

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
JANUARY 13, 2020**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, January 13, 2020, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Kelly Baker-Hefley
Susan Besser
Brian Laster
Lisa Marquardt
Mary Pearce (arrived at 5:01)
Jim Roberts, Chair
Mike Hathaway
Jeff Carson

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Planning & Sustainability Department
Kelli Gibson, Planning & Sustainability Department
Randall Tosh, BNS Department
Maricruz Fincher, Law Department

**Item 1:
Call to Order**

Chair Roberts called the January 13, 2020, meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**Item 2:
Minutes: December 9, 2019**

The December 9, 2019 meeting minutes needed more review before being presented.

**Items 3:
Staff Announcements.**

Ms. Rose stated that the Design Review Committee will be meeting on Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm, due to a holiday of Martin Luther King on Monday. Ms. Rose stated there is about to be a new electronic review process for the Historic Zoning meeting applications. Ms. Rose stated this process will not affect the commissioner's paper packets. Ms. Rose explained there will be social media and other methods of letting citizens know of the new process. Ms. Rose explained all of Planning's applications now go through IDT, the City's electronic plan review system.

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

No Requests.

**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.

No one requested to speak.

Item 6:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Addition (Carport Expansion) at 227 4th Ave. S.; Jennifer Bagwell, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 169 sq. ft. addition to a carport at 227 4th Ave. S. Ms. Rose stated the addition is proposed to allow the property owner to create a rear patio seating area. Ms. Rose stated the request is an alteration to a previously-approved addition from June 10, 2019, which included an upper-story addition onto an existing one-story rear addition as well as an attached carport. 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 (p.54, #1). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that accessory structures, like carports, be constructed in traditional locations behind the principal structure and designed to be visually subordinate in placement, size, mass, and intricacy to their respective principal structures (p.64, #1-2). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures should be designed to be shorter in height than and designed to be consistent with the contexts of the principal structures they serve (p.64, #3-4). Ms. Rose stated the new accessory buildings should “use components typically used in historic equivalents” (p.64, #6). Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to add 169 sq. ft. of covered seating area to the previously-approved carport addition at the rear elevation of the principal structure (behind the existing one-story addition and proposed upper-story addition). Ms. Rose stated the proposed additional area hips inward behind the main mass of the residence so minimize, if not eliminate, its visibility from the street view. Ms. Rose stated it is designed at a one-story scale, like the rest of the carport, and the proposed construction materials of the expansion (painted wood columns, shingle roofing, gutters) are consistent with the *Guidelines* and with the detailing on the principal structure and the carport. Ms. Rose stated the size of the proposed carport expansion, combined with the existing non-historic additions, however, represents an approximate 55.9 percent addition to the historic structure. Ms. Rose stated the previous approval in June 2019 resulted in an estimated cumulative 50 percent addition of non-historic additions to the historic residence. Ms. Rose stated the proposed lot coverage, including the detached carriage house, measures 22.3 percent, which is consistent with the intent of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that maximum building coverage not exceed 35 percent in specified residential zoning districts, as measured by building footprint (p.55, #5). Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny the proposed carport expansion with the following:

1. The size of the proposed carport expansion, combined with the existing non-historic additions, however, represents an approximate 55.9 percent addition to the historic structure. The *Guidelines* recommend that additions be designed to be limited to no more than half of the footprint of the original building. The original building is defined to include “all portions of the building that are at least 50 years in age” (p.54, #4). The proposal, as such, does not conform with the recommendations of the *Guidelines*.
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 Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Bagwell stated Ms. Rose explained it exactly correctly and stated the original addition to this house was done in 1983 and we are thirteen to fourteen years of that being considered part of that fifty-year window. Ms. Bagwell stated the part they added on, the carport, really had been squeezed down to 24 by 24 feet which is pretty minimal for the size of cars now a days. Ms. Bagwell stated Ms. Rose is calling it a carport addition, but in her mind, she is calling it a patio covering addition and a tree had to be removed causing no shade in the back yard. Ms. Bagwell stated you cannot see this from any sidewalks, you would have to be in the backyard to see it.

Chair Roberts requested to know if citizens wished to speak on behalf of this item and no one requested to speak.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7165 for the carport expansion with staff's comments and in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2020. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated Mr. Laster should comment on why he is going against the recommendation.

Mr. Laster stated because the structure is behind the principal dwelling and it is not excessive in what they are asking for.

Chair Roberts requested to know the height of this structure.

Ms. Bagwell stated probably not more than fifteen-feet and under the carport about ten-feet and we line up exactly.

Ms. Pearce stated she was trying to understand is the carport is at the same level as the porch, is she looking at that right.

Ms. Bagwell stated yes, the addition.

Ms. Pearce stated so she is trying to understand and agrees you will not see from the street and it looks like there are two columns to hold it up.

Ms. Bagwell stated yes, because it was backing up to the three columns on the back of the carport.

Ms. Pearce stated her comment would be if there could be a way to lower that brick wall and let the lattice go down because this looks like a bungalow.

Ms. Bagwell stated that was part of the original design.

Ms. Pearce stated awe gottcha we already approved that, but if you all could consider that I would be for this. Ms. Pearce requested to know if that could be a staff change.

Chair Roberts stated you would not see the carport from the street.

The motion carried 8-0.

Item 7:

Consideration of Alterations (Rear Deck Extension) at 412 Boyd Mill Ave.; Matt & Tamara McGraw, Applicants.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of an addition to an existing rear elevation covered porch at 412 Boyd Mill Ave. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* state that the construction of porches or decks may be supported on rear or secondary elevations where they are not readily visible from the street and that new porch material should be compatible with those found on the principal structure or match existing porches found within the district (p.79, #7). Ms. Rose stated the residence is an infill structure within the Boyd Mill Avenue Historic District, so the alteration of the existing deck may be appropriate. Ms. Rose stated the applicants are proposing to create a deck off the existing covered porch that is located between the main mass of the mass and the attached garage. Ms. Rose stated the design of the proposed expansion is guided by the space between the existing covered porch and the curved driveway. Ms. Rose stated the deck is proposed to be approximately 24” off the ground—to match the height of the covered porch—and consist of wood. Ms. Rose stated a lattice privacy screen is proposed to extend along approximately 20’ of the length of the deck. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed rear deck addition with the following:

1. The deck must remain uncovered, as shown. If a roof covering is desired, additional *Guidelines* will apply, and an amended Certificate of Appropriateness application must be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission.
2. The deck banding and lattice screening details must be submitted to staff for consideration 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 to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Mr. McGraw stated they had just moved to the area and they would like to build a deck to enjoy the outdoors.

Chair Roberts requested to know if citizens wished to speak on behalf of 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 #7166 for the rear deck expansion with staff’s comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2020. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Besser stated she was concerned there is no drawing you can see showing what it is really going to look like. Ms. Besser stated she feels she is very uncomfortable reviewing this due to lack of information.

Mr. McGraw stated he did not bring the originals with him.

Ms. Rose stated what is being projected is less clear than what was provided in the packet the commissioners were given. Ms. Rose stated the packet has more information, but difficult to read.

Chair Roberts asked if there were other comments.

Mr. Laster stated he had a question on the screening on what part of the deck will that be near the house or around the curb.

Mr. McGraw stated it will be on the street part of the deck before you get to the curb there is a neighboring house and on the outside of that there are some trees they planted and will not be visible from the road. Mr. McGraw pointed out on the projection what he just stated.

Chair Roberts stated he was still confused where the screen was.

Ms. Rose stated parallel to the driveway.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if it was only on the straight portions.

Mr. McGraw stated yes.

Ms. Rose explained the drawings were not professionally done and explained.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if the applicant could explain the pergola feature across the top.

Mr. McGraw stated his wife wanted to hang some plants from it and it will just extend a foot or a foot and a half.

Ms. Pearce stated hanging plants could be achieved with some hangers on the post and could quiet down the lattice a bit.

Chair Roberts stated it might be clearer if we have an amendment that talks about that and where the lattice and landscaping is going to go.

Ms. Rose projected the street view and the other two infill properties built at the same time.

Chair Roberts stated there should be a clarification amendment about the motion that talks about the lattice work and various products.

Ms. Pearce stated she would move that the lattice will go straight down the straight portion of the deck, as shown in the picture and the angle would not have it, that the lattice would include some kind of post with some kind of fennel to come back to staff and delete the pergola across the top. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion and the amendment carried.

Mr. Hathaway commented he almost understands and looking at the sketch there are five columns with 4 x 4 posts.

Mr. McGraw stated he was going to have 6 x 6 posts against the outside where the lattice was going to go. Mr. McGraw stated all the other new construction would be 4 x 4 posts.

The main motion carried 8-0.

Item 8:

Consideration of Signage & Fencing at Splendor Ridge Subdivision, located at 151 Franklin Rd.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.

Mr. Hathaway recused himself from this item.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for construction of a freestanding development signage in the form of walls at Splendor Ridge Subdivision, located at 151 Franklin Rd. Ms. Rose stated the subdivision entrance will be located off Parsons Place, though the subject project is located within the Franklin Road Historic District. Fencing is also proposed to enclose the subdivision along its northern and eastern edges. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend that new fences and walls support the historic character of the district (p.58). Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* do not recommend the use of monument style signage for use in residential areas of the historic districts, however, as they are not appropriate (p.85, #9). Ms. Rose stated the Splendor Ridge Subdivision development plan is vested under the previous Zoning Ordinance (effective 7/1/08 to 12/29/19), and as such, those regulations specific to Freestanding Development Signs in Section 5.12.10(2) must apply. Ms. Rose stated the proposal includes a main column height of 8'-2", which, per ordinance, is not permitted; the maximum height is allowable is 6 feet. Further, the height is taller than that of the historic wall in front of Riverview, which measures 3'-6" with 7'-3" columns. Ms. Rose stated while the wall materials are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used on the Riverview site (p.58, #2), the convex layout is conventional in appearance and atypical to the historic district. Ms. Rose stated guidance on walls is more specific to retaining and perimeter site features, as monument style signage is not recommended as appropriate in residential historic districts. Ms. Rose stated very few examples of residential freestanding development monument signs exist in this area; the closest in at Harlinsdale Manor on Franklin Rd. (see applicant's photograph). Ms. Rose stated the proposed equestrian-style fencing is compatible with the range of materials historically present in the district (p.58, #6), and the location—along the perimeter of the site—is appropriate. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of the proposed walls with the following:

- A. The *Guidelines* do not recommend the use of monument style signage for use in residential areas of the historic districts, however, as they are not appropriate (p.85, #9).
- B. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, including the lowering of all columns to a height no taller than 6 feet, per the regulations of the development's vesting document. The application must also meet any applicable floodplain regulations. For example, the walls may need to be designed to allow water to flow through them.

Mr. Gamble stated Ms. Rose did a great job explaining the complexities that we are trying to address. Mr. Gamble stated he would like to pass some 11x17 copies that is a supplement to your package. Mr. Gamble stated the residential guidelines for signage are really setup to address building by building, but note number one, design signs to respect and respond to the property in which it is being replaced, that is number one. Mr. Gamble stated at Riverview along Franklin Road and said what better compliment than in creating a secondary entrance off Parsons Place than to let it resonate with the main entrance to the house. Mr. Gamble stated that main entrance informed our design. Mr. Gamble requested Ms. Rose go back to the first slide and stated that is the elevation of the existing stone wall. Mr. Gamble stated you will notice it is only three and half feet tall and no landscape at the foundation of the stone. Mr. Gamble stated they raised it six inches in order to get more height for our landscape. Mr. Gamble stated they did not match exactly because they did not want to give a false sense of history, so instead of the **concurve** you see off Franklin Road we went to a convex curve it will respond better to topography, utility, flood plain. Mr. Gamble stated they wanted some similarity but have some difference as well. Mr. Gamble named the four different signage types for residential. Mr. Gamble stated the two appropriate would be the post and arm or post and panel. Mr. Gamble stated they are trying to create a style to match Riverview. Mr. Gamble stated they would like to have a gas lantern. Mr. Gamble stated he would like to talk about the two requests separately.

Chair Roberts requested to know if citizens wished to speak on behalf of this item and no one requested to speak.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7131 for the proposed monument signage, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2020. Ms. Besser seconded the motion.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated her concern was the context. Ms. Baker-Hefley stated if the entrance was coming off Franklin Road it would be appropriate, but since it is going through a subdivision not related to this beautiful historic wall it does not see appropriate.

Ms. Marquardt stated she concurred with Ms. Baker-Hefley.

Mr. Gamble requested deferral on the signage and wall to the next DRC meeting.

Mr. Laster moved to defer to the next voting meeting Historic Zoning Commission. Ms. Baker Hefley seconded the motion and the motion carried 8-0.

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

- A. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department.

Ms. Baker-Hefley moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7131 for the proposed fencing, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2020. Mr. Laster seconded the motion and the motion carried 7-0.

Item 9:

Consideration of Demolition & New Construction at 120 Morningside Dr.; Gary Semanchik, Applicant.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of the principal structure located at 120 Morningside Dr. Ms. Rose stated the applicant is also seeking approval for the construction of a 1 ½-story principal structure duplex at the same location. Ms. Rose stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its August 19, September 16, and December 16, 2019 meetings. Ms. Rose stated the structure proposed for demolition represents one of the last remaining vernacular farmhouse structures along the Franklin Road Historic District corridor between Mack Hatcher Parkway and Downtown Franklin. Ms. Rose stated this location, just north of the Harpeth River and Downtown, corresponds with the structure's historical context as a farmhouse. Ms. Rose stated the structure is of a vernacular architectural style, consisting of a hipped roof, a wide roof overhang that covers a full-width porch, and a front-facing dormer. Ms. Rose stated this style is indicative of early 20th century farmhouses. Ms. Rose stated several Notices of Violation have been issued against the property due to deferred maintenance issues; the property is recently under new ownership. Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* recommend against the demolition of historic buildings or structures and state that demolition only be approved if the Historic Zoning Commission deems one or more of the demolition criteria met, as listed (p.52, #1-2). The criteria are listed as follows:

1. The first criterion by which demolition may be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission is that of Architectural and Historical Integrity, specifically, if a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character. The *Guidelines* state that "loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that address relevant issues" (p.52, #1).
2. A second criterion by which demolition may be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission is that of Unreasonable Economic Hardship, specifically, if denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the Historic Zoning Commission. The *Guidelines* recommend that one "please refer to the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist as provided" on page 53 of the document (see Attachment 1). The *Guidelines* further clarify that the Historic Zoning Commission will use this checklist to assist with the review of economic hardship claims (p.52, #1).
 - This is a criterion by which the applicant has requested consideration of demolition, though it appears that the applicant has not submitted anything formally to substantiate the claim from the *Guidelines* Evidentiary Checklist (p. 53).
 - As recommended by the *Guidelines*, "expert testimony" was "provided by an architect," Amanda McCreary of Chisel Workshop, at the December 16, 2019 Design Review Committee meeting. Chisel Workshop provided notated photographs for the application submittal to further detail the extent of the proposed structural damage as seen on both the interior and exterior of the building.
3. A third criterion is Public Safety and Welfare, specifically, if the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure or building (p.52, #1).
4. A fourth criterion by which demolition may be considered by the Historic Zoning Commission is that of Structural Instability or Deterioration, specifically, "if the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect" The *Guidelines* state that "such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition."

Ms. Rose stated the *Guidelines* also recommend that "there should be a separate report which details future action on the site (p.52, #1).

- This is a criterion by which the applicant has requested consideration of demolition. The applicant has supplied a report from Ben Faris of EMC Structural Engineering, dated August 5, 2019. Mr. Faris's report outlines severe structural issues with the foundation and floor framing, specifically noting that an estimated 90 percent of the floor girders and joists need replacement and that 100 percent of the subflooring requires removal and replacement. According to the report, certain sections of the building are not safe for access. Roof structure sagging is evident according to the report, which also notes that up to 80 percent of the load-bearing walls are adversely affected to be point of requiring strengthening or rebuilding. Mr. Faris states further that the ceiling joists and roof rafters are instable, causing the attic space to be inaccessible. Despite the inaccessibility, Mr. Faris was able to comment on the framing conditions, as they were visible through water damage holes in the ceiling. Water infiltration and fire damage is evident in the framing, according to the report. Overall, it is the structural engineer's assessment that the building is not safe and that much of the structural framing needs to be replaced and rebuilt prior to occupancy. Site photographs have been submitted for reference.
- The applicant presented expert testimony from historic preservation contractor Michael Lee to the September 16, 2019 Design Review Committee meeting, addressing the *Guidelines* recommendation for the submittal of cost estimates for rehabilitation versus

demolition and construction of a comparable building product. The applicant did not submit this material within the formal application.

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 *Guidelines* recommend that one reinforce the corridor's rural character by preserving scenic view sheds and limiting building size to one to two stories around Harlinsdale Farm (p.131). Ms. Rose stated the subject property is located among many noncontributing, ca. 1970s ranch-style buildings adjacent to Franklin Rd. Ms. Rose stated it is evident the existing historic building, though now addressed to Morningside Dr., originally fronted Franklin Rd., and its context is associated with the rural character along the corridor. Ms. Rose stated as a pyramidal square, the proposed infill structure harkens to the same architectural form that the existing structure proposed for demolition. Ms. Rose stated the proposed overall height of 29'-10" and 1 1/2 -story scale is appropriate for the Franklin Road Historic District corridor and the unique block face context in which it is situated. Ms. Rose stated 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 the materials of the proposed new construction (parge coated CMU foundation, smooth trim board, wood lap siding with a 5" reveal, asphalt shingles, standing seam metal roofing at low areas) are consistent with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications have not been provided. Ms. Rose stated it is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions the proposed demolition with the following:

1. The applicant has complied with the recommendations of the *Guidelines* by demonstrating evidence of Structural Instability or Deterioration.
2. The building must be photographed inside and outside satisfactorily for Commission records 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.

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

1. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval 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.
3. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Ms. McCreary stated she would be representing the item tonight. Ms. McCreary stated they had an addendum they would like the commission to consider as well.

Ms. Rose stated this is the information shown at DRC, but not included with the packet material.

Ms. McCreary stated the first aspect we are asking to demolish this structure. Ms. McCreary stated anytime you have to demolish a historic structure it is heartbreaking. Ms. McCreary stated it is considerably dilapidated. Ms. McCreary stated the cost has been discussed with 3 different contractors and the amount was going to be very expensive and explained Mr. Semanchik did do his due diligence in checking the structure out. Ms. McCreary stated there is so much constructional damage that the cost to repair is way too much.

Chair Roberts requested to know if citizens wished to speak on behalf of 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 #7097 for the demolition of the principal structure, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2020 and with the addition of the cost estimates provided. Ms. Baker-Hefley seconded the motion.

Ms. Pearce stated she hates to lose one building, but this building has been sitting there and has deteriorated over the years.

Chair Roberts stated the six years he has been on this commission it has been talked about six times.

Ms. Besser stated she will not support this due to having the estimates showing it could be repaired.

Ms. Pearce stated she understands what Ms. Besser stated, but historic home are appreciated in value much more than new homes.

Ms. Baker-Hefley stated she truly appreciates the applicants doing what we have asked them to do and the thing that really got me was the safety concerns and it is with a heavy heart that this is appropriate.

Ms. McCreary stated they are proposing a pyramidal style go back in its place and stated this typology is seen around Williamson County. Ms. McCreary stated that is what was there, so in her mind that is what should go back there. Ms. McCreary stated they are proposing a one and half story pyramidal style be constructed in its place very similar footprint to what is there now. Ms. McCreary stated they would do a metal roof and it would have dormers and wood would be used.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is proposing to square off the plan instead of it being catty cornered and one of the recommendations is to have the new building more in line with Franklin Road.

Mr. Laster moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project #7097 for the new construction of the principal structure, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated January 13, 2020. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion.

Mr. Laster stated he noticed on the roofline there is a **cant_on it.**

Ms. McCreary stated they drove around looking at styles and some existing structures do have it.

Ms. Rose requested to know if everyone knew what Mr. Laster was talking about when he stated “cant”.

Ms. McCreary stated it is just a slight slope.

Ms. Pearce stated some of the photographs show just blank windows and no one over one like in the house now.

Ms. McCreary stated on the second floor the blank windows have to meet egresses.

Ms. Pearce stated she would amend the motion to include the second-floor windows read as one over one even though they are casement windows. Ms. Besser seconded the motion and the motion carried 8-0

**Item 10:
Adjourn.**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

Acting Secretary