannot be supported. The State Historic Preservation Office stated that to meet the guidelines, it is recommended that this grading be shortened or avoided overall, and it would be the recommendation of local staff that the grading be avoided overall. It could create a false sense of historic character and a feeling that is out of scale with the original Italianate design. It does lessen the intensity of the porch because the grading on most porches is significant, and the ground level is significantly lower than the porch itself. In this case, it would nearly be flush. The hyphen addition on the front of the house, according to the applicant's research, was built in 1990 and it is flanked to the right of the historic home. The grading seeks to modify the grade at this façade to accommodate the construction of an eight-foot-wide ramp for ADA access. The guidelines recommend that ramps be constructed of wood or concrete. The intent of the applicant is to alter the grade to accommodate the needed slope to construct the ADA ramp. Without information on how this would look, it is difficult for staff to support at this time. Ramps are recommended to be at the rear of the building or at lesser visible elevations. The proposed ramp would be primarily on the front façade. It is not clear how the grade is proposed to be situated at this location because there is no elevation or cross section provided to explain how the changes would occur. It's not clear if the proposal meets the intent of the guidelines. Ms. Rose noted that the State Historic Preservation Office provided similar feedback, noting that the extension of this area through the grading and the implementation of a ramp

is not appropriate. The feedback from the State Historic Preservation Office also recommended that if the ramp cannot be located behind this structure, that it be modified so that it is at least behind the plain of the front wall of the house and that it not physically tie into the historic structure. Landscape screening is also encouraged to help mitigate any adverse impacts, but Ms. Rose indicated that staff does not have enough information to support this portion of the application.

Lighting

The guidelines recommend that new light fixtures be designed and placed to be compatible with and subordinate to the historic buildings in the surrounding historic context. One should use existing or ambient streetlights rather than adding new lighting wherever possible. If new fixtures are necessary, one should use concealed lighting or fixtures that are simple in character but compatible with the placement, design, skill materials and quality of lighting on adjacent historic buildings. It is also recommended that lighting be installed at the ground level only and use footlights for residential driveways and walkways instead of large freestanding or post mounted lights. Ms. Rose referred to the lighting diagram illustration that demonstrates the location of the proposed lights. Most of them are at ground level and more subdued. The guidelines provide considerations for illumination noting that the use of a warm light would be appropriate as not to distort the color of material and finishes. One should avoid using colored bulbs or gel as we have seen this happen in some places. Staff does not know the intent of the color; it is believed that the intent is the warmer tone. Most of the lighting fixtures meet the intent of the guidelines. There are pole lights at the rear of the property. The guidelines state that residential driveways and walkways should avoid pole lights. Though not proposed as residential, the guidelines review things by form. The site was historically residential and the forms on the site are residential. It is recommended that the Commission think this through and make a recommendation based on whether the lights would be appropriate in this context or not. The use of the property is changing, but HZC does not contemplate use but does consider form and context and the context is residential and the guidelines do not recommend pole lights.

Fences and Walls

Ms. Rose stated that the applicant has provided color codes to identify certain areas. The purple color indicates the proposed one-foot-tall brick wall, with an open weave along the upper half, to be located behind the Winstead House to enclose a courtyard. This design and location are supported by the guidelines. The blue, yellow, and orange colors represent the removal and the relocation or the new construction of brick/stone retaining wall to accommodate the city regulations for the right of way in the roadway. The city requires that a left turn lane be installed on Lewisburg Pike and requires a certain portion of roadway to be altered. Because the applicant is relocating some historic and non-historic walls within a few feet of where they are currently, the applicant's intent is to reuse the existing materials and supplement them with matching materials, if necessary. The guidelines can support new retaining walls in primary yards, but also recommend that one minimize changes to the topography from those resulting elements. The applicant provided information to demonstrate the existing condition versus the proposed conditions and then the graded conditions. Ms. Rose referred to the applicant illustrations that demonstrate the proposed step two condition where it is recessed back a few feet before the brick wall. On top of the brick wall is a proposed iron gate that helps minimize the impact of the relocation. It will create a condition that is shorter than the existing retaining wall height creating more visibility of the site. The intent for the stepping is to not have a wall that goes straight up significantly changing the grading. Staff believes that this is the most sympathetic way to achieve and minimize any sort of grading changes to it. This information has been provided throughout the proposal and attempts to emulate the materials as similar as possible to the existing materials. Ms. Rose referred to the applicant illustrations (pg. 24) to show the location of the existing retaining wall and the proposed relocation of the retaining wall. The proposed 2-foot retaining walls in front of the Winstead House allows for some hillside plantings and a display garden at the center of the lawn. The existing

topography would not be altered extensively because of the new elements. The green area in the illustration identifies the wall directly in front of the Winstead House and corresponds to the area, previously discussed, with the graded condition at the porch. Ms. Rose stated that the green areas are supported except for the green area surrounding the front entry. This area cannot be supported. The dark blue area primarily right in front of the building that runs along South Margin Street represents the location of an existing brick wall and decorative iron fencing that is proposed to be maintained and repaired, as necessary. The dotted purple area in front of the house represents an existing decorative iron fence to be placed onto the top of the retaining wall. This wall is not supported so having a fence on top of the wall would not be supported either. Lastly, the dotted red color that surrounds the perimeter and the driveway area up to the house represents the proposed decorative iron fencing atop the relocated and rebuilt retaining walls. The retaining wall follows the proposed driveway up to the house and separates the front lawn from the driveway and appears to meet the design guidelines for material for the height and for placement. Ms. Rose noted, for the record, that on page 25 of the application it states that the design of the courtyard is subject to change. The courtyard, as shown in the application, is supported but any changes to the courtyard design would require review and approval by staff and/or the Commission.

Ms. Rose asked the Commissioners if discussion should occur on the portions presented so far.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that yes and the applicant should be allowed to present on the topics presented by Ms. Rose so far.

Ms. Rose noted that she has not received any comment cards from the attendees who are present to speak on the application. If any citizens would like to speak during the citizen comment portion, please fill out a card before Mr. Gamble has completed his presentation.

- Applicant Presentation. Greg Gamble representing the Heritage Foundation. Mr. Gamble stated that the use of the buildings was non-residential prior to the involvement of the Heritage Foundation. The O'More College did not adhere to the requirements of the City of Franklin for non-residential buildings, regarding code standards. The Heritage Foundation is required to update the buildings so that the code standards are met, for non-residential buildings. This includes ADA Handicap accessibility, ADA parking and lighting for the site. This process has begun and requires variance requests from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Then, a site-plan will be submitted to the city staff and Planning Commission. Mr. Gamble explained that some details of the project are still being considered and will return to the HZC for a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The first step in the process is to receive approval from the HZC. Ms. Rose outlined several recommendations to be considered as part of the approval tonight.
 - 1) The proposed retaining wall (Page 13) in front of the primary building with the iron fence.
 - a. Mr. Gamble stated that the recommendation from staff is understood and would result in changes to the application.
 - 2) The second consideration in accordance with the guidelines relates to the handicap accessibility route, located just to the right of the 1990's addition.
 - a. Mr. Gamble noted that the width of the ADA accessible ramp would be the width of the existing stairs. A width of eight feet was mentioned but the proposed width is equal to the existing stairs.
 - b. ADA requirements for non-residential commercial structures state that the accessibility be as close to, if not the same experience as someone who does not require ADA

accessibility. This location will comply with the code requirements for a commercial non-residential structure and be a similar experience as entering the facility through the front doors.

Note: The State Historic Preservation Office feedback stated that if the ADA ramp cannot be located behind the structure, it is recommended that it be located behind the front building line with a low profile. Also, the feedback stated that the entrance/ramp does not need to have a physical connection to the historic structure. The ramp could be removed, in the future, without disturbing any of the historic structure. When constructed, an expansion joint between the proposed ramp and the existing structure can be implemented. Mr. Gamble stated that it is a requirement to provide an ADA accessible route to the building that meets the requirements of the commercial codes. Because there is a site-plan review process that engineering and building codes will need to approve, the goal is to have the grading plan set so that the Commission knows exactly what needs to be reviewed for the COA for the ramp.

- 3) Mr. Gamble stated that the proposed post-mounted lighting needed to be discussed with staff at the DRC meeting. There are certain zoning code requirements, for lighting in parking areas, which must be met. The goal is to limit the number of post mounted lights using the low-profile posts for residential guidelines. Then, the lighting aspect would return to staff and the Commission for a COA.

Mr. Gamble explained that the discussed conditions can be addressed as the application moves through the process for approval from the City of Franklin.

Ms. Rose commented that a site plan would need to be approved and guidance given by the Planning Commission, potentially returning to the HZC for a COA. At that time, staff can have more information about the standards that will apply to the site plan component. Ms. Rose stated that alternative means for the recommended lighting amounts such as limiting the height of the poles are areas the Commission can provide guidance. The grading is something the applicant will have to provide for the Planning Commission to review and approve. It is important for the HZC to provide guidance through a motion one way or the other of whether it would support the grading alterations proposed at the front of the Winstead house and the Hyphen area. If the grading proposal could not be supported, it could be deferred so that the applicant can work through the comments provided by the HZC and return at a different date for review and approval. Once staff members have vetted the application through the city planning process, a more decisive plan can be presented to better inform the HZC.

Mr. Gamble stated that the applicant is comfortable with condition number one, regarding the retaining wall.

Vice-Chair Pearce summarized...

- eliminating the grading in front of the Winstead House
- providing more information regarding the details of the ramp
- disapproval of the lighting plan

Ms. Rose stated that there is no motion on the table, and we are not deliberating right now, but the recommendation from staff is to determine if the lighting meets the intent of the guidelines. The rest of the plan, in the staff's opinion, meets the guideline recommendations except for the pole lights. Once information is provided through the motion, staff and the applicant can work

together to adjust accordingly to meet all the other standards of the city. If necessary, staff would bring back any changes to the proposal to the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Gamble pointed out that this is an adaptive reuse of the buildings, and there are details that do not exactly line up with the city requirements for non-residential uses. Mr. Gamble stated that he is fine and happy to adjust the details regarding the ramp and lighting portions. We do not have any problems with recommendations 4-8, as well.

Ms. Rose explained that she had not presented any information on recommendations 4-8 and that before moving on to those items, discussion of items 1-3 should be finalized.

Mr. Gamble stated lastly that one item related to the site plan, but not provided in the application packet, is a fencing plan for the exterior boundary of the property. Additional meetings to refine the fencing plan along with a landscape design, as well as discussions with neighbors have been ongoing. Mr. Gamble noted that the neighbors of the subject property are interested in knowing what the plans are for outside boundary of the property. It is understood by the applicant that the proposal before the HZC tonight should be addressed, but also to move forward or progress through meeting milestones of the planning process. The boundary fencing portion is a priority, but more time is needed to provide the specific details.

Questions from Acting Vice-Chair Pearce to Applicant Representative / Clarification from Amanda Rose / Commissioner Discussion about how to break up into individual motions.

Vice-Chair Pearce consulted Mr. Squires on how to proceed regarding potential deferment of a portion of the proposal.

Mr. Squires asked Ms. Rose to explain exactly what is before the HZC to discuss.

Ms. Rose stated that everything presented to the HZC this evening is up for discussion along with the changes Mr. Gamble mentioned that the applicant agrees with staff to complete. Ms. Rose asked the HZC to make a motion to include parking driveways, walkways, grading alterations, lighting and fences and walls that were discussed in detail during the staff presentation. If there is a disagreement with the plan, the comments should be noted. The applicant has made it clear that they are open to staff's comments and that they will adjust accordingly. Action is needed on the proposal.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked counsel if it was possible to vote on one section instead of the whole project.

Mr. Squires stated that yes, the HZC can address a section or sections of the proposal.

Ms. Rose stated that the staff's recommendation of the proposal does not match addressing each individual section of the proposal. The HZC would need to create a motion that mentions those portions, parking, driveways, building alterations, lighting, grading alterations and fences/walls.

Commissioner Besser stated that it is difficult to group the items together. Each portion needs to be addressed individually, discussed, and voted on. Changes are being made, as we speak, and to feel comfortable with these changes each portion needs to be discussed.

Ms. Rose stated that if that is the direction that the Vice-Chair would like to take, the staff can certainly work through the process.

Vice-Chair Pearce recommended making a motion for the portion discussed so far, then moving on to the House portion of the application.

Commissioner Besser and LeMarinel agreed that a motion for each section should be made allowing for discussion on each portion of the application.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked counsel how to approach the public comment section given the change in how the proposal will be addressed.

Mr. Squires asked how much of the presentation remained.

Ms. Rose explained that there was still a significant amount of presentation left. Ms. Rose recommended an independent motion on parking/walkways/driveways, a motion on grading alterations and a motion on lighting...and so forth. It was also recommended that staff finish providing the analysis in full, then move through each section with a motion, one by one. This would allow citizens to comment after the complete presentation on any portion of the proposal.

Vice-Chair Pearce agreed with Ms. Rose.

- Staff Presentation Continued by Ms. Rose.

Alterations to Existing Buildings – Winstead House

Ms. Rose continued by referring to page 14 and pages 43-52 of the application that relates to the Winstead House. The proposal seeks to demolish select non-historic buildings. The dark colors in the application documents are the proposed area to be removed from the existing building. There are a number of non-historic additions to the house. The guidelines support demolition if a building or portion of the building has no historical or architectural integrity. The city has adopted the federal standard that any section of a building less than 50 years in age is considered non-historic. For this reason, the portions proposed to be demolished can be supported by staff. The alterations also include changes to select additions that are proposed to remain on the house. The 1990's era hyphen at the front of the building, previously discussed, calls for a grading change along with a fenestration alteration. The change would allow for two entrance doors that would allow for ADA access. Referencing the photograph on page 47, Ms. Rose stated that she believes the intent is to allow the doors to open with enough clearance to allow for ADA accessibility. As a non-historic element of the building the alteration is considered appropriate. The guidelines support door replacement with the understanding that the new doors should be designed to be compatible with the historic district. It is staff's opinion that this meets the intent of the guidelines. The State Historic Preservation Office did comment on this and suggested something similar. The applicant modified the proposal based on this comment.

Mansard Roof – Winstead House

The Mansard roof structure can be seen at the back of the building (page 49). Ms. Rose noted that a significant addition to the building appears to have been built in the 70's and 80's to accommodate the use changes of the building. The applicant would like to keep this section that we are calling a Mansard roof but alter it to be more compatible with the historic building form. Specifically, the modification includes changing the roofline into a hipped form which lowers the scale, recladding it with lap siding with closed shutters to emulate fenestration. A small, covered entrance to the courtyard façade is proposed and can be seen on page 49. The guidelines support (generally) the proposed alterations as the roofline, material and finish changes are in keeping with the original building. The changes improve the overall structure's appropriateness within the historic district as recommended by the guidelines. Based on DRC recommendations, the applicant has utilized a lap siding as opposed to brick to simplify the form and to appear subordinate in the courtyard area. Ms. Rose noted, as seen on the Winstead south elevation, that there is lap siding from existing additions and a large amount of brick on the existing building. The applicant would like to use a cementitious lap siding instead of brick, as previously discussed at the DRC meeting.

New Additions – Winstead House

Ms. Rose referenced the model seen on page 49 to discuss the addition of the building with the loggia porch. The guidelines recommend that additions be compatible with the historic building that are identified by differentiating methods of size, height, and inset from both walls. The location, design, scale, and massing are all appropriate for the addition. On page 43 there is an area that is proposed to be added to the existing hyphen, at the side, and then wrap around the back. The area is really a porch and can be seen on page 51. The guidelines recommend that one design new porches and stoops to be at the rear or side facades with minimal visibility and to avoid adding porches or stoops if they did not exist historically. The loggia area along the side cannot be supported because it is on the side elevation that is highly visible. By adding the loggia to a non-historic addition in a primary area, the accentuation is on the non-historic area and probably would not have been supported by the guidelines had they been applied in 1990 when the addition was built. It is recommended that the wrap around portion be removed and that it would be appropriate to maintain the rear portion. The State Historic Preservation Office also recommended that the porch be removed from the west side and only be implemented at the rear.

On page 48 the applicant provided a historic photograph that shows an enclosed side porch that the applicant would like to reconstruct. The proposed addition does not appear to match the historic photo in its entirety and has slightly different proportions. The side porch appears to match the scale as shown in the historic photo. The guidelines recommend against the construction of porches or stoops onto front facades if they did not exist historically. Because this porch did exist historically and it is generally in keeping with that, Ms. Rose stated that she would not call this a true restoration. The evidence in the photo proves that the porch did exist, therefore, the porch can be supported.

The proposal also includes the rebuilding of a ramp on the east side elevation. The ramp can be seen on page 49. Ms. Rose stated that the ramp was (probably) added when the addition was added. The applicant would like to keep a ramp element but is requesting to remove the existing ramp and rebuild it within an enclosed addition. The previously existing porch would be incorporated into the enclosed area. The ramp would allow people to access this portion of the museum area within an ADA appropriate space. The guidelines recommend that ramps be designed simply with reversibility that offers minimum impact and does not involve the removal of historic features. One should place ramps on minor side elevations that are not readily visible and designed as an addition. The historic form is designed in keeping with the building and offers minimal visibility from street views. This section is (generally) supported by staff.

The alterations proposed to the upper level can be seen on page 50. The alteration is proposed to fill in a break between the current addition and the historic original portion of the building. When you are looking at the floor plan the area corresponds to the storage and janitor closet area. The guidelines state that additions be compatible with the historic building that differentiate it through methods like roof breaks, wall insets and wall offsets. A combination of these should be considered when an addition is undertaken. In this case, the existing façade break is already there. You can see that the addition was added in a way that you can see the difference between the historic house and the addition. One can see the evolution of the additions over time from the historic original building to the more current additions. The intent of the guidelines is to create a condition in which each section can be identified from one another showing the evolution of the buildings over time. What is proposed does not allow for the differentiating of the buildings over time. This portion of the alterations does not meet the intention of the guidelines. The State Historic Preservation Office also commented that the applicant limits the extension over the proposed rebuild side porch area to provide the differentiation between the historic portion, the updated portion and the new elements and to not overwhelm the footprint of the historic building.

Carriage House

The Carriage House is a non-historic building located on the Lewisburg Pike side of the subject property, beside and set back from the Winstead House across from the proposed driveway. The proposed changes include alteration of the roofline for the implementation of Gables and to modify the glass roof. As a non-historic building the guidelines (generally) support the proposed alterations as the roofline material and fenestration changes are designed to be in keeping with the original historic building (Winstead House). The changes improve the overall structures appropriateness within the historic district as supported by the guidelines. At the DRC's recommendation, the applicant did simplify the overall design by removing some previously proposed conjectural elements. The Carriage House will be modified to be more in keeping with the character of the historic elements of the site.

Relocated Buildings.

There is a request to relocate a building to the subject site that is not currently on the subject site. Looking at the site plan, the area of relocation will be on the front of the property along the Lewisburg Pike side. The proposed building to be relocated is the Rosenwald School in Springhill that has been neglected and threatened by demolition and imminent development. The guidelines state that one may relocate a building into the district if the building is appropriate to the surrounding, styles, height, scales materials and lot placement and does not result in loss of a historic building on the site. There is no consequence to adding the building to the subject site. From that perspective, the schoolhouse is contemporary in age compared to the surrounding buildings that possess an elevated level of integrity that make up the two historical districts. The relocation will not result in the loss of a historic building but will save an important piece of local and endangered African American history. The addition of the historical building will afford the community the opportunity to learn more about the historic significance of the building that is associated with the Julian Julius Rosenwald school program. It does not appear that the addition of the building will interrupt the census results associated with the site. Overall, the schoolhouse is proposed to be situated in a way that is respectful of the site and setting of the Winstead House and the other historic buildings on the property.

The applicant has provided evidence that the Smokehouse was never used as a smokehouse. The building has been given this colloquial term, but it is a historical outbuilding on the site. The building has been in various locations on the property, but it is currently behind the building entirely in the Mansard roof building area. The building is behind the larger addition that is behind the 1990's portion that was added to the side of the front façade. The Sanborn fire insurance maps provide historical information on how buildings look and change over time. The applicants provided a property survey that was conducted in 1973 and it is the applicant's contention that the building was not located there in 1973.

There may have been a building in this area, but it is not clear if it is this building (Smokehouse) or another building. It does not appear that the building matches the footprint to a great degree and proves not to be 100% accurate. Experience over time with the Sanborn maps has proven fairly accurate. The guidelines would recommend against relocation of outbuildings from their historic locations. In this case, it is not exactly clear where the building was located. It is staff's opinion that the Smokehouse may not have been originally located on the site and because of this, relocation is supported.

Applicant Presentation: Greg Gamble representing the Heritage Foundation. Mr. Gamble did not have anything further to add to his presentation. Mr. Gamble stated that the applicant agrees with staff on the recommendations/conditions four through eight.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that it was time for public comment portion.

Citizen Speakers

- Lillian Stewart @ 201 Lewisburg Ave. Ms. Stewart has concerns about the lighting in the residential section. Ms. Stewart asked, "Is it correct to say that staff does not recommend pole lights?"

Ms. Rose stated that the recommendation from staff is based on context. The HZC would need to decide the appropriate context of the site. Ms. Rose stated that staff is of the opinion that the site is of a residential context following the recommendation of the Secretary of Interior standards. The recommendations for use of the site state that the site be used as.....

- it was used historically
- altered in a way or adaptively reused in a way that offers minimal impact to the site and setting.

Ms. Rose stated that the area is a residential context being adaptively reused.

Vice-Chair Pearce noted the code requirements for the pole lights that would need to be considered.

Ms. Rose explained that if it is determined that other regulations require a certain amount of pole lighting, staff would bring the information back to the HZC to share the options available.

Ms. Stewart also mentioned her concern about the use of wood fencing on the property. She believes that brick walls would be much more effective as a buffer for neighbors and for the historic appearance.

Ms. Rose stated that it would be recommended that the commission determine the appropriateness based on the guidelines, regardless of what other regulations may be.

- Annie Daniel @ 311 Berry Cr. Ms. Daniel thanked the HZC for their commitment to the historical preservation of Franklin. Ms. Daniel stated that she is here to request that the HZC consider the value of preserving a desirable living environment for the adjoining neighborhood. Ms. Daniel asked the HZC to consider a way to retain the privacy of the adjacent neighborhoods. Ms. Daniel pointed out the positive ways businesses and homeowners have learned to coexist and enhance each other by creating walls and barriers that respect space and privacy of different lifestyles. Ms. Daniel also shared the neighborhood's desire to maintain privacy through effective light and sound barriers along the property line. Ms. Daniel also asked for only low

light mode lighting with strict rules of operation of time. She believes that repairs to the existing wood fencing is not a long-term solution for the property. Ms. Daniel is concerned that proper consideration of property barriers between the residential and public use areas have not been discussed seriously. The neighbors of the subject property are requesting, as the only solution to these issues, the construction of a durable masonry wall barrier.

- Eric George @ 313 Berry Cr. Mr. George stated that he has the same concerns as Ms. Daniel and fully supports her comments. Mr. George is concerned about privacy and feels that a barrier is needed. He is concerned about headlights shining onto his property, car engine/horn sounds and the sounds of people mingling having a good time penetrating neighboring gardens and porches.
- Walter Green @ 227 4th Ave. S. Mr. Green stated that he is a neighbor but not a neighbor on the perimeter of the property. Mr. Green is speaking on behalf of the neighbors of Franklin Grove and agrees with what has been discussed by the three previous speakers. Mr. Green requests that the city consider protecting neighbors from light pollution along with proper consideration of perimeter barrier protection. Mr. Green stated that he looks forward to communications with the Heritage Foundation in a small group setting with multiple neighbors present as opposed to individual discussion.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that a motion was needed from the board.

Ms. Rose recommended that the motions be made according to the sections of the proposal as presented by staff.

MOTION 1

- Approval with conditions of **Parking, Walkways, & Driveways** portion of the application, with staff's recommendations
 - Marquardt
 - LeMarinel

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Besser stated that she needed more information regarding the ramp and how the ramp would reach the parking lot.

Ms. Rose stated that the proposed ramp construction was covered during the grading section.

Commissioner Besser stated that she needed clarification on how someone could get from the parking spot to the ramp.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the ramp allows access to the front garden, not to the parking lot.

Ms. Rose recommended making these comments in the next motion, as well.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked if specific language is needed in the motion that relates to the Planning/Zoning commission or Public Works?

Ms. Rose stated that the recommendation was meant to cover the whole project.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked Ms. Rose to give her an example of a recommended motion.

Ms. Rose stated that the recommendation to the Commission for the parking/walkway and driveways is approval of those actions outlined in the staff report with the conditions for numbers seven and eight in the report. Those conditions state that the application meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit, including site plan approval and that any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to either staff or the HZC for review and approval.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION 1

- Include Staff Conditions #7-8:
 - #7 - The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit, including site plan approval.
 - #8 - Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

 - Laster
 - LeMarinel
 - Amendment to motion passed 6-0

- Motion 1, as amended, passed 6-0

MOTION 2 (page 3 of the staff report)

- Approval with conditions of **Grading Alterations** portion of application, with Staff Conditions #1-2 and #7-8
 - #1 - In accordance with the Guidelines, the proposed grading change/retaining wall construction directly in front of the Winstead House entrance must be removed from the design. Revised plans must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to site plan approval.
 - #2 - In accordance with the Guidelines, the proposed ramp at the ca. 1990 hyphen addition must either be removed from the proposal, or the applicant must submit additional information to substantiate review by the HZC in light of the applicable Guidelines. Specifically, additional information detailing on how the grade is proposed to be situated at this location must be provided, as well as an elevation rendering the proposed ramp design.
 - #7 - The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit, including site plan approval.
 - #8 - Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

 - LeMarinel
 - Marquardt
 - 6-0

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Marquardt confirmed/ asked if that the applicant would be required to do exactly as the motion indicates with staff conditions.

Ms. Rose stated that this is correct and if any changes should occur, the applicant is required to return to staff or the Commission for review and approval.

Commissioner LeMarinel summarized by stating that this eliminates the front grading around the front porch for now. We do not have sufficient information about the ramp and that we are in agreement with the rest of the grading.

Vice-Chair asked if there was any more discussion.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she was going to propose deferral of the ramp.

Vice-Chair stated that the HZC can defer or not approve it and the applicant will return with more details on the ramp.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she did not want the ramp to be lumped into the motion that was made.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that essentially, we are saying, with the condition that not enough information was provided about the ramp, without assigning a specific date for those changes to be complete, which is what deferral would do.

MOTION 3 (page 4 of the staff report)

Lighting

Ms. Rose stated that as a reminder, the staff recommendation is that the lighting plan meets the intent of the guidelines, except for the pole light fixtures, as shown, as they are not supported in a residential context. It would be up to the Commission to decide whether staff's interpretation of the context is agreed by the Commission. If pole lights end up being required by the City of Franklin, the application comes before the Commission at some point. The conditions include numbers three, seven and eight.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked Ms. Rose if she knew the number of lights for the site.

Commissioner Laster stated that there are 24 pole lights.

Mr. Gamble stated that he did not have a total number of lights because the project still must go through the site plan process and the codes requirement will determine the number of candles for the parking lot. The number of lights will be evaluated through this process. What is shown are the typical lights that one would use for the overall campus. The pole lights are included in the proposal to meet the candlelight requirements for a parking lot in the city of Franklin regulations. Mr. Gamble stated that they are ready to move on to the next level where the engineering details can be plugged into the site plan documents. It is our goal to keep low-profile lighting on the campus.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that a previous Commissioner made the Board aware of light pollution resulting in very few up-lighting approvals.

Commissioner Laster asked if the pole lighting should be separated from the other lighting on the property so that pole lights are not recommended to be used but the other types of lighting are recommended.

Ms. Rose stated that the application meets the intent of the guidelines, but it is important for the Commission to share their opinions so that staff can relate this information to other bodies that review the proposal. The Commission will have the opportunity to review any changes to the lighting beyond the conditions, whether approved or disapproved in the motion.

Ms. Rose stated that it would be perfectly fine to defer the decision if the Commission chooses to do that.

Commissioner Laster stated that candlelight and pole lights have been mentioned. The zoning ordinance applies to candle lights. The FMPC needs to hear what the HZC's opinion is about lighting.

Motion 3

- Denial of **Lighting** portion of application, as presented
 - Marquardt
 - LeMarinel

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Marquardt stated that not enough information has been received to decide lighting. We do not know how many or what kind of lights would be appropriate. The pole lights are controversial, and the Commission needs examples.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he seconded the motion to deny because with the information provided a photometric plan could be put together that would tell the neighbors exactly how many foot candles would be in their backyard. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he would be in favor of a recommendation to the FMPC and the BZA to reduce foot candle requirements as appropriate.

Ms. Rose stated that considering the guidelines that apply, this Commission can interpret and enforce the section on lighting including fixtures and illumination considerations. The new guidelines adopted in May state that the color of the bulb (warm or cool color) should be considered instead of the type of candle. If a warm color is recommended, more candles may be recommended. This body is entitled to look at the type of fixture, the number of fixtures and the color of the bulb.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that we are not supposed to consider the foot candles specifically, but if approval of the lighting at this point will in any way sacrifice the neighbor's needs, I cannot go along with it.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked counsel if it was appropriate for the applicant to speak at this point in the meeting.

Mr. Squires stated that given how complicated the back-and-forth discussion is, resulting in designing on the fly, it would be more productive to continue discussions.

Commissioner Worthington stated that the lamp selection would determine how the neighbors are affected by the light spray. Several answers can be determined by the type of lamp chosen.

Commissioner Laster stated that if specific zoning requirements are necessary for foot candles, there are other ways to accomplish the lighting requirements other than pole lights. It would be important to let the FMPC know our position on pole lights for the residential section.

Ms. Rose stated that the role of the Commission is to review the fixtures appropriateness in context.

Commissioner Laster asked if the property continues to be zoned as civil institutional.

Mr. Rose stated that there has been no request for rezoning of the property.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that there are pole lights existing on the property but not the variety called the goose neck or what most people would consider as pole lights.

Ms. Rose explained the role of the Commission for this meeting's purpose, to clear up any confusion. There must be a lighting plan approved by the FMPC considering the zoning ordinance. If comfortable, the HZC can review the lighting plan after the FMPC reviews the plan. If the FMPC approves the lighting plan, then this body can review the light fixtures for placement, fixture design and bulb color. Up lights or down lights can also be reviewed like anything in the design guide but still allow the applicant to continue to move forward. As Commissioner Laster discussed, any sort of information the HZC wants the FMPC to know, as it reviews this plan, can be relayed to that board.

Commissioner Laster stated that he would like to recommend the minimal amount of pole lighting to FMPC or even eliminate pole lighting from being a choice. There are existing pole lights on the site, currently. The recommendation to FMPC should include a return to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Rose noted the comments Commissioner Laster would like the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission to know.

Commissioner Marquardt asked if the HZC is entitled to review the lighting fixtures.

Ms. Rose commented that she would have to consult the design guidelines to provide the correct guidance. Ms. Rose stated further that the lighting should not overwhelm the context of the site, but the individual design and locations would be part of the review.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that from what he understands about lighting that one might choose a smaller light fixture but choose more of the smaller lights to avoid bleeding of larger lights. The types of light fixtures will impact the photometric plan. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he would be in favor of more fixtures.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked for assistance from counsel to state the motion correctly.

Mr. Squires stated that there is a motion to deny the lighting plan as presented and a second on the motion. This is the main motion. An amendment was offered to add a recommendation to the FMPC that the minimal amount of pole lights necessary be used and that the applicant should return to the HZC for review and approval.

Commissioner Laster noted that on page 40 there is a path light. The largest historical property on the National Register of Historic Places in Mount Pleasant, Kentucky. The historic site utilizes path lights to illuminate much of the property along with a few pole lights. The lighting is soft but with enough light to see your way around. This type of lighting could be utilized on the subject property.

Ms. Rose stated that she understands the Commission to say that there is confusion as to what regulations the other city bodies are required to rule on and that the confusion and lack of information is creating a situation where the Commission cannot make a decision.

Vice-Chair Pearce noted that she feels like the Board is trying to say it would like to see soft lighting on the property as well as meet the city standards.

Commissioner Laster stated that, as he understands currently, all motions regarding lighting state denial. The HZC would say to the Planning Commission, our recommendation is the minimal use of pole lights.

Ms. Rose stated that Commissioner Laster is correct.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she would like to add a condition that a Photometric Plan be completed and provided to the HZC.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that a Photometric Plan would be required as part of the site plan.

Ms. Rose stated that the City of Franklin will require a Photometric Plan, as part of the site plan review process. The HZC is entitled to review the light fixtures. If the city approves the site plan including the Photometric plan, the HZC can ask for this information while reviewing the light fixtures.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that it seems like the Commission and the applicant agree that minimal soft lighting is most appropriate. An amendment may need to be added, if possible, to say that generally the lighting be as soft as possible. It may turn out that pole lights might provide soft lighting in some locations on the property.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he would likely vote against the motion because a denial will bring the request back in the future.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that the amendment would need to be voted on.

Commissioner Laster suggested that he would remove his amendment and leave the motion as a denial.

Mr. Squires stated that Commissioner Laster could withdraw his amendment to the motion, if the Commissioner that seconded the motion agrees.

Commissioner Worthington agreed to the removal of the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Squires stated that the original motion to deny is now on the table.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked if there was any further discussion.

Ms. Rose stated that she would personally like to make it clear to the planning staff and the Planning Commission that the HZC feels strongly about limiting the brightness on the site and recommends the lowest amount of light possible while also meeting the city regulations.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that the motion is to deny the lighting plan.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked the Commissioners to vote.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION 3

- Made by Laster
- Seconded by Worthington
- PULLED AFTER MORE DISCUSSION

- Motion 3, as amended, passed 6-0

Review of Fences and Walls

Ms. Rose reviewed the fences and walls section of the proposal. The applicant proposes a slight relocation of walls due to the roadway or the implementation of new fences or walls which is shown in color on page 23 of the proposal documents. The perimeter fencing relates to the areas of the property that are adjacent to the residential properties. The applicant is not requesting any sort of action on those fences and walls. The action of the applicant would be to preserve and maintain those walls as some belong to neighbors. The role of the HZC is to review alterations to existing fences and walls, whether historic or not, to ensure that the applicant maintains historical materials and character, or that any alterations to non-historic fences or walls are in keeping with the character of the district. The Commission should review any changes or new requests considering the design guidelines for character, the character height and the character placement. It would not be in the Commission's purview to place conditions on any walls or fences that are not being requested in the plan. Any walls or fences not included in the plan are perceived to be appropriate for use or use conflict. Ms. Rose recommended that the citizens bring their concerns to the Planning Commission where their concerns could be addressed and considered. The HZC is not tasked with the responsibility of making those types of decisions.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION 4

Commissioner Laster stated that the perimeter fencing on page 24 of the proposal was not included as part of the fences and walls section for review.

Ms. Rose confirmed that was correct. The only areas that are actionable, regarding fences and walls, are the areas in color on page 23 of the proposal.

Vice-Chair Pearce responded to a citizen who asked a question by restating what Ms. Rose recommended earlier. "Citizens who are concerned about noise issues or light pollution should have their concerns heard at the FMPC meeting." If the FMPC approves a fence or wall, then the HZC would be entitled to provide guidance on those fences and walls.

Mr. Squires asked if there was a staff recommendation for the fence and wall portion of the proposal.

Ms. Rose stated that the staff conditions can be found on page 4 of the staff report. It is recommended that the Commission approve all the colored areas on page 24 of the proposal except for the area in green and the dotted purple color in front of the Winstead House. Ms. Rose recommended that the motion should be stated clearly that the green and dotted purple areas in front of the Winstead House are not included in the recommendation for approval. Conditions one, seven and eight are included as part of the approval of the fences and walls section.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked Mr. Gamble about the plans for the corner of South Margin Street and Lewisburg Pike of the subject property.

Robert Whittemore. Mr. Whittemore explained that they are planning to match similar materials to the existing rock wall.

Cyril Stewart with Belinda Steward Architects. Mr. Stewart stated that the corner is complicated because of intersection improvements required by the city along with high tension power lines coming down in this area.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she appreciates the community sharing their concerns with the Commission related to barrier walls /fencing but reiterated that it is not in the purview, of the HZC, to make those types of decisions.

Commissioner Laster asked the applicant if they are open to hearing the concerns from the citizens.

Mr. Gamble stated yes, we are open to hearing citizen input and concerns.

MOTION 4

- Approval with conditions for **Fences and Walls** portion of application on page 24, except for the wall and fence proposed directly in front of the Winstead House (green and dotted purple areas on page 24), and with Staff Conditions #1, #7-8
 - #1 - In accordance with the Guidelines, the proposed grading change/retaining wall construction directly in front of the Winstead House entrance must be removed from the design. Revised plans must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to site plan approval.
 - #7 - The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit, including site plan approval.
 - #8 - Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

- LeMarinel
- Laster
- 6-0

Review of Winstead House Alterations

Ms. Rose stated that the alterations will be specific to Winstead House. This includes demolition of select non-historic additions as seen on page 43 of the application including fenestration changes at the hyphen to allow for double entrance doors. Also, alterations to the existing non-historic Mansard roof

addition to adjust its scale, height, roofline, and its cladding. The Loggia or side porch is also included and is proposed to be built based on evidence that a side porch existed at one time. The ramp proposed at the left of the building at the hyphen that is proposed to be enclosed. A new addition at the back of the Mansard building and a second level footprint addition is proposed.

MOTION 5

- Approval with conditions for **Alterations to Winstead House** portion of application, with Staff Conditions #4-8
 - Worthington
 - Marquardt

Commissioner Laster asked if the window at the corner of the building was original. (page 48) “Will any current windows or doors be covered by the addition?”

Ms. Rose answered no.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked if staff was comfortable reviewing construction on the second level.

Ms. Rose stated that the conditions currently in place would cover this area. If any alteration should occur, those changes would need to be reviewed and approved by staff and the Commission.

Commissioner Laster asked when (date) the two-story open porch, seen on page 49 of the proposal, was built.

Ms. Rose stated that the sleeping porch was originally designed to be a sleeping porch, but the date is not known.

Commissioner Laster also pointed out on the Winstead south elevation, page 49, there is a hipped form gable. It does not appear to have this gable on the original structure.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that there is not a gable there but there is a sleeping porch that is enclosed currently and also an added open-air stairwell for an egress stair.

Ms. Rose stated that it was her understanding that the open-air component, stairwell, will be removed.

Mr. Stewart stated it is the intent to keep the sleeping porch, which was added sometime after 1900 in the early 20th century. The removal of the metal stairs is planned, but keep the sleeping porch intact as it is, and remove what was built in the 80's. There was no intention to change the roofline.

Commissioner Laster noted that an amendment would need to be added.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the front porch on the Mansard building seems to be Georgian with the Italianate design differing from other areas of the building. Everything doesn't have to match, but if 90% of the design is consistent and 10% is different, it seems peculiar.

Mr. Stewart stated that originally the direction was to keep the design like the front porch of the Winstead House. It was suggested by staff, at the DRC meeting, to simplify the interior. Mr. Stewart

went on to say that he would be happy to move forward whichever way the commission feels is appropriate.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that it's missing significant details along with the disparity in scaling. The trim details around the windows seem like they warrant some type of cornice over the windows. The trim details would break up and hold weight against the large plain walls.

Commissioner Besser stated that she agreed with Commissioner LeMarinel.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked if someone would like to make an amendment to the motion.

Ms. Rose stated that minor changes to non-historic elements of building elevations are now approvable by staff, according to the design guidelines. This is an option if the Commission feels comfortable allowing staff to make those types of decisions.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he would feel more comfortable adding an amendment to the motion rather than attempting to describe what it should look like.

Commissioner Besser stated that she was unclear what type of siding would be used on the Mansard building.

Ms. Rose stated that it would be wood lap siding.

- AMENDMENT TO MOTION 5
 - Removal of hipped gabled roof above the sleeping porch
 - Laster
 - Worthington
 - 6-0

- SECOND AMENDMENT TO MOTION 5
 - Applicant shall work with staff on appropriate detailing/trim details for the Mansard building
 - LeMarinel
 - Besser
 - 6-0

- Motion 5, as amended twice, passed 6-0

MOTION 6

- Approval with conditions of Alterations to **Carriage House** portion of application, with Staff Conditions #6-8
 - Laster
 - LeMarinel
 - 6-0

Ms. Rose stated that it is recommended that the Commission support the application as amended with conditions six, seven and eight.

Mr. Squires pointed out that, according to Mr. Gamble's presentation, the applicant does not have any objections to numbers four through eight.

Ms. Rose stated that the Commission is adding those specifically to the motion.

Commissioner LeMarinel remarked that the canopies over the entry point are not noted as to how far those will emerge from the building.

Mr. Stewart clarified that the short canopies would not go beyond the edge of the existing roof other than a short distance to protect the entry.

Ms. Rose added that the depth would be akin to the distance like canvas awnings (18") but would be made of wood material and permanent. Ms. Rose offered to work with the applicant on the specifications if the Commission would like to add this condition.

Review of the Relocation of Lee-Buckner Rosenwald School onto Site (Page 54)

Ms. Rose stated that originally there were a number of alterations not supported by staff, but all of the alterations have been adjusted to meet staff recommendations. Therefore, it is recommended that the Commission approve the proposed relocation of the Rosenwald School with conditions six, seven, and eight.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked if there was a motion to approve the relocation.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Besser stated that condition six states that composite material would be acceptable, but in her opinion, the material should be wood.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked if Commissioner Besser would like to add an amendment.

Commissioner Besser stated that she would like to add an amendment that would state that wood material be used for siding and windows.

Commissioner Laster stated that he had not seen an outhouse proposed.

Mr. Stewart stated that all the groups that have reviewed the proposal agree that an outhouse would be appropriate. Original photographs of Lee-Buckner School indicate a small modest outhouse. The outhouse is tucked in behind the site of the school so that it is part of the context but not obtrusive. Mr. Stewart did note that the outhouse would not be in working order.

Vice-Chair Pearce asked the Commission to vote on the amendment and then the main motion.

MOTION 7

- Approval with conditions of **Relocation of Lee-Buckner Rosenwald School onto Site**, with Staff Conditions #6-8
 - Marquardt
 - LeMarinel

AMENDMENT TO MOTION 7

- Building must have wood siding and wood windows
 - Besser
 - Laster
 - 6-0

- Motion, as amended, passed 6-0

Review of the Relocation of Smokehouse within Site

Ms. Rose stated that it is recommended that the Commission approve as shown with conditions six and seven.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Besser stated that she is concerned that the Smokehouse is sitting on aggregate concrete banks. It may be problematic when the building is removed.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he agreed with Commissioner Besser regarding the relocation of the Smokehouse.

Commissioner Laster asked the applicant if the brackets in the corners, on page 51, currently existing.

Mr. Stewart stated that there are no plans to change anything on the Smokehouse. The door may be replaced with a door that is more appropriate. Mr. Stewart also stated that the foundation would be changed and that excellent movers have been selected for the relocation of the Smokehouse and the School. Relocation of the Smokehouse will not compare to the relocation of the Rosenwald school.

Commissioner Worthington pointed out the brackets that can be seen on page 49.

Commissioner Laster stated that he would vote no on the relocation of the historic building as recommended by the historic design guidelines, but also stated that the spot of the relocation is much improved from previous proposals.

Vice-Chair Pearce stated that there being no other discussion, there is a motion on the floor to approve the relocation of the Smokehouse.

MOTION 8

- Approval with conditions of **Relocation of Smokehouse within Site**, with Staff Conditions #6-8
 - Besser
 - LeMarinel
 - 4-2, with Laster & Worthington voting no

Ms. Rose mentioned that the item will require approval by the Planning Commission, not for the alterations to buildings, but for the overall plan.

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC (NOT READ INTO MINUTES)

- Minor Alterations (Siding) at 123 5th Ave. N.; Noel Jones, Applicant.
- Rear Yard Fencing at 906 Fair St.; Cliff Jones, Applicant.
- Rear Yard Fencing at 119 Winslow Rd.; Danny Anderson, Applicant.
- Rear Yard Fencing at 1315 Adams St.; Michael Cameron, Applicant.
- Signage at 141 1st Ave. N.; Frankie Courtney, Applicant.

ADJOURN

Motion to Adjourn (8:51 pm)

- Passed 6-0