



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, January 9, 2023

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 05:02 PM

Board Members Present: Susan Besser, Josh Denton, Brian Laster, Tyler LeMarinel, Jim Roberts, Mary Pearce, left at 6:43 pm, Lisa Marquardt, Scott Harrison, Kathy Worthington arrived at 5:05 pm

Board Members Absent: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes

Sponsors:

Minutes: December 12, 2022

- o Motion to Approve the Minutes
 - Laster
 - Pearce
- o Motion carried 7-0 Commissioner Harrison recused himself as he was not present at the December meeting.

OFFICERS

2. Consideration Of 2023 Commission Chair & Vice-Chair.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Chair Roberts explained that in accordance with the bylaws a Chair and Vice-Chair are to be elected each January.

- o Motion for Roberts for Chair and Pearce Vice-Chair
 - Marquardt
 - Laster
- o Motion carried 8-0

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Rose announced and welcomed Planning Commissioner Scott Harrison to the Historic Zoning Commission. Commissioner Harrison will be the representative from the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission, required by state, for this year.

Ms. Rose announced that the Design Review Committee Meeting will take place on Tuesday, January 17, 2023, in the City Hall Board Room, due to the Federal holiday on Monday.

VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

- Laura Turner at 1108 Dickerson Lane discussing St. Paul Episcopal Church

Ms. Turner stated that she is speaking on behalf of St. Paul's Episcopal Church as a major historic icon in the city of Franklin. Although St. Paul's is not included in the historic Hincheyville overlay and at the 2020 Tennessee Historical Commission meeting the new rector requested that the church be moved from the National Register of Historic Places. It was explained to the rector what the difference between being listed on the National Register of Historic Places and historic overlay meant, he allowed the church to remain on the register. The rector does not want any historic oversight regarding his plans to demolish the historic footprint of the church behind the Sanctuary to build a second story building.

Ms. Turner further stated that ADA access can be accommodated in the existing structure. Years ago visionary leaders of the church purchased the First Tennessee Bank building behind the church for future growth. The bank building is not historic and can accommodate growth without harming the historic, culturally significant, and sacred sanctuary of St. Paul's.

In November, the head of the Construction committee, Bob Larsen, stated that 906 Architects have identified three contractors and the church will select one in December. Ms. Turner stated that she and others have been vocal in opposition of these plans which will put in jeopardy 150-year Urban Pecan Tree. According to Ms. Turner, Mr. Larsen stated that the committee plans to meet with the HZC to be transparent regarding the upcoming changes to St. Paul's.

Ms. Turner ended by respectfully requesting support from the HZC on preserving and protecting the historic footprint of St. Paul's Episcopal Church.

- Nell Henderson at 202 Revere Lane discussing St. Paul Episcopal Church

Nell Henderson, wife of John Henderson and former early president of the Heritage Foundation, are most concerned with the recent developments regarding St. Paul Episcopal Church. Ms. Henderson read a letter Mr. Henderson wrote highlighting his concerns. Mr. Henderson and other members of the church believe the historical essence will be damaged if the ongoing capital campaign continues without adjustment and corrective measures regarding historical preservation. Renovations made to the church should be in keeping with the historical nature of the church and Upgrades/additions can be made without disrupting the historical architecture or the historical trees. The letter went on to suggest that Parish leadership visit other historic Episcopal churches in Tennessee such as Christ Church Cathedral in Nashville among others. As Ms. Henderson read Mr. Henderson's letter, she noted alternative ways to meet the needs of St. Paul's proposed construction plan without damaging the historic building and without inconveniencing the congregation while under construction. Lastly, Ms. Henderson stated that the historic designations (National Register of Historic Places and the Hincheyville District) are not easily remedied if hasty missteps are taken. Ms. Henderson explained that the letter was signed by several communicantes and the letter was presented to the vestry. Ms. Henderson and her husband spoke to the vestry and encouraged them to listen to the professionals and experts in the areas of preservation. This board will be hearing the proposed contemporary alterations in the future. "We feel the plan, for one of our major landmarks, is more

contemporary than it should be for a 19th-century historic church.” “It is our hope that this board will be able to point out its heritage and historical importance for future generations, to the rector and the St Paul’s construction committee.”

APPLICATIONS

3. **Consideration Of Wall Construction/Signage At 1001 Benelli Park Ct.; Jim Poole, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Ms. Huffer stated that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its October 17, 2022, and December 19, 2022, meetings.

The proposal includes the construction of a retaining wall with an attached sign for the residential infill neighborhood. The wall will be at the entrance of Benelli Park Court and will face onto Boyd Mill Avenue and will be 5' from the right-of-way. The wall will measure 20' in length, 3'-4" in height, and will be 2'-6" wide and will consist of a stone material that will blend with the other existing stone walls that are seen on Boyd Mill Avenue. The wall will taper away from Benelli Park Ct., as the need to retain the land lessens. This will further keep with the style of walls in the neighborhood. The sign that will be attached to the wall will utilize 8" aluminum letters to spell out "Benelli" and will measure 3.67 sq. ft. Up lighting will also be used to illuminate the sign and the oak tree.

The Guidelines recommend that retaining wall materials should be similar in scale, texture, color, and form to those historically used in the district. This proposal meets this guideline by utilizing a stone material that is similar to what is seen on Boyd Mill Avenue.

Additionally, the applicant has adjusted the original design based on feedback from the DRC meeting to better meet the intent of this guideline.

The guidelines recommend that development entrance signs have a maximum sign area of five square feet with a column cap maximum set of seven feet.

The proposal meets these guidelines by measuring three feet in height, three feet, four inches in height and 3.67 square feet for the sign square footage. Additionally, the guidelines recommend that illumination should be used with a warm white light which does not distort the color of building materials or finishes. Illumination for development on entrance signs should utilize external illumination, which is limited to soft landscape, up lighting. The proposal meets these guidelines by utilizing a 48-inch warm light brass up lighting fixture for the sign and a three inch warm light brass fixture for the up lighting of the oak tree.

Ms. Huffer completed her presentation by explaining that staff recommends that Item #3 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1) The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a sign permit.
- 2) Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Applicant Speaker: Jim Poole, resident of Benelli Park. Mr. Poole thanked Ms. Rose and the staff for their help and support throughout the process. Mr. Poole stated that Ms. Huffer summarized the proposal nicely and he did not have anything else to add.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on this application, there were none.

MOTION

- o Motion for Approval with conditions
 - Harrison
 - Denton

Discussion

Commissioner Worthington asked if there were specific details regarding the individual letters of the sign.

Mr. Poole stated that the letters will be aluminum cut out individually and will be mounted to the face of the stone.

Ms. Rose provided an illustration on the overhead screen for further information about the letters.

Mr. Rose stated that the letter color would be aluminum or dark silver for readability against the stone.

With no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissions to vote.

MOTION VOTE:

- o Motion for Approval with conditions
 - Harrison
 - Denton
- o Motion, passed 9 – 0

4. Consideration Of New Construction (Accessory) At 418 Lewisburg Ave. (Collins Farm); Brian Walker, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

- Applicant Speaker: Brian Walker
- Project Leader: Amanda Rose

Staff Presentation: Ms. Rose stated that the applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for the installation of a small 16 by 16 pavilion at Collins Farm, which is a city park off Lewisburg Avenue. The applicant appeared before the DRC in September and in December of last year. Ms. Rose stated that the City of Franklin has partnered with the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) to complete certain maintenance needs and improvements at Collins Farm. One of the requests of the DAR is to install a pavilion on the site. The purpose of the pavilion is to provide a shady place for park visitors and volunteers to sit, rest, and discuss topics of the day and historical events of the past. The pavilion will also serve as a place for organized meetings such as volunteer workdays, educational events, and public outreach.

Ms. Rose explained that the Guidelines recommend that one locate new accessory structures to be secondary in prominence to the historic principal buildings on the site or in the district. Further, the Guidelines state that one should use materials and exterior finishes that are typically used in historical equivalents and that details should complement, but be less elaborate than, the character of the historic principal buildings. Asphalt shingles, fiberglass shingles, 5V metal, and standing seam metal are appropriate roofing materials. If new accessory structures lack historically appropriate detailing, such as on prefabricated sheds, the Guidelines recommend that they be located so they are not visible from the front facade or street.

The size of the proposed pavilion is 16' x 16' x 11' 10 ¾". It is proposed to be constructed of unstained, rough-sawn western red cedar. Because the pavilion is located in the flood plain a flood durable wood of western red cedar is proposed. The posts are 6" x 6" in size and measure 7' in height and are proposed to be anchored to a concrete pad with post bases. On the drawing, the anchors are black and slightly decorative. At the DRC's request, these anchors will not be used. Instead, the anchors listed in the materials, Simpson ABW66RZ, will be used. These are not decorative; they are plain galvanized anchors.

The pavilion will be proposed to be positioned so that its gable ends face away from Lewisburg Ave. and toward the existing structures. This positioning has been chosen so that the pavilion will more seamlessly blend into its surroundings. Latticework will also be included on the gable ends, at the DRC's request, though it is not shown on the drawings. The latticework will pay homage to an outbuilding that once stood on the property (see photograph in application materials), soften the appearance of the roof's support structure, while also providing more traditional detailing. It will be installed in the same orientation as the latticework of the prior outbuilding.

The roof is proposed to consist of 26-gauge r-panel metal paneling, black in color, at a 6/12 pitch with 12" overhangs. There will be no gutters attached to this structure. The concrete pad will extend slightly beyond the drip line of the roof to dissipate the energy of any rainfall.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Rose completed her presentation by stating that no recommendation is provided, as this is a city-sponsored item.

Finally, Ms. Rose stated that If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any proposed changes to the approved plan must be

submitted to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval prior to work commencing.

Applicant Presentation: Brian Walker. Mr. Walker with Franklin Parks Department. Mr. Walker did not have anything further to add to Ms. Rose's presentation.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on this application, there were none.

MOTION

- Motion for Approval
 - o Marquardt
 - o Harrison

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Pearce asked if Ms. Rose could pull up the photo of the lattice work. Ms. Pearce stated that she is pleased with the applicant response to the DRC recommendations.

Ms. Rose provided a historic photo of the building that was on the site years ago. This photo is the inspiration of the lattice work recommended by the DRC.

There being no further discussion, Chair Robert asked the Commissioner to vote.

MOTION VOTE:

- Motion for Approval
 - o Marquardt
 - o Harrison
- Motion, passed 9 – 0

5. **Consideration Of Alterations (Porches/Stair Landings, Foundation Enclosure/Repair, Ramp Construction) At 239 Franklin Rd. (Hayes House); Brandon Priddy, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

- Applicant Speaker: Brandon Priddy
- Project Leader: Amanda Rose

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that this COA is to request a series of alterations to the Hayes House located at the Park at Harlinsdale Farm on Franklin Road. Ms. Rose explained that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its September 19, 2022, meeting. Ms. Rose mentioned that this is a city-sponsored item and there will not be a recommendation, only an overview of the alterations and what the guidelines suggest.

The proposed alterations include the following:

- Alterations to the stairs/landings at several secondary entrances for ADA compliance.
- Alterations to the main porch to better distinguish newer work from historic configurations.
- The construction of an ADA ramp at the rear of the building, to tie the parking area to an accessible entrance.
- In-kind repair of existing brick paths; and
- Alterations to the parking area using the West Tennessee paving material.

Porch/Stair Landings

Ms. Rose stated that the secondary entrances of the building feature stone and/concrete stairs and landings, each in various states of repair, and the application seeks to repair/replace these landings by removing the stones, building a new concrete sub-structure, and replacing the stones at an ADA-appropriate tread and riser height. Simple black steel railings are proposed to be installed for accessibility on a couple of the locations, while a simple wood railing is proposed at the location of the rear addition (as this better coordinate with the proposed access ramp). The Guidelines support the maintenance of historic materials and appearances; the proposed alterations are conducive to maintaining historic appearance while also meeting

code requirements.

The porch stairs are proposed for alterations as well, as the existing stairs and railings are not original. The application seeks to propose a new wood stair in a style more contemporary to the architecture of the building. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) approved only a very simple design for both sets of front porch steps and railings; as such, the same is being proposed to the HZC. See page A2 for the proposed conditions. The proposed conditions are in keeping with the Guidelines' recommendation for the use of simple wood detailing on porches.

Ms. Rose stated that lattice work is proposed to enclose the porch foundation area as well, and the style is in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines, as the piers are proposed to be left exposed. Further, the proposal includes a request to paint the non-historic brick underneath the porch deck; this is appropriate, as the brick is not historic. SHPO approval will be required for this aspect of the application, if approved by the HZC, before work commences.

Accessibility Ramp

Ms. Rose explained that the Guidelines support the construction of ramps on rear or side facades where not readily feasible, recommend the use of wood or concrete, and support simple designs that offer reversibility and do not involve the removal of historic features. A simple wood accessibility ramp is proposed to tie the parking area to the accessible entrance. This is demonstrated by starting the ramp at the rear and left corner of the building, spanning it across the rear elevation, and tying it to the rear and right secondary entrance. The underside of the addition is proposed to be enclosed at this location as well, with painted brick to better support the structural integrity of the addition and the ramp. The proposal is in keeping with the intent of the Guidelines.

Walkways and Parking

Finally, Ms. Rose stated that the proposal also includes the repaving of the existing parking area with West Tennessee mix, which will match the material of the main drive to the farm and will offer a soft, historically typical treatment to the area. The existing stone and brick paths are proposed to be cleaned up and repaired, with a new stone path (from reclaimed stone on site) to be added from the parking area to the foremost secondary entrance on the left facade. This is an appropriate and historically typical pattern. A new brick landing is proposed to be added to the front entrance and to the secondary entrances on the right facade for ADA compliance. The herringbone pattern will distinguish the new work from the old and will correspond to the context of the site.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Rose finished her presentation by stating that no recommendation is provided, as this is a city-sponsored item.

Applicant Presentation: Brandon Priddy, 906 Studio Architects. Mr. Priddy thanked Ms. Rose for her help in communicating with the State Historic Preservation Office.

Ms. Rose added that the SHPO has approved the proposal. The only remaining approval needed from the state is approval to paint the brick piers under the porch. The state reviewed the proposal from both interior arrangements and exterior alterations. Ms. Rose stated that she is very confident the plan would meet the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior, as proposed today.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on this application, there were none.

MOTION

- Main motion for Approval
 - o Pearce
 - o LeMarinel

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Laster asked when the brick piers were constructed.

Ms. Rose stated that she believed brick piers were added when the state approved repairs for the Queen Ann gutters. Or, brick piers were added when the City of Franklin took ownership of the farm in the mid 2000's. The brick piers were added in the more recent future.

Commissioner Laster stated that the reason for painting of the brick piers is to blend in with the stone.

Mr. Priddy stated that, yes, this is correct. We visually want to make the piers recede more. Also, the brick that will be used to stabilize the porch on one side of the house could also be painted to minimize the visual impact.

Commissioner Laster asked if the stone would be painted.

Mr. Priddy stated, "no."

Commissioner Marquardt stated that Mr. Hathaway mentioned, in September, matching the railing at Fort Granger to an area on the Hayes House.

Mr. Priddy stated that in conferring with the state, it was preferred that a simpler style be used for the Hayes House.

Commissioner Marquardt noted that she likes the railing at Fort Granger and how it fades away, but she completely understands the preferences and guidelines of the state.

Ms. Rose stated that the State Historic Preservation Office abides by the Secretary of Interior standards which the city of Franklin has developed its Historic Design Guidelines. In this case, because the Hayes House is framed and the style is contemporary to the late 1800's, early 1900's, it was recommended that wood be the material to reflect this historical time period. The experience at Fort Grainger is the cultural experience and with that type of railing, one is able to see through to the surrounding landscape. There is merit to both types but in talking to the state consultant and city staff, it was felt that the wood would achieve the same feeling at the Hayes House.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked for more details regarding the materials that will be used for the Hayes House. Is there a scheme that would provide this information.

Mr. Priddy stated that colors have not been discussed yet, but initially a gray color has been discussed. No final decisions have been made regarding colors.

Commissioner LeMarinel mentioned the green colors used on the front steps. Mr. LeMarinel also stated that as foreign as the ramp looks on the drawing, in real-life, depending on the color, could look even more bizarre or misplaced. Mr. LeMarinel stated that it would be his preference that the alterations tie together in some fashion.

Mr. Priddy stated that the colors could be matched to what is existing.

AMENDMENT #1

- Rear ramp verticals painted to match the color scheme of the front porch, staff approval on color and deck can be sealed wood.
 - o LeMarinel
 - o Marquardt
 - o Rescinded

Discussion

Commissioner Pearce asked if Mr. LeMarinel is agreeable to adding that it should come back to staff for approval.

Commissioner LeMarinel expressed his concerns about maintenance of the painted wood ramp. Since the ramp isn't covered, the wood ramp would not weather well if painted. Painting everything that is vertical would work while the ramp floor is sealed wood.

Commissioner LeMarinel suggested the best route may be for the applicant and staff to work together on the coordination of colors and materials.

Commissioner Pearce noted her concern that if the green paint colors don't end up being exactly the best color choice, their hands would be tied and no changes could be made.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked if he should rescind his motion.

Commissioner Marquardt was agreeable to the change.

After no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote.

AMENDMENT #2

- The applicant will work with Staff on the color scheme of the rear ramp and steps.
 - o Pearce
 - o Denton
 - o Amendment #2 carried 9-0
-

MOTION VOTE:

- Main motion for Approval
 - o Pearce
 - o LeMarinel
- Overall Motion, as amended, passed 9-0

6. **Consideration Of Demolition (Accessory), New Construction (Accessory), & Alterations (Fence/Gate) At 202 2nd Ave. S.; Brandon Priddy, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

- Applicant Speaker: Brandon Priddy
- Project Leader: Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its May 16, 2022, June 20, 2022, and December 19, 2022 meetings.

Demolition:

The proposal includes the demolition of an existing, non-historic accessory structure. The Guidelines recommend against the demolition of historic buildings or structures if they retain integrity. The existing accessory structure is a ca. 2000s prefabricated structure. As a non-historic accessory structure, its removal is consistent with the Guidelines.

New Construction:

The proposal includes the construction of a new accessory structure. The Guidelines state that new accessory structures are to be located behind the rear plane of the principal building. The front facade of a new accessory structure is recommended to be parallel with the principal building's front facade and placed in traditional locations in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. New accessory structures are to be secondary in prominence to the historic principal buildings on the site or in the district. New accessory structures should not block the view of principal buildings from public viewsheds. The new accessory structure should be compatible with and be visually subordinate in size, mass, and height to the principal building they support. The Guidelines also recommend that the size of new accessory structures be subordinate to the principal building and not exceed 1.5 stories; the new structure's footprint should not exceed 50 percent of the principal buildings. The new accessory structure and principal building's footprints are not to exceed 35 percent of the lot.

- Location and Design - The new accessory building is intended to be situated in the same general area as the existing accessory structure that is proposed for removal. The applicant has adjusted the original design based on feedback from the DRC to better meet the scale and sizing concerns that were expressed. The overall ridge height of the new construction does not exceed the second-floor windowsills of the principal building.
- On the north elevation that faces Church Street, the proposal includes a 10'x10' stone veneer faux door and faux bi-fold shutters. Based on feedback from the December 19, 2022, DRC meeting, the applicant adjusted the features of the second frontage from a faux bay of windows to the 10'x10' faux door and by adding stone veneer on the foundation of the structure. The Guidelines state that facade alterations are important to preserve, especially when they are highly visible from public streets. By adjusting the design of this facade from DRC comments, it addresses the concerns of the commissioners and

better meets the intent of the Guidelines.

- On the south elevation that faces towards the existing fountain will not be seen from street view, it will utilize a glass door system. The applicant will repurpose two Gothic stained-glass windows, to be placed on either side of the door. The stained-glass windows will also have storm windows to protect the glass from the elements. While the use of stained glass is not typical to the Guidelines, it will be utilized on a facade that is not visible from the public viewshed.
- The east elevation of the new accessory building, which faces the principal building, will utilize a 12'x14' wooden arched door. Per the recommendation from the December 19, 2022, DRC meeting, the dimensions for the arched door were altered.
- On the west elevation, which faces the rear of the property, an exterior panel door is proposed. This elevation will not be seen from public view.
- Materials - The materials of the new accessory building will utilize painted siding with 4" exposure and a dark metal standing seam roof, which are consistent with the Guidelines. While the applicant does not state what type of siding will be utilized, the Guidelines recommend that new accessory structures utilize materials and exterior finishes typically used in historic equivalents and to avoid the use of modern siding materials like vinyl or pressed wood.
- Size - The footprint of the proposed new accessory structure measures 1012 sq. ft., which equates to 42 percent of the footprint of the primary building. The total building coverage measures approximately 20 percent of the lot, which is consistent with the Guidelines.

Fence & Gate:

The proposed fence is to be located facing Church Street at the left rear corner of the primary building connecting to the right corner of the proposed new accessory structure. The applicant plans to use a black metal fence, which is consistent within the Guidelines that state that fences should be compatible with the architectural style of the building and should support the historic character of the district. The use of this type of fencing is appropriate due to the primary building being a high-style Federal building.

Further, the Guidelines state that fences for the rear yard are to be at least 20' behind the front facade and are not to exceed 7' in height.

Additionally, the applicant is proposing to have a gate to control access to the site. The proposed gate is an antique metal gate that is 10' wide and 5' tall and will have stone pillars on either side of the gate. The dimensions of the pillars are proposed as being 5'-8" tall and 2' wide. The Guidelines state that gates should be of a different design, material, or detailing from the associated fence or wall design. While the applicant follows these Guidelines, it would be appropriate for the stone of the pillars to be compatible with the stone foundation of the primary building.

The applicant is proposing new gates attached to the existing fence at the rear of the property, to screen the trash receptacles. It is unclear from the application the dimensions and material of the gates. Because the proposed location is at the rear of the property, this proposal may qualify for administrative review.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that this Item be approved with the following conditions:

1. The siding material must be a cementitious board or wood, rather than vinyl or pressed wood.
2. The stone for the gate pillars must be consistent with the color and context of the stone on the building's foundation.
3. The proposed screening of trash receptacles with the fence is unclear, and it is not approved as part of this application. It may qualify for an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, however; the applicant must work with the Assistant Preservation Planner to provide the additional information requisite to consider this action.
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Project Consideration:

Be advised that if the studio is proposed for public use/access, not just for the property owner's use, additional parking will be required.

Applicant Presentation: Brandon Priddy. Mr. Priddy thanked the staff and the board for their assistance and recommendations throughout the process.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to comment on the item, there were none.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION

- Main motion for Approval with conditions

- o Pearce
 - o Harrison
- Discussion

Commissioner Denton asked if the pink flag is the location of the building that will be close to the roadway.

Mr. Priddy stated that it is a flag that he placed on the property. It could be the property line or a utility marker.

Chair Roberts asked for more detail regarding the fencing proposed.

Mr. Priddy stated that along the Church Street side there would be metal fencing, stone pillars, the gate, then another piece of decorative metal fence that ties to the back of the main structure. There is another small area around the back that will surround the area of the trashcans.

Commissioner Pearce asked if the dark color of the roofing material is part of the proposal or will the staff review the color.

Ms. Rose stated that the color is proposed to be bronze or black and staff will have the opportunity to approve the final color.

Commissioner Pearce asked if the details of the doors facing the Church Street side will also come back to staff for comment and if not, Ms. Pearce stated that she would like to see the condition added.

Ms. Rose stated that the area is the Church Street side, south elevation. Ms. Rose made a note of the conditions for the roof color and the door details.

AMENDMENT #1

- Roof color and faux doors that face Church St. to come back to staff for approval.
 - o Pearce
 - o Denton
- Amendment to motion carried 9-0

Commissioner Marquardt asked if the footprint on the current application is considerably smaller than the original application.

Ms. Rose stated that the footprint is not small, but the scale is significantly smaller. The original scale was a very tall scale/1.5 to 2 story height. The applicant has worked with his client, the owner, and brought that down to a scale that is supported by the zoning ordinance and the design guidelines. Ms. Rose noted that Kelly has worked very hard along the way to incorporate the DRC recommendations into the project.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that in the original proposal there was a rendering that compared how the building would look next to the historic building.

Mr. Priddy stated that the next page in the application documents compares the difference between the two buildings scale wise.

Commissioner Marquardt asked about the opening and closing of the gate between the stone columns in the middle gap.

Ms. Rose explained that this particular drawing does not show the amount of actual space between the buildings. The metal gate and columns are proposed to go between the two.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she doesn't see anything consistent with the gate in the area.

Mr. Priddy asked Ms. Rose to go back to the site plan. There is an existing stone wall between the gravel parking lot and the fountain.

Ms. Rose provided an illustration of the proposed metal gate to be used along with images of the courtyard.

Ms. Marquardt asked about the height difference.

Ms. Rose stated that in the proposal the height is 5 feet 4 inches including the cap.

Commissioner Marquardt commented on the use of stone and how difficult it is to match.

Mr. Priddy stated that the goal is to use a material that is complementary in the same palette and style. The gate will be clearly different than the existing gate.

Commissioner Marquardt asked if the part of the fence is historic wrought iron.

Mr. Priddy explained that yes that part of the fence in the upper right-hand corner of the site plan is historic.

AMENDMENT #2

- The stone used for the pillars to be approved by staff.
 - o Marquardt
 - o Pearce
- Amendment to motion carried 9-0

Discussion

Commissioner Laster stated his concerns about the size of the faux window on the outbuilding that can be seen from Church Street. One would expect either one to two windows with the sash (s) measuring 26 – 28 inches. This would complement or harmonize the neighborhood better.

Mr. Priddy stated that the design decision was based on keeping the building simple. Two smaller windows with faux shutters would look great. The windows would be narrow enough for the shutters to close.

Commissioner Laster created an amendment to the motion.

AMENDMENT #3

- Reduce width of the faux window facing Church St. so the sash appearance is between 26" – 28."
 - o Laster
 - o Besser
- Amendment to motion carried 9-0

MOTION VOTE

- Main motion for Approval with conditions
 - o Pearce
 - o Harrison
- Overall motion, as amended, passed 9 – 0

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

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Commissioner Denton stated that he has declined in the past to participate in this matter. Now that the potential for a conflict no longer exists, he is able to participate and will do so in a fair and unbiased manner. **

- Applicant Speaker: Greg Gamble, Benton Smothers
- Project Leader: Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The applicant applied for a Modification of Standards (MOS) to the Zoning Ordinance for the location of the refuse areas, as the Zoning Ordinance does not allow for placement in front of buildings. The Board of Mayor and Aldermen approved a MOS for the proposal on October 25, 2022. Due to the property's location within the Historic Preservation Overlay, however, the Design Guidelines still apply, and the applicant is seeking a COA for the location and screening.

The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at its November 21, 2022, and

December 19, 2022, meetings. Additionally, the applicant requested to defer this proposal from the December 12, 2022, HZC meeting, to the January 9, 2023 meeting.

The proposal includes the addition of two refuse areas for the Factory at Franklin that will be located between the buildings and Liberty Pike. The proposed screening is to measure 31'-8" in length, 11'8" in width, and be 8' in height and consist of masonry walls with a stained cedar gate to access the trash receptacles/compactors.

The Guidelines are not intended to be a comprehensive document that covers all zoning requests, such as the placement of refuse areas, but the Guidelines do note that site and setting alterations should not be undertaken in locations that are visible from the public view and distract from or overwhelm the context of historic districts. The Guidelines also note that fences and walls should measure no more than 3' in front yards, as principal buildings and front yards are more visible from public view sheds. With these Guidelines in consideration, the refuse locations and requisite screening, at the Liberty Pike locations, are not recommended.

During the December 19, 2022, DRC meeting, the DRC requested that the applicant provide alternative locations, further away from the street, for consideration. Additional locations were not provided for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that this Item be denied, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated January 9, 2023.

Applicant Presentation: Greg Gamble & Benton Smothers., Representing Holladay Properties. Mr. Gamble thanked the Commission for the opportunity to come back to the DRC to discuss the refuse location at the Factory, further. Mr. Gamble stated that the group reanalyzed the parking lot, the drainage, the storm, infrastructure, truck turning movements, pedestrian safety and landscape screening. Mr. Gamble explained that they believe this plan is the best plan for the physical location and design and how it relates to the businesses at the Factory. Part of the analysis included comparisons to Main Street. What was found was the distance from the Farmer's Market to Mafioso's is approximately 10-15 feet more, than the same distance from Third Avenue to Fifth Avenue. Within the distance of Main Street(backhouse) there are 47 locations that are dumpsters or trash receptacle areas as each business has it's own refuse area. The Factory situation is completely different. There are four areas for refuse trash at the factory. Each refuse area will be maintained and operated by Holladay Properties, one single entity. Each location will have a washout area and each one will have connections back to the infrastructure within the parking of the Factory. They can control and maintain when the trash is picked up. It is designed in such a way that they feel confident that there will only be one pick-up a day unless there is a special event planned. The intention is for the four refuse areas to be very well maintained through a managed operation. This plan, as presented, does align with the modification of standards that is incorporated into the development plan that was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission. It was also unanimously approved by the Board of Mayor and Alderman. The plan is currently consistent with those plans that were approved in the modification of standards approved by the Board.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment on this item.

Citizen Speaker:

- Andy Blair at 533 Plantation Ct. Nashville, TN. Mr. Blair stated that he is in support of the proposal. Ideally, it's not best to house refuse areas along major streets or in front of the buildings. Mr. Blair explained the significance of the property to him as his grandfather owned the original Stove Factory. Mr. Blair stated that he would like the property to be utilized in the best possible way in the future. Mr. Blair sees Holladay Properties as the best stewards of the Factory since Calvin Lehw saved the Factory back in 1990. The 30 feet Magnolia trees should provide the necessary screening of the refuse areas from Liberty Pike and Franklin Road rather than placing the refuse areas at the back of the Factory property. Access to the refuse areas for the restaurants would not be convenient. Mr. Blair thanked the Board for letting him speak and he looks forward to hearing the recommendations.

There being no other citizen comments, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION

- Motion for Approval
 - o Harrison
 - o LeMarinel

Discussion

Commissioner Marquardt asked Mr. Gamble to explain why other locations would be impractical or not ideal.

Mr. Smothers stated that it's more about travel distance especially for the restaurants at the Factory. For restaurants in buildings 11, 12,13 and 14 to travel to the back parking lot of the Factory would require a route through the interior of the

Factory which is something that should be avoided. Mr. Smothers stated that this process to it would be very difficult to control. The shortest distances are the most convenient for the restaurants.

Mr. Gamble stated if you compare the distance between Mafiosos and the Farmer's Market to the distance between Third Avenue to Fifth Avenue in downtown Franklin, the distance is two city blocks for trash disposal. That would be like asking Starbuck's at 5-points to throw away their trash beyond the roundabout in downtown Franklin.

Mr. Smothers explained that one of the first questions potential restaurateurs ask is where and how far the trash containers are.

Commissioner Marquardt asked how many containers would be in each of the four locations.

Mr. Smothers explained that there will be 3 containers.

Commissioner Denton asked about a procedural clarification regarding the MOS at the BOMA meeting in October.

Ms. Rose explained that the developmental plan was amended for this project and the HZC did provide a recommendation to the FMPC and BOMA about the modification of standards.

Commissioner Denton asked if the HZC is to consider the design of each refuse area or is the HZC to consider whether or not the refuse locations are appropriate.

Ms. Rose explained that BOMA did approve the modification of standards because the zoning ordinance specifically states the refuse location should not be located where they are proposed to be located. The design guidelines do apply, in addition to the zoning ordinance, to location and mechanism.

Chair Roberts stated that the COA for refuse locations at the Factory is back to the HZC for final approval.

Commissioner Pearce stated she would like to see one of the 3 dumpsters come out of each refuse location. The pick-up process is very loud and it is not in keeping with the guidelines to house refuse areas in front of buildings in Franklin. Ms. Pearce stated that she deeply appreciates what Holladay Properties are doing at the Factory, but she strongly disagrees with the proposed refuse locations and size. Perhaps if the refuse locations were not 30 feet long, it would be something she could support.

Commissioner Besser stated that she agrees with Ms. Pearce and cannot support the request for the refuse locations. Ms. Besser explained that she appreciates the work the applicant has done to position the refuse locations so that they are convenient to the Factory tenants.

Commissioner Harrison asked Ms. Pearce where she heard the dumpster being emptied. Mr. Harrison explained that BOMA is planning to propose a new Factory district to protect this area of Franklin. Mr. Harrison went on to say that it is important to approve the refuse location so that the project can continue to move forward successfully creating tourist dollars for the city. Mr. Harrison is in support of the item.

Commissioner Laster stated that the Commission should go back to the design guidelines for discussion, specifically viewsheds. The city staff is not recommending approval of the refuse locations because Franklin Road is a major thoroughfare in Franklin. Liberty Pike may have been considered a "secondary street" in the past but the majority of the Factory can be viewed from Liberty Pike. Mr. Laster stated that the guidelines are correct in that they protect the viewshed of the Factory along Liberty Pike. Mr. Laster finished by stating that he cannot support the refuse locations.

Commissioner Harrison stated that the applicant is proposing accurate screening for the refuse locations and if the Board of Mayor and Alderman have planned to specifically designate the Factory area for protection, it would be a great loss to the city if the Factory were to be torn down. The reasonable accessibility of the refuse locations can make or break the survivability of a restaurant. Mr. Harrison stated that a group of people have and are putting forth money to make the Factory a functional and successful location for businesses. The dumpsters can be hidden with foliage and solid walls. The dumpsters should be allowed to help the Factory businesses now and in the future.

Commissioner Laster stated that he is grateful that BOMA sent the request back to the HZC for final approval. There is a

simple solution for the refuse locations, but it is more complex. If this proposal is denied at this meeting, a solution can be found. Mr. Laster reassured the application that a solution will be determined.

Commissioner Pearce stated, regarding the comment about a Factory District, that there will be elevations that have a view into the refuse locations.

Commissioner LeMarinel agreed with Mr. Laster that the guidelines should be considered closely. The Factory is a very unique property with many fronts and backs with no real route for trash disposal through the buildings. The Factory property doesn't fit into any of the standard categories. As Mr. Gamble has said, many other considerations are factored into the placement of the refuse locations such as parking, drive isles, pedestrian walkways and others. While we might not like the proposed refuse locations, the dumpsters have to go somewhere. The applicants have made concessions along the way and have done as good a job as possible, considering the property dynamics. Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he is in support of the refuse locations.

Chair Roberts stated that he supports the proposal, as he has said all along. Chair Roberts supports the location chosen and the number of dumpsters per location. The Factory is a large and unique property and the applicants have gone above and beyond to meet the refuse needs of the property while being sensitive to the historic design guidelines. Chair Roberts explained that the proposal is practical, but expensive solution to accommodate the Commissions concerns and meet the needs of the Factory tenants. Chair Roberts finished by stating he has no problems supporting this request.

Commissioner Denton noted that as Ms. Pearce said, 30 feet is a long way but when you look at the area in context, along with the screening of the refuse areas, to the Factory Buildings, it is a well-planned area.

Commissioner Marquardt asked the applicant if the number of dumpsters inside the refuse areas is diminished to two instead of three, would two dumpsters sustain five years of growth at the Factory. Is there a middle ground, regarding the size of the refuse area, for those of us who are having doubts about the proposed size of 30 feet.

Mr. Smothers stated that based on the refuse consultant analysis of the Factory's estimate trash output, three containers will be needed. To reanalyze the refuse topic would require more time and money. Ultimately, having fewer dumpsters would require more pick-ups daily, which is what we want to avoid.

MOTION VOTE

- Motion for Approval
 - o Harrison
 - o LeMarinel
- Motion, passed 5 – 4 (With Denton, LeMarinel, Roberts, Worthington, Harrison voting in favor, and with Besser, Laster, Pearce, Marquardt voting against.)

8. **Consideration Of Alterations (Roofing on Principal Building & Previously-Approved Roofing on Accessory Structure) At 215 Lewisburg Ave.; John Alfrey, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

- Applicant Speaker: Julie Alfrey, Owner & David Still, Contractor
- Project Leader: Amanda Rose

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the purpose of this proposal is to consider two different items. The applicant is proposing that the roofing material on the existing structure be maintained and the second item pertains to the type of roofing material. Alterations to the previously approved accessory structure is the garage behind the building. The accessory structure was approved with asphalt shingle roofing on the main form and with a standing seam metal roof on the dormer, by the HZC in April of last year. A stop work order was placed on the accessory structure in November of 2022 because a metal roof was added in lieu of or in contrast to the current plan. The applicant did submit a COA application for consideration by the Commission at the December 2022 meeting for the roofing material which was denied by the Commission. The second part of the proposal involved the removal of the asphalt shingle roofing on the main house and its

replacement with Cedar Shake Roofing. The Commission chose to defer this to the January 2023 HZC meeting because the was insufficient information provided by the applicant.

Accessory Building.

The Guidelines recommend that one locate new accessory structures to be secondary in prominence to the historic principal buildings on the site or in the district. Further, the Guidelines state that one should use materials and exterior finishes that are typically used in historical equivalents and that details should complement, but be less elaborate than, the character of the historic principal buildings. Asphalt shingles, fiberglass shingles, 5V metal, and standing seam metal are appropriate roofing materials. For alterations to non-historic accessory buildings (such as this one), the Guidelines reference Chapter 2, which states that one should use materials and finishes with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability. Details should be designed to minimize impacts on the historic district.

In this case, the use of metal, while not originally proposed/approved for use, is appropriate. The inherent color of the roofing material is more elaborate than the color of the material on the principal building, however, and therefore draws more emphasis to/more visual prominence to the accessory structure. This is not in keeping with the Guidelines, which recommend that new buildings be secondary in prominence to historic ones. Further, because the accessory structure was constructed in a manner that did not match the specifications in the original building permit (staff worked with the HZC and the applicant to seek to mitigate the height as best as possible), the accessory structure is more prominent than intended originally.

Color and finish, when inherent to a material, can be impactful on the character of a historic district. In this case, it appears that the metal color that was installed was chosen to emulate the color and high sheen of copper metal. Copper is not likely to be supported on an accessory building, as historically, it is an expensive, high-style material, and the Guidelines also state that new accessory buildings should be designed more simply than the principal buildings by using “details [that] complement, but [are] less elaborate than, the character of the historic principal buildings.” Further, copper roofing weathers to a patina finish, whereas alternative materials may not. Without additional information on the existing metal, it is not clear if the high sheen will fade, and if it is not copper, it will not. patina. Thus, the use of the installed metal roofing may be appropriate if it can be painted to be muted and subdued so that it is more in keeping with the Guidelines.

Staff recommended that the applicant provide a physical sample, painted in the requested color, for HZC consideration. Paint commonly fades and peels, so if the proposed color is not inherent to the material itself, it is necessary to understand how the paint color and treatment is proposed to be maintained and to meet the Guidelines. The application includes information on the prevalence of use of metal roofing on buildings and structures in the historic districts; the Guidelines do not contest this. The application also includes photographs of various copper (material) metal roofs, wood shingle roofs, dimensional asphalt shingle roofs, and muted red/orange metal roofs. The applicant also submitted a sheet of potential paint colors, should the HZC opt to allow for painting the existing metal with the applicant's paint choice, Sherwin Williams Pro Industrial Water based Alkyd Urethane. Research indicates that alkyd urethane is appropriate for use on exteriors and metals.

Principal Building

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing asphalt shingle roofing on the principal building and to replace it with cedar shake roofing. The Guidelines state that roof materials contribute to building style and historic character and recommend retaining historic roof materials and refraining from altering roof sections on main or other visible facades. Further, the Guidelines recommend that if partial or wholesale replacement is needed, one uses materials whose composition and appearance match the historic materials.

At HZC's request, the applicant has provided additional information to support the proposal, including photographs of the roof and photographs of the wood shingles proposed for use.

Staff visited the site on December 15, 2022, to investigate the roofing material. There is an enclosed back porch addition with a shed roof that was added to the original building, and under the shed roof, there is evidence of a previous green shingle roof. The starting run of the roof along the edge, however, has wood shakes underneath the green shingle. From this investigation, staff finds that the building had wood shakes applied to it at some point in its history; staff's photographs are included below.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Item be approved with the following conditions:

1. The metal roofing on the accessory structure may be maintained but must be painted a muted, subdued color to meet the intent of the Guidelines. The HZC shall select a color with a non-gloss finish and of a muted, subdued color.
2. The color and sheen of the metal selected for the principal building addition (previously approved) must be consistent with that selected by the HZC for the accessory structure.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit/work commencing.
4. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Julie Alfrey. Ms. Alfrey thanked staff for visiting the house and for their assistance in the process. Ms. Alfrey stated that she provided 35 to 40 photos of accessory buildings throughout the historic district. At this point, Ms. Alfrey stated that in simplifying the roof they would like to go back to the cedar shake roof. Ms. Alfrey stated that their goal is to add to the historic district.

Citizen Speaker:

- Gale Haddock at 213 Lewisburg Avenue. Ms. Haddock thanked the Commission for their time and effort as members of the HZC. Ms. Haddock requested that the Commission require the applicant to use a subdued color on the apartment/accessory building roof.

Chair Roberts stated that he would like to have two motions for this item: 1) accessory building and 2) main house.

MOTION #1 (Accessory Structure)

- Main motion for Approval with conditions for the accessory structure
 - o Laster
 - o LeMarinel

Discussion

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he believes the metal roof is appropriate but not necessarily the color. Mr. LeMarinel also noted his concerns about how the Commission will choose a color for the applicant. The addition roof should be selected from the manufacturer's list of choices because the color will be baked in and it's a finish that will last longer than paint. Once the roof color is determined, the paint color of the garage can be chosen to match the roof. This would be a more appropriate and successful approach for choosing the color. Mr. LeMarinel stated that a variety of colors could be used that would be appropriate, but not the orange color that has been discussed.

Commissioner Laster noted that a condition could be added that would require the color to be approved by staff.

Commissioner Besser agreed with Mr. LeMarinel that it is unusual to choose a color for someone else. This is not something the Commission typically usually does.

Ms. Rose offered to elaborate. Ms. Rose stated that she spent a lot of time asking the applicant exactly what the "ask" is. The applicant provided a sheet from the manufacturer that listed metal colors. The applicant's ask is to keep the existing metal that was installed without approval in the color that it currently is or conversely, applying a paint color to the existing metal so that it better meets the guidelines. The four colors the applicant feels comfortable with have been provided to the Board to see (color examples). The problem with the guideline isn't really the color as much as it's a color inherent to the material. Ms. Rose stated that it's not going to be an alternative material that emulates historic material, the way the guidelines would offer as appropriate. The material is a copper color, but it will never weather like copper. The sheen that is inherent to the color will never go away.

Commissioner Denton asked what the intended life span of the paint on the roof.

Ms. Rose stated that the paint is appropriate for metal, but there are not any case studies that document how the paint formula weathers over time.

Commissioner Denton stated that he would like to hear from the applicant regarding the details of the proposed paint.

David Still. Mr. Still stated that in the application documents, there is a QR code that can be scanned that will provide a

variety of information from the manufacturer. The color is a permanent color.

Chair Roberts stated that the question is “What is the life expectancy of the paint? When applied to your prefinished material.

Mr. Still stated that it is a lifetime industrial paint that may fade over the years (10-20 years) but should not peel. This information is supplied once the QR code is scanned.

Ms. Rose stated that she was not aware of the additional paint information.

Commissioner Laster stated that bronze color would be appropriate for this situation. There are several buildings around Franklin that have a bronze roof including next door to the subject property.

Mr. Still agreed that the dark bronze would be a very acceptable color.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that Sherwin-Williams has a top-secret “Bronze Tone Chart” if you ask specifically for it.
AMENDMENT #1

- Metal roofing painted a dark bronze, with a condition that the color be presented to staff for approval.
 - o Laster
 - o Besser
- Amendment to motion carried 6-1 (With Roberts voting no & Harrison abstaining)

Discussion

Commissioner Denton stated that more information is needed from the applicant even though a solution has been discussed. The solution ends up being the work that was done prior to any sort of approval from the Commission. Also, the fact that what was approved by the HZC but wasn’t followed by the applicant is concerning.

Chair Roberts agreed with Mr. Denton on this point.

Commissioner Worthington expressed concerns about the (paint) product performance and the warranty of the metal roof. How is the roof warranty affected once it’s been painted. The metal roof is already coated and sealed and ready for the weather.

Chair Roberts stated that the discussion taking place is because the originally approved plan for the use of asphalt shingles was not followed by the applicant. The building is already more prominent than the main house, mostly due to the topography and the location. When it was discovered that the applicant did not follow the approved plans, it was agreed that staff would work with the applicant for a solution to mitigate the problem. The Commission agreed that the staff could do that. The current metal roofing only exacerbates the height problem and does not complement the character of the main building. Chair Roberts stated that painting prefinished metal will only lead to maintenance problems down the road for whoever owns the property. Chair Roberts finished by saying that he will not support any other solution other than the asphalt roofing.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that staff would have to review the material, is that correct?

Chair Roberts explained that the amendment states this condition.

Ms. Rose explained that the metal roofing material and installation was never approved and there is a stop work order on the property now. The applicant is requesting to change the color of the roof instead of removing the metal roof.

Chair Roberts stated that the only metal approved for this project was the metal on the back elevation dormer.

Commissioner Marquardt asked staff if in their opinion, do you feel that painting the metal roof a dark bronze shade would mitigate the inconsistency under discussion?

Ms. Rose stated that yes, on the surface value, painting the roof a dark bronze color would fix the issue of the material not being consistent with the weathering pattern as you would see with a metal of that type. Ms. Rose also stated that she is not aware of the longevity of this type of paint and how long it will last or whether it will peel or fade. We don’t know how the prefinished metal will accept paint or urethane. We did not get the example of the painted metal roof, as requested from

the applicant. The request that was received from the applicant was to paint the metal roof or keep the existing roof. Painting the roof would be appropriate but that may not fix the problem the way removal of the roof and installing a new metal roof or removal of the metal roof with installation of the asphalt roof.

Commissioner Besser stated that if the Commission approves this motion a president would be set for future proposals.

AMENDMENT #2

- Denial of accessory structure roofing material to maintain or paint.
 - o LeMarinel
 - o Besser
- Amendment to motion carried 8-0

AMENDMENT #3

- Defer to February HZC Meeting
 - o Marquardt
 - o no second, motion died.

MOTION #1 (Accessory Structure) - VOTE

- Main motion for Approval with conditions for the accessory structure
 - o Laster
 - o LeMarinel

- Overall motion failed 0 – 7 (Marquardt- abstain) MOTION #2 (Principal Building)
- Motion for approval for the primary building as outlined in the staff report.
 - o LeMarinel
 - o Laster

Commissioner Laster stated that there is precedence for the use of cedar shake shingles and if there is evidence and documentation that cedar shake was used on the house, then the applicant is encouraged to use cedar shake.

Commissioner LeMarinel encouraged the applicant to get the correct metal color as there are metal parts on the addition of the house.

Chair Roberts asked Mr. Tosh to share the location on the house where the evidence of the cedar shake was found.

Mr. Tosh stated that the cedar shake was found on the back of the house. There was no evidence of the cedar shake use on the front of the house. Mr. Tosh confirmed the cedar shake exists under the roof at the back of the house.

Chair Roberts stated that he walked over to the house and couldn't see anything other than the asphalt shingles on other homes in this area. The logic that this particular house had cedar shake but none of the other houses didn't, doesn't make sense or follow expectations. If there is good evidence of cedar shake on the house, there is no reason not to use cedar shake siding.

Commissioner Denton stated that given the evidence that there were cedar shakes present, he is in support of the use of cedar shake.

There being no further discussion, Chair Robert asked the Board to vote on the Main Motion.

Main Motion Vote:

- #2 (Principal Building)
- Motion for approval for the primary building as outlined in the staff report.
 - o LeMarinel
 - o Laster
- Motion, passed 8-0

9. **Consideration Of Alterations (Parking, Ramp Construction, Front Yard Fence/Gate Construction) At 128 4th Ave. N.; Ben McCreary, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

- Applicant Speaker: Ben McCreary
- Project Leader: Amanda Rose

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant seeks a COA for the construction of an accessibility ramp. Alterations to a partial parking area and the installation of a front yard fence and gate at 128 4th Ave. North. All the proposals were previously approved in early 2021 under the previously approved design guidelines. The work has not been completed, however, and those associated approvals and the certificates of appropriateness have expired. The applicant is coming forward to seek reapproval of those plans.

Accessibility Ramp

The proposed accessibility ramp is located on the rear elevation of the house. The ramp is composed of wood and is designed to include wood or metal balusters and painted wood lattice. The Guidelines recommend that ramps be composed of wood and placed on rear or secondary elevations. The Guidelines also recommend that ramps be designed to be reversible and have a minimal impact on historic features and that detailing be like that found on the historic buildings onto which they are placed. Wood balusters should be selected for consistency with the Guidelines. The location, design, and detailing of the proposed ramp are consistent with the Guidelines. The Guidelines recommend that one minimize the visual impact of parking by following historic patterns that locate parking along the rear or side of the buildings. Parking or nonresidential uses in residential buildings should be located behind the building or should be further screened from off-site. Materials for parking areas for nonresidential uses in residential buildings must comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed location is to the side of the building, and the depth of the lot does not allow for placement of the parking to the rear. The nature of the fencing may allow for visibility of the car park, which is not consistent with the Guidelines, so additional landscaping should be utilized to screen parking areas from street view. The materials for parking are listed differently throughout the document, but ultimately, the material must comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Fencing/Gate

The Guidelines state that one should design fences and walls to be compatible with the architectural style of the building. For example, wood picket fencing is appropriate for vernacular frame houses, while cast-iron fencing and brick columns are more appropriate for more ornate, high-style architecture.

The proposal includes the construction of wooden scalloped picket fencing and gates in the primary yard. The fencing extends along the primary yard of the property and ties into swing gates, of the same style (scalloped) and materials, located at the entrance to the parking area on the side of the house. The fencing (straight picket) is also proposed to tie into a wooden pedestrian gate in the front yard and to the wooden privacy fencing located along the side yard property lines. The proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for height (three feet) and style. The proposed swing gates appear to be consistent with the Guidelines but should be configured to swing inwardly and not open onto the public sidewalk. The site plan (SP101) shows stone piers for the gate, which page A201 demonstrates wood posts with "Martha's Vineyard" post caps. The use of wood piers is more appropriate to the context of the building and more consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that Item #9 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Wood balusters should be selected for the ramp for consistency with the Guidelines.
 2. The applicant must utilize wood posts for the fence/gate for consistency with the Guidelines. Additionally, the swing gate must be configured to swing inwardly and not open onto the public sidewalk for consistency with the Guidelines.
 3. Additional landscaping may be required to screen the parking from off-site, per the Zoning Ordinance.
 4. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit/work commencing. Approval for the parking entrance gate is contingent upon approval of a site plan by the City of Franklin.
 5. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.
- Project Considerations

1. On the site plan sheet SP101, identify the location of the curb on the drawing. As discussed previously, the minimum setback for any gate is to be 30 ft from the edge of the travel lane, which is the streetside edge of the on-street parking. On-street parking spaces are to be 8 ft in width as measured from the face-of-curb. It appears the gate is set back appropriately, but without the curb location or dimensions for the on-street parking spaces shown, staff cannot verify.
2. Upon inspection, if the ramp does not screen the HVAC sufficiently from off-site views, additional screening may be required.
3. Applicant shall be aware that no variance or waiver of any requirement of the Zoning Ordinance may be granted through the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness or associated site plan. The note below which was included on the site plan is not being approved or upheld with the Certificate of Appropriateness, and no variance or legal opinion regarding the note is being rendered by staff's review of the site plan.

Applicant Speaker: Ben McCreary, Chisel Workshop. There are no changes since the last meeting.

Ms. Rose noted that the only changes were those as a result of staff conditions.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the commissioners.

There being no discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote.

MOTION

- Motion for Approval with conditions
 - o Marquardt
 - o Worthington
- Motion, passed 8-0

OTHER BUSINESS

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

10. Convenience Signage At 99 E Main St.; Matt Horner, Applicant.

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

11. Rear Yard Fencing At 808 W. Main St.; Will Powell, Applicant.

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

12. Convenience Sign Reface at 231 Public Sq.; Lance Gregory, Applicant.

Sponsors: Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 07:38 PM.

Chair

Date

