

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
MAY 13, 2019**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, May 13, 2019, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley
Susan Besser
Jeff Carson
Brian Laster
Lisa Marquardt
Jim Roberts

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department
Kelly Dannenfelser, Planning & Sustainability Department
Tiffani Pope, Law Department

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the May 13, 2019 meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**Item 2:
Minutes: April 8, 2018.**

Ms. Besser moved to approve the April 8, 2019 minutes with one small spelling correction. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

**Items 3:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated there is a Design Review meeting on Monday at May 20th at 4 p.m. Ms. Rose stated there will be a special DRC site visit at 3 p.m. that same day.

**Item 4:
Consideration of Requests to place non-agenda emergency items on the agenda.**

No one requested to add any non-agenda items.

**Item 5:
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.

Ms. Pam Whitson from 803 Fair Street, stated the Fair Street house, that she refers to as the Airplane House, has been compromised to the point that it no longer fits into the neighborhood unless it is painted.

Ms. Whitson stated there were several neighbors here tonight as well who wish the house to be painted. Ms. Whitson stated the person working on it stated it was denied by this commission to be painted.

Ms. Rose stated there maybe some miscommunication with this item and the contractor asked if the house could be painted and advice given by staff was brick is not usually allowed to be painted. Ms. Rose stated this project has not come before this commission for any review.

Ms. Whitson stated her other concern was about Fair Park and how it does not fit into the neighborhood. Ms. Whitson stated it is too tall and not appropriate with their neighborhood at all. Ms. Whitson stated she is concerned about the other homes going to be built there and hopes this commission will make changes.

Item 6:

Consideration of Storage Addition at 112 2nd Ave. S.; Pull-Tight Players, Inc., Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of the temporary rear storage area with a roofed storage addition. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its December 17, 2018 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the existing rear storage area consists of vertical plank fencing that backs to the brick wall of the theater. Approximately half of the area is covered by a metal awning. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is seeking approval to remove the temporary fencing structure and to replace it for a roofed storage addition. Ms. Rose stated the addition is proposed to run from the right side of the rear pedestrian door, toward the right and rear corner of the brick wall of the theater (as viewed from the rear). Ms. Rose stated it is proposed to consist of 8' vertical siding and a concrete slab foundation, to be covered with a metal awning that spans the addition area and extends over the pedestrian door. Ms. Rose stated access doors are proposed to be located on to left side and back side of the addition (as viewed from the rear). Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed storage addition with the following:

1. The applicant has not indicated the type of siding proposed for use. Due to the vernacular nature of the historic building and the addition's proposed use, the use of either wood or smooth-faced cementitious siding is appropriate. The applicant must submit the material specifications to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The applicant has not indicated the type of metal roofing proposed for use. Due to the vernacular nature of the historic building and the addition's proposed use, the use of an agricultural grade (5V) roofing material is appropriate. The applicant must submit the material specifications to the Preservation Planner for review and approval 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 to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner and/or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Brad Wilson stated Ms. Rose has done a great job with the presentation. Mr. Wilson showed a sample of the material that is a cement like material in a 4 by 8 sheet with a vertical trimming. Mr. Wilson stated they did not have a sample of the roof material but did have a picture of it.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6982 for the proposal with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster requested to know if the applicant had considered horizontal siding.

Mr. Wilson stated they were trying to match what is already there.

Discussion ensued on the door and that the City would want to make it look better.

Mr. Laster stated he moved to amend the motion to include altering siding orientation from vertical to horizontal, using a 4-4.5-inch reveal, with the siding being wood or smooth face material. Mr. Laster also stated that the exterior door must come back to staff for review as part of the motion. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Laster questioned if the where the existing roof awning that covers the storage area attaches to the wooden lintel above the transom.

Mr. Wilson stated that the new roofing would be above it.

Mr. Laster questioned if it would attached or detached.

Mr. Wilson stated he needed more information.

Ms. Rose stated the roof pitch will tie above the transom and lintel.

Mr. Laster requested to know if the flashing is going to be a cut line or if it uses the existing mortar joint.

Ms. Rose stated she did not know.

Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to include that an existing mortar line be used as the cut line for flashing and that the existing brick should not be moved or altered for a cut line. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

With the main motion having been made and amended twice, the motion carried 6-0.

Item 7:

Consideration of Additions (Principal), Alterations (Principal), Relocation (Accessory), and Wall at 424 S. Margin St.; Don Burke, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 424 S. Margin St., as follows:

1. The construction of an enclosed addition to accommodate a kitchen/circulation area, a two-bay garage, and a master suite;
2. The construction of a side elevation covered porch;
3. The alteration of existing roof dormers;
4. The restoration or replacement of side and rear elevation windows;
5. The construction of a primary yard wall; and
6. The relocation of an outbuilding from directly behind the principal structure to an area in the side yard, in order to accommodate the proposed addition.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its November 19, 2018 and February 18, 2019 meetings. Ms. Rose stated the applicant also hosted a Special DRC site visit at the subject property on April 9, 2019. Ms. Rose stated the proposed

addition has been designed to consist of three masses. Ms. Rose stated utilizing a “connector” design, the applicant is proposing the construction of an enclosed kitchen/circulation area at the rear of the existing house, which differentiates the form from that of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated that the addition then extends rearward, with a “connector” tying into a new two-bay garage mass, and then leftward (toward 5th Ave. S.) to a master suite mass. Ms. Rose stated while the bulk of the addition is located behind the historic structure, the mass containing the master suite is proposed to be visible from vantage points in front of the house. Ms. Rose stated the proposal, as such, is not entirely consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines* for placement, which support placed on obscured elevations with limited visibility (p.54, #1). Ms. Rose stated a side addition may be appropriate due to constraints on the property—which is much wider than it is deep—and the enclosed addition is entirely recessed behind the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated the use of the connector design was recommended by staff and largely supported by the Design Review Committee when discussed during its April 9, 2019 site visit. Ms. Rose stated the “connector” design lessens the overall mass of the proposed addition. Ms. Rose stated the footprint of the proposed enclosed addition measures 2,378 sq. ft., which equates to a 112 percent addition to the existing structure (2,121 sq. ft. footprint), which is not consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.54, #4). Ms. Rose stated the proposed lot coverage (including proposed covered porch addition) measures 31.5 percent, which is consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55, #5). Ms. Rose stated the materials of the proposed enclosed addition (stone foundation, painted wood fascia, cut stone quoining, brick veneer, wood panel (on connector) asphalt shingles with copper metal on garage dormer) are mostly consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.55). Samples of the proposed stone foundation and brick veneer have not been provided. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed enclosed addition with the following:

1. While the general design and materials of the enclosed addition are appropriate, the footprint of the equates to a 112 percent increase to the existing structure, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* recommend that enclosed additions measure no more than half of the square footage of the footprint of the historic building (all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age) (p.54, #4).
2. If issued a COA, the addition windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Burke stated the reason for the approach to the project is to minimize the view from the street. Mr. Burke stated this house is built on one half a double lot. Mr. Burke explained the reason for the request for the more than fifty percent coverage is due to the other lot and they want to lessen impact of the view from the street. Mr. Burke stated this is the minimal that can be asked for in order to accomplish one-story living.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6983 for the proposed enclosed addition with staff’s comments. Ms. Marquardt explained she made her motion because what is being proposed is to preserve that corner on the block. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know the distance from the street to the bay window.

Ms. Rose stated the only notation concerns the corner of the front of the existing house, which is 35 ft., so based on that, it is probably 55 ft. from the street.

Mr. Roberts stated from the front property line to the back is 74-75-ft.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know if this is currently subdivided.

Mr. Burke stated no, on most property maps it is considered two lots.

Mr. Laster stated he had issues with the 96 percent coverage because it is 46 percent over the guidelines.

Ms. Besser stated she is struggling with this plan and explained why she could not support it.

After discussion, Ms. Marquardt's motion failed 3-3, so the motion died.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing the construction of a brick privacy wall along the left side of the front façade. Two options are proposed for consideration:

- a. Option A proposes the construction of the 5'-tall brick wall, recessed 3 feet from the left and front façade corner; and
- b. Option B proposes the construction of a 6'-tall brick wall, recessed 12 feet from the left and front façade corner.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that fence materials are recommended to be compatible with the surface materials of the building, with compatibility generally achieved by "maintaining the range of materials historically present in the district" (p.58, #6). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that primary yard fencing should not exceed 3 feet in height (p.59, #10) and that solid brick fences be recessed at least 20 feet from the plane of the residence's primary façade (p.59, #8). Ms. Rose stated while the materials of the proposed wall are appropriate, neither Option A or Option B are proposed to be recessed far enough from the plane of the residence's primary façade to meet the recommendations of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed wall with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend that solid brick fences be recessed at least 20 feet from the plane of the residence's primary façade (p.59, #8). While the materials of the proposed wall are appropriate, neither Option A or Option B are proposed to be recessed far enough from the plane of the residence's primary façade to meet the recommendations of the *Guidelines*.
2. If issuance 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 to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Burke stated they wanted to press for a five-foot wall closer to the street or do the six-foot wall.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6983 for Option B of the proposed wall with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she wanted to confirm that Option B is 46-feet and 9-inches from the sidewalk and 20-feet back through a window.

Mr. Laster stated the house already has a significant setback and there are many houses in Franklin that would not meet the 46', so that is in spirit with the guidelines.

Chair Roberts stated he could not support Options A or B but could support 16 or 17-foot back.

After discussion, Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to include it shall be 16-feet from front of the house and six-feet tall. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

With the main motion having been made and amended, the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the construction of porches onto rear elevations or onto secondary elevations that are not readily visible from the street. Ms. Rose stated the new porch materials are recommended to be compatible with those found on the principal structure or match existing porches within the historic district (p.79, #7). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to add a 155 sq. ft. covered porch to the left side elevation of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated the visibility of the porch is limited by the setback of the principal structure from the sidewalk and the proposed placement of the porch near the rear of the left elevation. Ms. Rose stated the materials and design of the proposed porch are in keeping with the architectural character of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposed covered porch addition with the following:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Burke stated currently there is no access to this porch. Mr. Burke stated he tried different ideas and just dropped from the fascia line with a 4-inch profile. Mr. Burke stated that there is no access to the porch without the proposed addition.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is correct in that without the approval of the addition, there will be no access to this porch.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Marquardt move to defer this item to the next meeting date or until it can be presented again. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to alter the two existing dormers (one facing rearward and the other facing leftward, toward 5th Ave. S.) to create one large dormer/upper-story enclosed area. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that roof sections on main or other visible elevations remain unaltered and supports the placement of dormers onto rear or elevations with minimal visibility. Ms. Rose stated roof alterations, such as dormers, are recommended to use designs, materials, and scale in keeping with building character (p.82, #4, #6). Ms. Rose stated the proposed dormer alteration appears to be consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has not indicated the material proposed for the re-cladded dormer. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed dormer alteration with the following:

1. The new dormer windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The siding material for the dormer must consist of wood or smooth-faced cementitious siding of a 4-5" reveal for consistency with the *Guidelines*.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6983 for the dormer alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to restore or replace windows on side and rear elevations of the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic windows and historic window openings (p.90, #1). Ms. Rose stated restoration of historic windows does not require issuance of a COA. Ms. Rose stated the applicant has indicated that replacement may be proposed; without documentation to substantiate window replacement, such a proposal cannot be supported. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed window replacement with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic windows and historic window openings (p.90, #1). The applicant has indicated that replacement may be proposed; without documentation to substantiate window replacement, such a proposal cannot be supported.
2. Restoration of historic windows does not require issuance of a COA. The applicant may work with the Preservation Planner to discuss restoration options.

Mr. Burke stated they were comfortable with staff's comments.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6983 for the window replacement with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to relocate an outbuilding at the rear of the property to accommodate for the proposed addition. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the restoration of historic buildings but cautions against the moving of outbuildings from their original locations unless moving is the only way to preserve them (p.74, #3). Ms. Rose stated the outbuilding has no foundation, lessening the chance of any structural issues with the proposed relocation. The relocation appears to be proposed in order to accommodate the proposed enclosed addition to the principal structure, however, which is not supported by the *Guidelines* due to its proposed footprint size. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission defer review of the proposed outbuilding relocation with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* support the restoration of historic buildings but cautions against the moving of outbuildings from their original locations unless moving is the only way to preserve them (p.74,

#3). The relocation appears to be proposed in order to accommodate the proposed enclosed addition to the principal structure, which is not supported by the *Guidelines* due to its proposed footprint size. It is recommended that relocation be considered only if the proposed enclosed addition is approved.

2. 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 to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Burke stated he agreed with the deferral.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Besser moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission defer review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6983 for the outbuilding relocation with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Front & Side Yard Fence at 246 4th Ave. S.; Mike & Abby Rapier, Applicants.

Ms. Rose stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of primary yard and side yard fencing at 246 4th Ave. S. Ms. Rose stated the applicants are proposing to place either a wooden picket-style fence or a wrought iron metal fence along the front property line, behind the sidewalk. Ms. Rose stated the north side of the fence is proposed to tie into the house at the front porch railing, while the south side of the fence is proposed to follow the neighbor's driveway and tie into an existing wood fence half way through the side yard. Ms. Rose stated a matching gate is proposed to cross the pedestrian walkway that leads to the front porch. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that primary yard fencing is fencing that is located along the front yard property lines and areas that are readily visible from the street. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend the use of picket-style fencing for primary yards, as it is the most common fencing style (p.58, #4), and they also recommend that primary yard fencing be no taller than three feet (p.59, #10). Ms. Rose stated operable gates should be configured to swing inwardly and not open onto the public sidewalk, and sliding gates should be avoided (p.59, #12). Ms. Rose stated due to the lack of green space, the applicants are seeking to tie the north side of the return into the front porch, at the railing. Ms. Rose stated this arrangement is atypical fencing for the historic district, as fencing typically follows the property perimeter and/or ties into the building plane at side elevations or building corners to create enclosed areas. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed fencing with the following:

1. The applicant must utilize the proposed wood picket option for the fencing, as this option is more consistent with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*, and iron fencing is not generally appropriate for 20th century residences.
2. For better consistency with the *Guidelines* for primary yard fencing, the applicant must align the north side return so that it ties into the house at the side of the right-most front porch column instead of at the front porch step railing.
3. In accordance with the *Guidelines*, the pedestrian must swing inwardly (p.58, #12).
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department. Any changes to approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. Sean Sandusky, the contractor, was present to represent this item. Mr. Sandusky stated the applicant is proposing to put the picket fence in instead of the wrought iron and want to keep the fence consistent with the period of the house.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6984 for the fencing, specifically the 3-ft wooden fence, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Mr. Carson seconded the motion.

Chair Roberts stated he had an issue with it tying into the rail at the step.

Ms. Rose stated her recommendation is to have it tie into a typical place rather than a non-typical place, as proposed. Ms. Rose stated she would like to here from the applicant about this issue.

Mr. Sandusky pointed out the areas where the owner wanted it tied in and then showed the area Ms. Rose has added as a condition.

The motion carried 5-1, with Mr. Roberts voting no.

Item 9:

Consideration of Addition & Alterations (Garage Door) at 709 Fair St.; 906 Studio Architects, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a rear addition at 709 Fair St. Ms. Rose stated the applicants are also seeking approval for the replacement of the garage door, located on the principal structure front elevation. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its March 18, 2019 and April 15, 2019 meetings. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed principal structure addition and garage door replacement with the following:

1. For better consistency with the *Guidelines*, the applicant must utilize a parged-coated foundation for the addition. The use of a parge coat will not introduce an entirely new masonry materials (as painted brick would), and it would be reflective of the qualities of the existing stone and the existing addition's foundation materials (p.54, #3).
2. The addition windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The garage door replacement is appropriate but must match the existing door in design, as recommended by the *Guidelines*. The specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to installation.
4. The subject property is located within the Floodway Fringe Overlay (FFO). As such, issuance of a COA is contingent upon the approval of a variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Hathaway stated the applicant is in agreement with staff's comment with the exception of two conditions. Mr. Hathaway stated one is the parge coat, as he has concern with maintenance and long-term

durability. Mr. Hathaway stated the other exception is the garage doors. Mr. Hathaway stated trying to match the existing door is a challenge, so they would like to do one that is a close match, but stained, not painted.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6985 for the proposal with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Marquardt moved to amend the motion to allow for the painted brick foundation.

No one seconded the motion, so the amendment failed.

Ms. Besser requested to revisit using stone.

Ms. Rose stated she recommended them against using stone.

Mr. Josh Davis stated the stone is more expensive and difficult to match.

Ms. Rose explained that parge coat is similar to stucco.

Ms. Baker-Hefley requested to know if staff's comments regarding the garage doors speaks to the paint and if there is any way the applicant could follow staff's comments and use a stained door.

Ms. Rose explained the intent of the guideline is to have a matching door that has some of the detail of the existing door.

Mr. Laster stated that to go with any other garage door seems to go against the guidelines.

Mr. Laster moved to amend the motion to retain and repair the existing garage doors and to allow them to be modified to up-swing if desired, or to replace them with a design proportional and scaled to match the existing. Ms. Besser seconded the motion, and the motion carried 4-1, with Ms. Marquardt voting no.

Discussion ensued about the garage doors.

The main motion with amendment passed 5-0, with Ms. Marquardt abstaining from the vote.

Item 10:

Consideration of Additions (Principal) & Alterations (Accessory) at 215 Franklin Rd.; 906 Studio Architects, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a series of work at 215 Franklin Rd., reads as follows:

1. The enclosure of a one-story screened porch at the rear and right elevation to allow for the creation of first-floor bedroom and a second-floor addition for a bedroom;
2. The addition of a breezeway connector between the principal structure and the accessory structure;
3. The construction of a covered porch onto the rear elevation; and

4. The alteration of the accessory structure through the replacement of the garage doors, the replacement of the attic window, the construction of a rear exterior stair, and the addition of a metal awning above the garage doors.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its April 15, 2019 meeting. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building and be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building. Ms. Rose stated the original building is defined to include “all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age” (p.54, #3-4). Ms. Rose stated the historic building must be clearly identifiable, and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition, as through approaches that unify the existing structure and new construction into a single architectural whole (p.54, #2). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* support the placement of additions on rear or obscured elevations with limited visibility, noting, however, that rear or side elevations may not always be appropriate for additions, as some historic buildings have visual prominence from many vantage points (p.54, #1). Ms. Rose stated the proposed additions consist of three parts:

- The applicant is proposing the re-working of a one-story screened porch addition into an enclosed addition, with an expanded footprint and the creation of a second-story addition above it. The design takes advantage of upper-level space and seeks to correct some difficult roof plane connections. The proposed form consists of a side gable on the right elevation that is wider and taller than the historic side gable adjacent to it. While the addition is clearly differentiated from the existing form, the *Guidelines* also recommend that additions be “compatible with the proportions” of the building. The additional mass and height of the new gable form is not congruent with the existing proportions. The proposed expanded footprint measures 69 sq. ft.
- The applicant is proposing to add a breezeway connector between the accessory and principal structures to accommodate accessibility needs. The connector is narrow, designed with a low roof pitch, and designed to tie underneath existing eaves, meeting the *Guidelines* (p.54, #2). The fenestration design lessens its perceived mass from the public right-of-way.
- A covered porch is also proposed to be constructed onto the rear elevation. The *Guidelines* support the construction of porches onto rear elevations or onto secondary elevations that are not readily visible from the street. New porch materials are recommended to be compatible with those found on the principal structure or match existing porches within the historic district (p.79, #7). The visibility of the porch is hidden from street view by the principal structure, and the materials and design of the proposed porch are in keeping with the architectural character of the historic structure.

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that one repair or replace historic features on outbuildings with like replacements, when the features are visible from the street (p.74, #2). Ms. Rose stated the applicant has requested the replacement of the modern-style garage doors with doors that are more architecturally appropriate for the style and age of the residence, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the replacement of the attic window is also appropriate, as the window appears to be modern and out of keeping with the fenestration style found elsewhere on the building. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that replacement windows match the historic materials found on the building and relate to the architectural style of the structure or those found on neighboring buildings (p.90, #1, #5). Ms. Rose stated the applicant has not provided specifications for the proposed window. Ms. Rose stated the proposed construction of the exterior stair is appropriate, and the placement of the proposed metal awning over the garage doors is in keeping with alterations approved in other historic district locations. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed enclosed addition with the following:

1. While the design of the proposed enclosed addition takes advantage of upper-level space and seeks to correct some difficult roof plane connections, the proposed form consists of a side gable on the right elevation that is wider and taller than the historic side gable adjacent to it. The *Guidelines* also recommend that additions be “compatible with the proportions” of the building. The additional mass and height of the new gable form is not congruent with the existing building proportions.
2. If issued a COA, the addition windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Hathaway stated this was a house added in the early 80s before HZC was started. Mr. Hathaway stated they have worked hard to mitigate as much as they could. Mr. Hathaway requested the commission to approve them lowering the ridgeline to be at or below the front ridge of the original house and he would love to work with Ms. Rose on this.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6986 for the proposed enclosed addition with staff’s comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated one of the problems with addition is the window placement. Ms. Besser stated the using a closer placement match to those existing on the side elevation could help.

Mr. Hathaway requested to know if Ms. Besser is talking about horizontal placement or vertical height.

Ms. Besser stated both.

Mr. Hathaway stated there is some flexibility.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated it was her understanding there was a specific need for a second bedroom on the main floor due to a child with health issues. Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she is all for modifying homes for health issues. Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she is concerned about the height.

Mr. Hathaway requested to know if this should be deferred to another meeting.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to defer this item to the next voting meeting with strong encouragement to attend a DRC. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission proposed covered porch addition with the following:

1. The design, materials, and placement of the proposed covered porch are appropriate in light of the *Guidelines*. The additional footprint created by the proposed covered porch addition, however, is not consistent with the *Guidelines*. Per *Guidelines*, additions should be limited to no more than half the footprint of the original building, with the original building defined to include “all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age” (p.54, #4). The recent non-historic

addition, combined with the proposed additions, measures approximately 160 percent of the original historic structure's footprint.

2. If issued a COA, the addition windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Hathaway stated the applicant was trying to mitigate a bad looking area.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6986 for the proposed covered porch addition with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

After discussion on the size of the porch and proportions, Ms. Baker-Hefley moved to defer the item to the next voting meeting with a recommendation to attend a DRC. Mr. Laster seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

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

1. The connector is narrow, designed with a low roof pitch, and designed to tie underneath existing eaves. The foundation material has not been identified and must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The windows must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Hathaway stated they were in agreement with staff's comments.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6986 for the breezeway addition with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Besser seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0.

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

1. The window must have historic profile and dimension and consist of either wood or a composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to issuance of a building permit.

2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.

Mr. Hathaway stated they agree with staff comments.

Chair Roberts requested to know if any citizens wished to speak, and no one asked to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6986 for the accessory structure alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated May 13, 2019. Ms. Besser seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0.

Item 11:

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

There were no non-agenda emergency items.

Item 12:

Adjourn.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Acting Secretary