



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, December 12, 2022

5:00 PM

Board Room

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Historic Zoning Commission will be held on the date and time listed above at 109 3rd Ave. S., Franklin, TN 37064. 615.791.3212 For accommodations due to disabilities or other special arrangements, please contact the Human Resources Department at (615) 791-3216, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Accommodations have been made to ensure that the public is able to participate in the meeting. The public may participate in the following ways: • Watch the meeting on FranklinTV or the City of Franklin website. • Watch the live stream through the City of Franklin Facebook and YouTube accounts. • Email comments to planningintake@franklintn.gov to be provided in full to the Commission and included in the minutes, but not read aloud in their entirety during the meeting. Emailed comments are accepted until 12:00 PM (noon) on the day before the meeting. • Comment in-person in the Board Room. Speakers may sit in the Boardroom or wait in the lobby.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Roberts called the meeting to order at 05:00 PM

Board Members Present: Susan Besser, Josh Denton, Brian Laster, Tyler LeMarinel, Mary Pearce, Jim Roberts, Lisa Marquardt, left at 6 pm, Kathy Worthington

Staff Present: Amanda Rose, Randall Tosh, Bill Squires, Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes

Sponsors: Amanda Rose

A motion was made by Commissioner Marquardt, seconded by Commissioner Laster to approve the October 10, 2022 Minutes. The motion carried 7-0, Chair Roberts recusal.

A motion was made by Commissioner Besser, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel to approve the November 14, 2022 Minutes. The motion carried 8-0.

MEETING CALENDAR

2. Consideration of 2023 HZC & DRC Meeting Dates & Application Deadlines Calendar.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Ms. Rose announced that the meeting calendar for the 2023 Historic Zoning Commission and Design Review Committee dates along with Application deadlines calendar have very few alterations. The HZC meetings will take place the second Monday of each month, with the application deadlines corresponding accordingly. The DRC meetings will be on the third Monday of each month with the exception of January. The January DRC meeting is proposed to be on Tuesday, January 17, 2023, following the normal date, due to the observance of Martin Luther King Jr. Day. The only other adjustments to the calendar are related to application deadlines that fall on Franklin City holidays.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearce, seconded by Commissioner Denton to approve the HZC Calendar as presented. The motion carried 8-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Ms. Rose announced on December 19, 2022:

- Surface Pro assignments and setup - 2:15-2:45
- DRC: City Hall schematic design - 3:00
- Regular DRC – 4:00 – 8 items are currently on the agenda.

- After the recent approval of a brick wall installation at the Arlington, the contractor has brick samples available at the location.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the sample mortar is almost white whereas the building mortar is very tinted. Ms. Pearce also noted that the wall is long and is going to be very visible on West Main Street.

Ms. Rose asked that the Commissioners provide feedback to her once they have had a chance to view the samples.

- Benelli Park DRC staging

Ms. Rose explained that there would be a request for approval for a wall installation at the entrance of Benelli Park (intersection of Benelli Park Court and Floyd Moore Avenue). The dimensions of the wall are marked with spray paint for the Commissioners to see.

VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

APPLICATIONS

3. **Consideration Of New Construction (Accessory) At 316 Bridge St.; Eric Smith, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Chair Roberts stated that this item was deferred from the November meeting and no action was taken.

4. **Consideration of Alterations (Courtyard) At 159 1st Ave. N. (Harpeth Square); Andy Berry, Applicant**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer: Ms. Huffer stated that the proposal includes the addition of two arbors. One fronting East Main Street between the Italian restaurant and the bookstore. The other fronting Second Avenue North at the alley between the bank building and the hotel. The arbors will be identical with masonry columns that will be reused from the previous

Harpeth Square. The top of each arbor will utilize stained cedar, and each arbor will be 11 feet, 8 inches in height. The guidelines recommend site and setting alterations should be considered as appropriate when they are undertaken in locations that are not visible from public view, do not involve the removal of historic features and do not detract from or overwhelm the context of the historic districts. The proposal does not fully meet this guideline as the arbors are visible from the street at both locations but, the proposal meets the guideline by not removing the historic features and not detracting or overwhelming the context of the historic district. The applicant adjusted the original design based on feedback from the DRC meeting in order to better meet the intent of the guideline. The applicant also adjusted the top of the arbor to minimize the massing concerns by changing the art shape of the arbor to a flatter top and minimized the slat size. The proposal includes the installation of two gates under each arbor and will match the existing fence utilized at the perimeter of the courtyard. The proposed gates will be made of the same black metal material as the existing fence and will not have any locking mechanisms. The guidelines recommend that the gates should swing inwardly.

Ms. Huffer stated that staff recommends approval of this item with the following conditions of approval.

1. Any exterior signage is required to be submitted separately and receive a separate permit and a certificate of appropriateness.

- Applicant Speaker: Andy Berry with Smith Gee Studio. Mr. Berry introduced himself and noted that the gates are set on a removable base so they can fully be removed as an option.
- Owner Representative: Steve Bacon

A motion for approval was made by Commissioner Denton, seconded by Commissioner Besser.

- Discussion

Commissioner Denton asked staff if placement and location, regarding potential signage, would have to be approved.

Ms. Rose stated that all aspects of a sign that relates to the design guidelines would require approval.

Chair Roberts noted that, according to the application documents, the gate appears to swing outward.

Mr. Berry stated that for safety reasons the gate would need to swing outward.

Ms. Rose explained that the guidelines were written primarily for fences and walls that are used for perimeter locations on properties. In that case, if the gate swung open, it would swing to the right of way. In this case, because the gate is recessed far onto the property, it would be appropriate to swing outward to meet coding requirements.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the reason to have two columns is for placement of a sign.

Mr. Bacon explained that the intent is to brand and call attention to the area. The goal is to draw pedestrians into the area. The gate portion would only be used for events that may serve alcohol. The gate would not be closed during a regular day.

Ms. Rose noted an illustration in the application documents to confirm the area under discussion.

Commissioner Marquardt requested the street view of the area and asked how far the setback is from Landmark Booksellers.

Ms. Rose provided views from the intersection of East Main Street and Main Street and Second Avenue North.

Mr. Bacon estimated the setback was 20-30 feet from Landmark Book Sellers.

- Motion, passed 8 - 0

5. Consideration Of Alterations (Windows/Doors, Lighting, Partial Demolition) At 230 Franklin Rd. (Factory At Franklin: Jamison Theater); Luke Dougal, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Commissioner Josh Denton recused himself from this item.

- Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the proposal requests a series of alterations to Jamieson Theater location and also approval for select alterations to the connector section that is currently between Buildings two and three. The property was discussed at the November DRC meeting regarding these alterations. The Jameson Theater is located in building five and the secondary alterations are located at the connector between building two which highly visible from Franklin Road and building three which is the main building that you experience on the property as the entrance.
 - Ms. Rose stated on the north elevation that you see on the application documents, includes the painting of the roof structure and the corrugated metal siding. The proposal also includes the removal of the non-historic bar feature and the infill of the floor level where that bar area is sunken with concrete and the painting of the door at both locations. Originally the proposal included infilling the door of the house structure with salvaged brick. This was leftover from the DRC meeting that should have been removed because the intent of the door is to keep it in place as recommended by the DRC.
 - The proposal for the West elevation includes painting of the roof and the corrugated metal in keeping with previous proposals. Additionally, the proposal includes the replacement of the non-historic storefront doors and windows with new ones of a black finish which has been previously approved and keeping those existing opening dimensions. There would not be any widening or shortening of the doors in any way. Replacement of the non-historic aluminum storefront windows with one that better matches the detailing of the historic windows is appropriate. The guidelines recommend that new storefronts, if required, be restored to match the original designs. In this case, a contextual industrial design is appropriate.
 - The proposal for the South elevation includes the replacement of the wall sconce to match the existing building façade lighting, which is shown in the application documents, and painting of the existing metal doors, the widening of the overhead door opening and replacement of that door. The creation of a new pedestrian door and the removal of the signage over the overhead door. Ms. Rose noted that the signage is being removed because the door is being heightened. The replacement of the non-historic light fixture is appropriate, as is the painting of the metal door and the removal of the sign. The guidelines recommend that one preserves and maintains doors on non or on historic commercial buildings in their original locations and configurations. In this case, the overhead door was added and is positioned on the site with very little visibility to pedestrians and virtually no visibility from the prominent street views. The creation of the new door opening is also supported by the guidelines as it is at the rear and has simple detailing that complements the context of the site.
 - The connector which is located toward Franklin Road with the main building located to the right and is adjacent to the restaurant. The little connector was approved by the commission previously at the applicant's request to be demolished because it is not historic. It is desired by the tenant, however, to maintain that connection, which is fine with the applicant's requesting because it's now being maintained to change out the storefront doors and windows to match the other storefront doors and windows that are being engaged on the site and is appropriate. The applicant is also proposing to remove the EIFS band from the connector and replace it with a black metal panel in keeping with what was approved on building two. The removal that is standing is appropriate and in keeping with the previous request, is non-historic and is not appropriate for use in the historic district. The introduction of the metal may be appropriate at this location given the industrial character of the property and the use of metal throughout, as well as their approval for the previous treatment. The use of the storefront configuration and design that was approved for the adjacent building is also appropriate at this location as well.
 - Ms. Rose stated that it is recommended that this item be approved by the Commission with one condition.
 1. The door on the bar as seen on the north elevation be maintained in place per the guidelines but is painted as requested.
 - Applicant Speaker: Gina Emmanuel (Applicant Representative). Ms. Emmanuel reiterated that the door on the bar on the north elevation would be maintained and painted as requested. Also, there is an additional door to be added at the rear of the building and the old overhead tracks will be maintained on the building.
- Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on the item. There were none.

MOTION

- Motion for Approval with conditions.
 - o Commissioner Laster
 - o Commissioner LeMarinel

Discussion:

Commissioner LeMarinel noted and asked for more detail about the asymmetrical grille patterns on the window profiles.

Ms. Emmanuel stated that the intent is to maintain the historical character of the windows.

- o Motion, passed 7 - 0

6. Consideration of Alterations (Refuse Area Locations & Screening) At 230 Franklin Rd.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

- Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant, Greg Gamble, would like to speak to the Commission about a deferral request.
- Applicant Speaker: Greg Gamble. Mr. Gamble explained that after reviewing staff comments on the application, more time is needed to better understand the design guidelines. Ms. Rose and Ms. Dannenfelser have set aside time on Friday for a meeting to gain a better understanding of the design guidelines and how the guidelines relate to this project. Mr. Gamble also noted that he believes that this item would benefit from another DRC meeting review. A deferral is requested so that discussions can continue and a request for the December 19, 2022, DRC meeting has been submitted.
- Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on the item, there was none.
- MOTION
- Motion to per applicant request to defer to January 9, 2023, HZC Meeting
Commissioner Pearce moved to defer this item to January 9, 2023. Commissioner Laster seconded the motion.
- Motion, passed 7-0

7. **Consideration Of Alterations To Previously-Approved New Construction (Roofing Materials: Principal & Accessory) At 215 Lewisburg Ave.; John Alfrey, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Commissioner Josh Denton rejoined the meeting at 5:34.

- Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. The applicant is seeking a COA for two different items related to this property at 215 Lewisburg Avenue. Currently there is approval for an addition to the building and approval for the construction of an accessory structure which is a garage.
Ms. Rose stated that the first proposal is specific to the roofing material for the previously approved accessory structure (garage). Ms. Rose referred to the approved roof plan that consisted of asphalt shingles for most of the roof. The dormer at the rear was approved for a standing seam metal roof. The applicant received a stop work order on the property because there is a roofing material that's entirely metal on the structure instead. The applicant was offered options to either remove the roof and replace it as approved by the Commission or to seek approval for an alteration to the previously approved plan. The second portion of the proposed application seeks approval for the removal of the roofing material on the main house, the principal building, that consists of asphalt shingle and to replace it with a cedar shake roofing material. Beginning with the accessory building, the garage, Ms. Rose stated that the guidelines recommend that accessory structures use materials and exterior finishes that are typically used in historical equivalents, and that details should complement (but not less elaborate) the character of a historic principal building. Asphalt shingles, fiberglass shingles, metal roofing, standing seam metal roofing are all appropriate materials. In this case, the use of standing seam metal, not originally proposed or approved, may be appropriate. The color of the material is not typical and is more elaborate than the color of the material on the principal building. It is recommended this item be denied for the accessory structure material. If the Commission chooses to approve the material, it is recommended that the Commission specify if the existing color on the roof is appropriate and otherwise specify what an approved color would be and how that color would be achieved. Ms. Rose further stated that staff recommends that the roofing material not be approved and be installed as previously approved – asphalt shingle and the dormer with a metal roof. If the Commission does approve, please specify if this color is appropriate and if not specify an appropriate color and a way to achieve the color through painting or removal of the material. Alterations for the principal building include the removal of the asphalt shingles and replacing those shingles with Cedar Shake roofing. The guidelines state that roofing materials contribute to the building cited in the application. Staff consulted the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps which the city had commissioned over different points in time. These maps provide information on the age, footprint of the building, scale, type of build and sometimes materials used. In this case, the building footprint indicates an age of somewhere between 1940 to 1950 and a composition roof which is made of multiple type materials. Based on the historical information available, the guidelines would suggest the most appropriate material would be the historical material which can be inferred to be a shingle material. Ms. Rose explained that asphalt shingles were very common in the 1920's on. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant sent an email, shortly before the meeting (4:30 pm), that

included a photo to be presented as an exhibit. The photo has not been reviewed due to the time that the email was received, and a recommendation has not been prepared for the Commission. Ms. Rose referred to the photo via the overhead screen which indicates the presence of wood underneath the shingles. The applicant is submitting the photo for consideration that a Cedar Shake roof was historically on the building or at least the porch. The recommendation from staff based on the materials that staff had at the time of the preparation of the report is that the historic documentation for the fire insurance map doesn't indicate an alternative material. Ms. Rose stated that the recommendation is that the request for alteration (removal of the asphalt shingles) of the principal building be denied based on these above-mentioned reasons.

- Applicant Speaker: Julie Alfrey, owner. Ms. Alfrey stated that historic homes have a way of revealing the past whether through the removal of wallpaper or the removal of roofing material. Ms. Alfrey invited the staff for a site-visit to see the original Cedar Shake roof discovered. Ms. Alfrey explained that she would like to use Cedar Shake and noted the roofing material is more expensive.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on the item.

- Citizen Speakers:
- Gail Haddock at 213 Lewisburg Avenue. Ms. Haddock stated that she lives next door to the project under discussion. Ms. Haddock thanked the Commissioners for their volunteer efforts for the public good. As an alderman, Ms. Haddock voted in favor of the establishment of the historic overlay districts and supports the HZC as the governing body of the districts. Ms. Haddock noted the importance of upholding the guidelines established by the HZC and the city. Noncompliance should not be tolerated, and applicants should be held to the standards and requirements strictly and consistently. Ms. Haddock urged the Commissioners to follow the staff recommendations to deny the proposed changes to this project. Ms. Haddock expressed her concern about the color of the roof. Ms. Haddock finished by thanking the Commission for the attention to her remarks.

- Bob Ravener at 221 3rd Avenue S. Mr. Ravener stated that he agrees with Ms. Haddock's remarks regarding upholding the established guidelines and he supports staff recommendations. Mr. Ravener noted the tremendous job that the staff does day in and day out, holding people accountable in an effort to keep the established character Franklin what it is.

Chair Roberts stated that the proposal would be broken down into two parts. The accessory building, then the main house (principal building).

MOTION

- Commissioner Denton made a motion to deny the accessory structure and Commissioner Worthington seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that had the original request been presented in this color and arrangement, he would not be in favor of the request. The proposal, as originally approved, should be how the project proceeds.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the Commission may allow exceptions to the rules if there is a special hardship on the applicant and, in this case, there doesn't appear to be a hardship on the applicant.

Chair Roberts stated that the drawings are clear on what was originally approved. Chair Roberts supports the motion to deny the alterations to the accessory structure.

- Motion passed, 8-0

MOTION

- Commissioner Marquardt moved to defer the principal building to January 9, 2023, HZC meeting. Commissioner Pearce seconded the motion.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that due to the new evidence presented shortly before the meeting, more time is needed for discussion.

Commissioner Pearce also noted that because the request is for a full shake roof everywhere, more investigation and inspection is needed.

Ms. Rose offered to set up an appointment with the applicant for a site visit.

Chair Roberts suggested that Mr. Tosh and the Building and Neighborhood Services department be involved in the site visit.

- Motion passed, 8-0

RECOMMENDATION REQUESTS

8. Recommendation Request for Submittal of Updated Nomination For The Lewisburg Avenue Historic District To The National Register of Historic Places.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Amanda Rose. Staff Project Leader. Ms. Rose stated that this request is to the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the updated nomination/listing for the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District to the National Register of Historic Places. The City of Franklin has several national registered districts. There are five, four of which are locally reviewed for compliance with the design guidelines. The staff has been working overtime to update the nominations/listing to be more thorough than their original forms. Many of the nominations were compiled and approved in the 1980's. There was a rush to do so because the National Historic Preservation Act had just been approved in the 1970's and it was important to get the historical properties listed. Creating updated documentation will be useful to the city staff, the Commission, and the public at large. Ms. Rose stated that the City of Franklin respectfully request that the Commission consider nomination to the State Review Board and the State Historic Preservation Office and then onto the Federal government Department of the Interior for consideration of approving the supplemental information. The National Register of Historic Places is the government's official list of what is worthy of preservation, including building structures and objects among other items. The certified local government is requested to provide an official recommendation to the state as it reviews the information and determines whether the information should be forwarded to the federal government. In this case, the certified local government is the Historic Zoning Commission and the Mayor of Franklin. Ms. Rose noted that the City of Franklin is a premier CLG in the state. Ms. Rose explained that National Register districts are not the same as local historic districts, but they can be the same as they are in the City of Franklin. The national registered districts are used as boundaries by which to base local districts. Sometimes there are portions of the district that aren't under design compliance or there are portions that expand beyond the local district. This request is to amend the existing documentation for what is already on the National Register listing.

Commissioner LeMarinel clarified that although the request is being called a nomination, it is additional documentation to be attached to a previously approved body of work.

Ms. Rose stated that she used listing and nomination interchangeably, but it should be called a listing. The National Registry boundaries for the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District are roughly the same as the local boundaries except for an additional parcel that is part of the local district.

Ms. Rose provided a summary of the proposed changes. The original listing was from 1988 and included a very brief nomination description. The staff made efforts to evaluate accessory structures that are important to the integrity of a historic district. The original listing from 1988 did not provide information on any accessory structures. The descriptions have been supplemented greatly. The original nomination included several errors with resource classification as to whether it was contributing or noncontributing. The estimated dates of construction have been addressed through thorough research as part of the update. Ms. Rose stated that the period of significance (the time that the district itself had resources that were constructed) is proposed to be extended from 1842-1935 to include, up to 1960. The survey finds that the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District maintains a high degree of integrity. The update identifies the resources from 40 buildings and revises the number from 40 buildings to 54 primary resources. The updated number includes two historic retaining walls and one historic wrought iron fence. A total of 14 of the primary resources, originally called buildings, were not documented in the original nomination. A total of 44 or 82 percent of the resources are contributing to the district. Outbuildings account for 20 of those 54 resources and are significant to staff and the Commission as requests are reviewed for potential demolition. A total of six resources are no longer present and removed from the inventory. Unfortunately, five outbuildings and one single family residence have been removed from the 1988 listing. One resource identified in the original listing was noncontributing and has been updated as a contributing resource. None of the resources classified as contributing have

changed status to noncontributing, which means that the HZC is doing an excellent job reviewing requests for alterations and is mindful that approved alterations are being completed in a way that keeps the integrity of the structure. As part of the update, boundaries are being cleaned up. The boundaries are not intended to change other than a narrow strip of land toward the back of 120 Lewisburg Avenue that is a result of subdivision of property in this area. There are some boundary decreases associated with this section because of Evans Estates. Area A is west of 108 and 110 Lewisburg that includes four subdivided lots for Evans Estates. Modern residences have been built out, so it is recommended that the boundary of the NR change to take those areas out. It is important to keep a positive percentage of contributing versus noncontributing structures. Area B includes a single parcel with a modern residence that was subdivided off of 118 Lewisburg Avenue. Boundary decrease Area C is a parcel at the south end of the district. According to the Sanborn maps, a stone residence originally existed, but is no longer present. It is recommended to decrease the boundary. Ms. Rose concluded by asking the Commission for a favorable recommendation. The staff is interested in hearing the comments and feedback from the Commission as the staff believes the update to the listing is very important to the historic resources inventory.

Chair Roberts asked Ms. Rose why the boundary stops at 210 Lewisburg Avenue and doesn't continue on through the Lewisburg historic district.

Ms. Rose stated that the 1988 nomination stopped at 210 Lewisburg Avenue, and the goal of the update wasn't to expand the district at this time. Beyond this point would be considered the local historic district.

Commissioner Pearce stated that extension of the Lewisburg Historic District could be put on the work list.

Ms. Rose noted that staff would like to propose a preservation plan for the community that addresses some of the needs. There are opportunities for expansion for most all of the districts and opportunities for new districts. There is no reason this district couldn't be expanded, but it is not part of the request at this time.

Commissioner Denton asked if decreasing the original district boundaries would create any sort of push back from the State Review Board or the Federal Review Board.

Ms. Rose explained that the Tennessee Historic Preservation office recommends keeping the integrity intact as much as possible. Removal of the noncontributing resources helps to serve as a basis for adopting local historic districts. When the adoptions are made and the guidelines are written, the alterations to buildings that are adjacent to historic buildings nearby truly reflect what the guidelines are. The alterations are considered according to the historic building rather than what the new building may look like.

Chair Roberts asked if once the recommendation is approved by the HZC will the listing be reviewed by any other City of Franklin body or will it go straight to the State Review Board and then National Registry.

Ms. Rose stated that the listing would go straight to the next level. The mayor is also asked to provide a recommendation after the Commission makes a ruling. The next step is the state review Board which is charged with reviewing all National Register new nominations, new listings updates and providing a recommendation to the federal government on whether or not to approve. Ms. Rose stated that she is on the State Review Board and would need to recuse herself from discussion and voting regarding this item.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she believes all nominations benefit from review and updates.

Ms. Rose stated that during her tenure with the City of Franklin, the downtown Franklin district and the Hincheyville districts have been updated with the Lewisburg Avenue district as the third update. There are two more updates coming up that include Adams Street District and the Natchez Street District.

Commissioner Worthington asked for clarification as to whether the overlay district would be changed or not.

Ms. Rose stated that the overlay district would not be changed and made clear that the updating of the Lewisburg Avenue district is simply to increase the district's historical integrity. We are recognizing that originally 40 resources were listed whereas now 54 resources are listed as contributing.

Commissioner Worthington asked if any of the accessory structures were listed as contributing resources.

Ms. Rose stated that the majority of those are contributing resources.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to speak regarding this item.

Gail Haddock, 213 Lewisburg Avenue. Ms. Haddock asked what it means if there is confusion about her property regarding the boundary lines.

Ms. Rose stated that there is some confusion because there used to be a house on the property that is no longer there. Because the building is no longer there, there isn't a need to have the property listed as part of the updated Lewisburg Avenue District.

Ms. Haddock stated that she wasn't sure if that was accurate. Ms. Haddock remembered that there was a concrete block house or cinder block house that looked like it was a building used for the sewage treatment plant when she purchased the property in 1981.

Ms. Rose asked Commissioner Laster if he knew any information about the property from his familiarity with the Sanborn maps.

Commissioner Laster stated that he would have to take a closer look at the maps.

Chair Roberts asked Ms. Haddock if there was a building in front of her house in 1988.

Ms. Haddock stated, "no" there wasn't a house.

Ms. Rose further explained that the decreased area listed as 213 Lewisburg Avenue was incorrectly listed as 211 Lewisburg Avenue. The decreased area would correspond with 213 Lewisburg Avenue. Documentation, further than this information, doesn't appear to exist other than what Ms. Haddock has explained. Because the resource is not present as compared to the 1988 nomination, it is appropriate to move forward with the current decrease that includes Ms. Haddock's property.

MOTION

- Commissioner Pearce made a motion to approve to recommend. Commissioner Laster seconded the motion.
- Motion, passed 7-0

OTHER BUSINESS

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

9. **Signage (Convenience) at 125 5th Ave. S.; Michael Evans (Park Happy), Applicant.**

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

10. **Signage (Convenience & Sandwich Board) at 108 4th Ave. S.; Michael Evans (Park Happy), Applicant.**

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

11. **Signage (Convenience & Sandwich Board) at 135 5th Ave. S.; Michael Evans (Park Happy), Applicant.**

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

12. **Signage (Sandwich Board) at 100 4th Ave. N.; Heather Joel, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

13. **Alterations (Structural Repair of Bell Tower) at 255 Natchez St.; Ronald Crutcher, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

14. **Signage (Wall) at 400 Main St. Ste. 120.; Kylie Brown, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 06:21 p.m.

Chair

Date

