

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
November 12, 2018**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, November 12, 2018, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Susan Besser
Jim Roberts
Mike Hathaway
Kelly Baker-Hefley
Lisa Marquardt
Jeff Carson (arrived at 5:06)
Mary Pearce

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
James Svoboda, Planning & Sustainability Department
Joey Bryan, Planning & Sustainability Department
Tiffani Pope, Law Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Chairwoman Besser called the November 12, 2018 meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

**Item 2:
Minutes: October 8, 2018**

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to approve the October 8, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

**Item 3:
Consideration of 2019 Historic Zoning Commission and Design Review Committee Meeting Dates and Application/Notification Deadlines.**

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the 2019 Historic Zoning Commission and Design Review Committee Meeting Dates and Application/Notification Deadlines. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion passed 7-0.

**Items 4:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated there will be a special DRC site visit at 2:30 pm at Huffines Ridge Drive next Monday. Ms. Rose stated after the site visit, the committee would convene back at the City Hall Training Room for the regular DRC meeting.

**Item 5:
Consideration of Requests to place non-agenda emergency items on the agenda.**

No one requested to add any non-agenda items.

Item 6:

Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

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

No one requested to speak.

Item 7:

Consideration of Signage at 231 Public Sq., Ste. 102; Jennifer Martens, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of wall signage and projecting arm signage at 231 Public Sq., Ste. 102. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its October 15, 2018 meeting.

Ms. Rose stated the proposed wall sign is aluminum and features applied, brushed aluminum letters of a ¼” depth. Ms. Rose stated the aluminum material is appropriate, and the proposed design features a no more than three colors (black background with gray/silver lettering). Ms. Rose stated the proposed location is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines* and consistent with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee. Ms. Rose stated it is proposed to be placed above the storefront and below the lintel, which is the most logical placement based on the fenestration pattern of the rehabilitated building and this location is not out of scale or substantially different than sign locations on nearby buildings. Ms. Rose stated the proposed projecting arm sign is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the applicant redesigned the proposed sign so that the face is situated below the arm, which is more in keeping with the design of similar signs in the downtown area. Ms. Rose stated the proposed sign is aluminum and features applied, brushed aluminum letters of a ¼” depth. Ms. Rose stated the aluminum material is appropriate, and the proposed design features a no more than three colors (black background with gray/silver lettering). Ms. Rose stated the proposed location, however, is just short of the 8-foot grade clearance *Guidelines* recommendation and Zoning Ordinance requirement (p.120, #2).

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

1. The projecting arm sign must be situated so that the bottom of the sign is a minimum of 8 feet above grade, per *Guidelines* recommendations (p.120, #2) and Zoning Ordinance requirements.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a sign permit. Any proposed changes must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a sign permit.

Ms. Martens stated everything was pretty straightforward.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6848 for the signage in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

The motion carried forward 7-0.

**Item 8:
Consideration of Signage at 1753 Players Mill Rd.; S. Chris Getman, Applicant.**

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the placement of a monument-style sign at 1753 Players Mill Rd. Ms. Rose stated the property is located adjacent to the National Register-listed Seward Hall and is located within the Historic Preservation Overlay. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that monument-style signs are not recommended for use in nonresidential district may be appropriate for civic or institutional uses (p.120, #10). Ms. Rose stated if used, the *Guidelines* recommend that monument signs measure no more than 12 square feet for the total sign surface and 6 feet for the total sign height (p.120, #2). Ms. Rose stated the sign materials are recommended to be wood, metal, or composite materials that have the appearance of historic sign materials (p.120, #11). Ms. Rose stated the monument sign is proposed to be placed at a large institutional site. Ms. Rose stated while the site is located within the Historic Preservation Overlay, it is not located within a historic district. Ms. Rose stated the proposed sign type is appropriate in light of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the proposed sign's design, however, is not entirely consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated it is proposed to consist of two stone veneer piers with a 19-sq. ft. high-density urethane (HDU) sign panel between them. Ms. Rose stated the panel is proposed to feature a dark brown background with white lettering and logo. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that the total sign surface of a monument sign measure no more than 12 square feet (p.120, #2). Ms. Rose stated the applicant modified the original proposal in order to utilize a stone veneer that is more in keeping with the style of the stone used at the historic Seward Hall site, which is in keeping with the recommendations of the Preservation Planner.

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

1. Unless otherwise approved by the Historic Zoning Commission, the applicant must modify the size of the sign surface so that it measures no more than 12 square feet, as recommended by the *Guidelines*.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department for issuance of a sign permit, and any proposed changes must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Getman stated they did generate a larger sign, so it would be more legible for traffic.

Ms. Rose stated Mr. Getman had a sample of the materials, and they were passed around for Commissioners to view.

Discussion ensued on the material between the applicant and Commissioners.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6851 for the monument signage, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Pearce stated she supports the motion as it is.

Mr. Roberts stated the width is the issue with the sign size but that the height can be adjusted.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

The motion was approved 7-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of Alteration (Porch Expansion, Dormer Addition) at 126 Harlinsdale Ct.; Joshua Orr, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the principal and accessory structures located at 126 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 5). Ms. Rose stated the following alterations are proposed:

- The expansion of the front porch to cover the entire width of the front façade of the principal structure (adding approximately 97 sq. ft.);
- The addition of a shed dormer onto the left side of the attached garage roof; and
- The addition of a shed dormer onto the right side of the attached garage roof.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its August 20, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose noted the proposed pool deck does not require issuance of a COA itself; rather, the applicant must receive a COA for the required security fencing prior to installation. Ms. Rose stated the fencing must qualify for administrative approval.

Ms. Rose stated the subject property features new construction. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detract from the character of the historic district (p.66, #4). Ms. Rose stated the dormers are recommended to “relate to the style and proportion of windows on the principal structure” and “be set back a minimum of two feet from the exterior wall” (p.64, #5). Ms. Rose stated the new accessory buildings should “use components typically used in historic equivalents” (p.64, #6). Ms. Rose stated one of the proposed dormers—the one proposed for placement on the right side of the gabled roof—offers limited, if any visibility, for the street, as designed. Ms. Rose stated the left dormer will visible from the street, appears to be situated a minimum of two feet from the exterior wall, and is comparable to dormer placement on similar buildings within the infill neighborhood. Ms. Rose stated the proposed porch expansion is appropriate, as full-width porches are common within the infill neighborhood. Ms. Rose stated the expansion is proposed to match the style and materials of that previously approved for the existing porch. Ms. Rose stated the total building coverage on the lot is approximately 29.3 percent, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts (including R-2, the zoning of this lot), as measured by building footprint.

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

1. All windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Orr stated he had no comments because Ms. Rose did wonderfully on her report.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6849 for the proposed alterations in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Item 10:

Consideration of New Construction at 130 Harlinsdale Ct.; Andrew King, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a two-story single-family residence with attached two-bay garage and detached one-bay garage at 130 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 6). Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its May 21, 2018 and August 20, 2018 meetings. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detract from the character of the historic district (p.66, #4). Ms. Rose stated further, the *Guidelines* state that the height of new construction should be compatible with the existing buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street and that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street (p.66, #5). Ms. Rose stated the subject property is located along a street that terminates at a cul de sac. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street and since there is no true “block face” on this curvilinear street, the neighboring structures are the most applicable to the *Guidelines* recommendation. Ms. Rose stated the most immediate neighboring lots with approved buildings include 122, 126, 134, 135, 127, and 123 Harlinsdale Ct., as follows:

- 122 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 4) – 36’-11”
- 126 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 5) – 35’-9”
- 134 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 7) – approximately 30’
- 135 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 8) – 38’-2”
- 131 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 9) – VACANT with no approved building
- 127 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 10) – 36’-6”
- 123 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 11) – 37’

Ms. Rose stated the approximate average height of the approved structures on these lots is approximately 35’-9”. Ms. Rose stated the height range deduced from calculating both 10 percent above and below this average is approximately 32’-2” to 39’-4”. Ms. Rose stated the proposed overall height of 39’-10” is not consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated that the proposed 30’ front setback is relatively consistent with those previously approved along the street and that the proposed foundation height along the main form of the structure at the front elevation appears to be consistent with the foundation height of the adjacent structures on the same side of the street (p.67, #12).

Ms. Rose stated that the proportion and rhythm of window openings are consistent with the *Guidelines*, which recommend maintenance of the rhythm and spacing of window and door openings of adjacent structures (p.68, #17).

Ms. Rose stated that the materials of the proposed new construction (gray/brown Tennessee limestone, cementitious lap siding of a 5" exposure, cementitious board-and-batten siding, composite shingles, standing seam metal roofing, stone chimneys) are consistent with the *Guidelines*, and she stated that the window and garage door specifications have not been provided.

Ms. Rose stated that the proposed attached garage is mostly consistent with the *Guidelines*, as it side loaded and integrated into the form of the principal structure in such a way as to not be visible from viewsheds immediately in front of the principal structure. The detached accessory structure is designed in such a way that it is located at a traditional location behind the rear plane of the main form of the structure (p.68, #22).

Ms. Rose stated that the total building coverage on the lot is approximately 35 percent, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts (including R-2, the zoning of this lot), as measured by building footprint.

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

1. The proposed overall height, 39'-10", at does not meet the recommendations of the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* state that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street. Since there is no true "block face" on this curvilinear street that terminates in a cul de sac, the neighboring structures are the most applicable to the *Guidelines* recommendation. The six most immediate neighboring lots with approved buildings were used to calculate the average height, which is approximately 35'-9". The height range deduced from calculating both 10 percent above and below this average is approximately 32'-2" to 39'-4". As such, the overall height of proposed principal structure, at 39'-10", must be lowered slightly to meet the intent of the *Guidelines*. The revised elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. All windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any proposed changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval. Specifications for any required flood vents will be required to be submitted with the building permit application materials.

Ms. Rose stated the board-and-batten siding, while an appropriate siding material within the Harlinsdale Manor neighborhood of the Franklin Road Historic District, may exaggerate the verticality of the structure on which it is placed. Ms. Rose stated the use of horizontal lap siding on the proposed principal structure may assist with softening the perception of the overall height.

Mr. King stated he had no comments.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6850 for the proposed new construction in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt stated the roofing material from the rendering looks almost like a standing seam.

Mr. King stated it is mostly composite shingle material, except on the front porch, which is standing seam.

Chairwoman Besser request clarification that the modified 38-foot height is part of this motion.

Ms. Rose stated that was a good question and wanted clarification as well.

Mr. Roberts moved to amend that the overall height to be 38-feet and requested to see a drawing of the elevation. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to have the garage sit parallel to the house.

Ms. Rose suggested Mr. King to clarify more on the lot.

Mr. King explained that it is on a cul-de-sac and explained that if angled, it would be pointing at the neighboring garage.

Discussion ensued on how the garage and house should sit. Mr. Bryan projected the Google street view of the property.

Ms. Pearce withdrew her motion to have the garage sit parallel to the house.

Ms. Pearce moved to have the posts on the front porch be lowered and simplified with a base of stone or wood and brought back to staff for approval. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-1, with Chairwoman Besser voting no.

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

Item 11:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved New Construction (Footprint & Facade Modification) at 99 E. Main St.; Chartwell Hospitality, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction at 99 E. Main St. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has indicated that a discovery of a Middle Tennessee Electric easement will require the building footprint to be modified at the 1st Ave. S. area of the site, reducing the footprint and creating the need for façade alterations that are directly related to the footprint modification. Ms. Rose stated the proposed footprint alteration is requested to modify the footprint from the previously approved 18,625 sq. ft. area (including covered walkway) to 17, 986 (including covered walkway). Ms. Rose stated the main façade modifications stemming for the reduction are as follows:

- the removal of the cantilevered second floor and covered walkway from the 1st Ave. S. façade (see Exhibit 1);

- the removal of one window bay from the E. Main St. elevation, near the street intersection (see Exhibit 1);
- the introduction of entrance doors onto the chamfered elevation, near the street intersection (see Exhibit 1); and
- the removal of own window from the parking lot elevation, near the fire escape (see Exhibit 2).

Ms. Rose stated the proposed alterations continue to reinforce the architectural features of adjacent buildings and therefore meet the intent of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following conditions:

1. All previous COA conditions of approval remain in effect, as follows:
 - a. All brick materials be “compatible in size, profile, and detailing with historic materials.” The applicant must provide compatible brick samples for consideration and approval by the Historic Zoning Commission prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - b. Parking screening should be provided through the use of landscape elements or brick walls (both of which are common to the historic district) so as to retain the general setback pattern.
 - c. Any utilities proposed for placement on the top of the building must be placed such that distance or elements like parapets keep them from view, per the *Guidelines*. Grounded utilities must also be screened from street view, per the *Guidelines*.
2. The application must meet the requirements of the City for site plan approval and building permitting.
3. Any exterior alterations to the plan set, including, but not limited to, foundation height, overall building height, materials, architectural features, and building footprint, must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration and approval in light of the *Guidelines*.
4. All signage, awnings, building-mounted lighting, and individual storefront configurations require additional information and more detailed specifications be submitted to the Preservation Planner for determination of eligibility for COAs. This information must be submitted in the form of COA applications at later dates.

Mr. Reece stated they had to back off 20-feet due to powerlines. Mr. Reece stated they took out a 10-foot sliver of the middle of the building and left the elevations intact.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6852 for the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with staff’s comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce suggested an awning could go over the front door.

Ms. Marquardt requested to know if the awning would come back to this commission.

Ms. Rose explained that more information is needed to make the determination of whether a proposed awning would meet administrative review criteria.

With the motion having been made, the motion carried 7-0.

Item 12:

Consideration of Alterations (Window Replacement) at 230 Public Sq.; Fifth Third Bank, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of select windows at 230 Public Sq. Ms. Rose stated the locations of the windows proposed for replacement are as follows:

- A total of 7 windows along the upper story of the E. Main St. façade;
- A total of 4 windows along the upper story of the rear façade (facing drive-thru and Baskin Robbins); and
- A total of 16 windows along the rear façade on the backside of the drive-thru (at back entry alcove).

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to replacement 27 existing fixed wood windows with new single-hung windows to match the existing muntin patterns. Ms. Rose stated the windows on the E. Main St. façade are of a one-over-one lite pattern, while the windows on the rear elevation are feature either four-over-four lite patterns or one-over-one lite patterns. Ms. Rose stated the windows appear to be historic in age, though it is not clear if they are original. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of original windows, opening dimensions, and details (p.129, #1). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that replacement windows (if originals are missing) match the historic materials found on the building (p.129, #5) and be appropriate to the period of the building, and as such, a late 19th or early 20th century building is recommended to utilize four-over-four, two-over-two, or one-over-one sashes with distinct meeting rails and an operable appearance (p.129, #7). Ms. Rose stated per the *Guidelines*, wood, anodized aluminum with dark bronze finishes may be appropriate for replacement windows (p.129, #9). Ms. Rose stated the applicant does not list the reason for the proposed replacement within the application materials. Ms. Rose stated the applicant's consultant, Mr. John Shurley, contacted staff in October 2018 to discuss the state of repair of the windows. Ms. Rose explained that Mr. Shurley's request, staff inspected several of the lower and upper-story windows on October 11, 2018. Ms. Rose stated the inspection of the upper-story windows took place from the interior of the building. Ms. Rose stated while most of the front façade (Public Sq.) windows appear to be in good repair, many of the windows along the E. Main St. and rear facades are dry rotted with voids in the frames and sills. Ms. Rose stated one window on the E. Main St. elevation has a broken bottom sash with the glazing removed. Ms. Rose stated it is currently boarded. Ms. Rose stated window replacement may be substantiated due to the safety hazard that may be presented by the many of the E. Main St. and rear façade windows. Ms. Rose stated the use of a one-over-one lite pattern on the E. Main St. façade and four-over-four lite pattern along the rear façade is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the traditional wood series of the window specifications provided for consideration is appropriate for use as replacement windows at these locations, as the proposed specifications will allow the "upper facades" to "retain their historic appearance and details" (p.129). Ms. Rose stated the it is recommended that the Historic Zoning approve with conditions the proposed window replacement request with the following:

1. The applicant must utilize the traditional wood series (and not the contemporary wood series) of the proposed window specifications. A one-over-one lite pattern must be maintained on the E. Main St. elevation, and the rear façades must utilize a consistent one-over-one and four-over-four lite pattern.
2. In keeping with the *Guidelines*, the original window opening dimensions cannot be altered in any way in order to achieve window replacement.

3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Shurley stated Ms. Rose has done a very good job and that one-over-one windows would be more historically appropriate for replacement profiles.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6853 for the replacement of select windows along the E. Main St. and rear facades with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated she saw a photograph of only the front of the building and the windows were one-over-one profile.

Mr. King stated the windows on the front are original.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to replace in-kind, like for like. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion carried 7-0.

The main motion carried 7-0.

Item:13

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved New Construction (Height) at 331 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 4); Bristol Fair Park Holdings LLC, Applicant.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 331 Fair Park Ct. (formerly Lot 3; now Lot 4). Ms. Rose stated the residence is proposed to be situated to front Fair Park Ct. and back against floodplain areas visible from Highway 96W. Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a COA from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative six-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a requested lot size increase on December 11, 2017. On June 11, 2018, the Historic Zoning Commission considered and approved a series of requested alterations relating to garage size, roof planes, and siding type. Ms. Rose stated the newly-proposed alterations are limited to height. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting approval to change from a slab-on-grade construction method to an elevated foundation, as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Rose stated it also appears that additional height is proposed beyond that necessitated for the adjusted foundation height. Ms. Rose stated the previous COA stated that as a condition of approval, "any deviation from the overall height (approximately 31'-3" at the highest point of the front elevation and approximately 35' at the highest point of the rear elevation, foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be presented to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to construction."

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detract from the character of the historic district (p.66, #4). Ms. Rose stated the further, the *Guidelines* state that the height of new construction should be compatible with the existing buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street and that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street (p.66, #5).

1. The subject property is located along a newly-created street that has previously-approved new construction. The *Guidelines* state that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street. The adjacent lot on the same side of the street with an approved building is 325 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 2).
 - 325 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 2) – approved at 28’-8” at the highest point of the front elevation and 31’6” at the highest point of the rear elevation
 - 331 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 4 – subject property) – previously approved at 31’-3” at the highest point of the front elevation and approximately 35’ at the highest point of the rear elevation
2. The approximate average height of the approved structures on these lots (include that previously approved for the subject lot) is approximately 30’ at the front elevation and approximately 33’-3” at the rear elevation.
3. The height range deduced from calculating both 10 percent above and below this average is approximately 27’ to 33’ at the front elevation and approximately 29’-11” to 36’-6” at the rear elevation.
4. The applicant’s architect indicated to staff that the proposed height shown on the plan set is that of the front elevation, at 32’-8”. Therefore, the proposed front elevation height of 32’-8” is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Unless substantial grading changes have been made to the site since the previous approval, it can be inferred that the newly-proposed rear elevation height, which is not indicated, is different than that of the front elevation. Thus, it is unclear if the overall height, and not just the front elevation height, meets the intent of the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* state that the height of new construction should be compatible with the existing buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street and that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street (p.66, #5).
 - The applicant’s architect indicated to staff that the proposed height shown on the plan set is that of the front elevation, at 32’-8”. Using the calculation prescribed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed front elevation height of 32’-8” is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Unless substantial grading changes have been made to the site since the previous approval, it can be inferred that the newly-proposed rear elevation height—which is not indicated—is different than that of the front elevation, as the previous approval for the rear elevation height varied from that on the front by nearly 4’. Because of this, it is unclear if the overall height, and not just the front elevation height, meets the intent of the *Guidelines*.
2. The façade materials on the rear elevation must meet the intent of the previous condition of approval for this project, which states that “the siding treatment must be uniform as either lap

siding or vertical board-and batten on each building projection,” with a note that “lap siding treatment is more common to the historic district.” To meet this previous condition of approval, the applicant must use lap siding along the entire rear elevation, as the shed projection was removed from the design and no longer creates a natural roof break to introduce a secondary siding material.

3. As a previous condition of approval, window and garage door material specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
5. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Hathaway stated there were several height adjustments and apologized for not showing the grade difference. Mr. Hathaway stated this site cannot be seen from Highway 96W due to the wooded growth. Mr. Hathaway stated they did add height but that it was less than 10% of the overall average of the approved elevations. Mr. Hathaway stated they would request no deferral tonight.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer review of Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #6854 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018, until the next DRC meeting on December 10th meeting. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Item:14

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved New Construction (Height) at 332 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 5); Bristol Fair Park Holdings LLC, Applicant.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved new construction of a two-story single-family residence at 332 Fair Park Ct. (formerly Lot 4; now Lot 5).

Ms. Rose stated the project was originally approved for issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Zoning Commission at its April 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the project was then approved for an administrative 6-month extension per COA Extension Policy effective until October 11, 2017. Ms. Rose stated the Historic Zoning Commission approved a request lot size increase on December 11, 2017. On June 11, 2018, the Historic Zoning Commission considered and approved requested alterations relating to garage and footprint size.

Ms. Rose stated the newly-proposed alterations are limited to height. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting approval to change from a slab-on-grade construction method to an elevated foundation, as

required by the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Rose stated it also appears that additional height is proposed beyond that necessitated for the adjusted foundation height. Ms. Rose stated the previous COA stated that as a condition of approval, “any deviation from the overall height (27’-9”), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be presented to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to construction.”

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detract from the character of the historic district (p.66, #4). Ms. Rose stated further, the *Guidelines* state that the height of new construction should be compatible with the existing buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street and that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street (p.66, #5).

1. The subject property is located along a newly-created street that has previously-approved new construction. The *Guidelines* state that compatibility is generally achieved by building within 10 percent above or below the average height of the buildings on the same block face on the same side of the street. The lots of the same side of the street with approved buildings are 326 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6) and 320 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 7).
 - 326 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 6) – approved at 29’-10” at the highest point of the hipped roof and 28’-6” at the highest point of the gable roof
 - 320 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 7) – approved at 29’-10” at the gable
 - 332 Fair Park Ct. (Lot 5 – subject property) – previously approved at 27’-9”
2. The approximate average height of the approved structures on these lots (include that previously approved for the subject lot) is approximately 29’-2”. The height range deduced from calculating both 10 percent above and below this average is approximately 26’-3” to 32’-1”. Therefore, the proposed front elevation height of 31’-5” is consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the with conditions the proposed alterations to the previously-approved new construction with the following:

1. Any deviation from the overall height (31’-5”), foundation height, finished floor elevation, lot coverage, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to construction.
2. As a previous condition of approval, window and garage door material specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
4. A scaled set of all elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Finished floor elevation;
 - Exact overall building height; and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Mr. Hathaway stated they had need for extra height from the previously approved due to the hip roofs and helps elevate some of the height. Mr. Hathaway stated they stayed within the 10% average size.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if any citizens wished to speak on this item, and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6855 for the alterations to the previously-approved new construction, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated November 12, 2018. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts requested to know if there was any visibility from Fair Street.

Mr. Hathaway stated no.

Chairwoman Besser requested to know if the ceiling heights had been determined previously.

Mr. Hathaway stated he cannot speak to that originally and explained he was looking at what market conditions were that and some adjustments were made due to that, with a 10-ft. ceiling height downstairs and a 9-ft. ceiling upstairs.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if any changes were made to the front façade.

Ms. Rose stated they could pull up the previously-approved plan.

The motion carried 6-0.

Item 15:

Non-agenda emergency items accepted by the commission for consideration.

There were no non-agenda emergency items.

Item 16:

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

Acting Secretary