



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, February 13, 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@franklinton.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, Jim Roberts, Chair, Scott Harrison, Lisa Marquardt, Kathy Worthinton

Board Members Absent: Mary Pearce

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes

Sponsors:

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel to the Minutes from the January 9, 2023 meeting. The motion carried 8-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Rose asked citizens who would like to speak regarding items either on the agenda or not on the agenda, to please fill out a speaker card and give it to Ms. Rose or Chair Roberts.

Ms. Rose reminded the Commissioners that next Monday, February 20, 2023, at 3:00 p.m. there will be a special DRC meeting to discuss the conceptual City Hall plan. The regular DRC meeting will take place following this meeting. The agenda and materials will be emailed to the Commissioners within the next day.

VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Chair Roberts asked if there were any non-agenda items to be presented. There were none.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Laura Turner at 1108 Dickerson Lane. Ms. Turner stated that she has been an advocate for animal welfare, dangerous overdevelopment and saving our scenic lands throughout her life. She explained that she has major concerns about the proposed new construction/alteration and demolition of her church, St. Paul's Episcopal Church. The history of the church goes as far back as the founding of the City of Franklin. The first wedding held at St. Paul's was the marriage of Martha Maury, daughter of Franklin founder, Abram

Maury. The historical integrity of St. Paul's must be maintained for future generations. At the Parish meeting in January, Ms. Turner explained that an update about the plan and construction was expected. Ms. Turner explained that the parishioners were told that "construction would begin in the summer." Ms. Turner cautioned that the planned development/alterations will destroy the historical integrity of St. Paul's thus affecting the City of Franklin's goal of historical preservation. Visionary planners within the church purchased the First Tennessee Bank property years ago for future development. Ms. Turner finished by stating that she understands that the Board has no governing power over the church, but she felt she needed to make the Board and public aware of the proposed plans of the church.

APPLICATIONS

2. **Consideration Of New Construction (Accessory) At 230 Franklin Rd.; Luke Dougal, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the proposal includes the construction of an accessory structure to serve as a carousel. The Guidelines state that new accessory structures are to be located behind the rear plane of the principal building. 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 view sheds. 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.

Location and Design - The new accessory structure is intended to be situated behind the main Factory Building, near the smokestack, and will not be seen from street view. The proposed structure will be 26 feet tall and will measure 2,600 sq. ft. The accessory structure is unique, as it will contain a carousel, and the building will be octagonal in shape. While this shape is not typical for the historic district, it meets the general intent, as it is housed under a rectangular roof shape and is recessed out-of-view shed. The applicant is seeking to tie the design of the carousel to the overall campus, but due to supply chain issues, there is uncertainty about what can be achieved in a timely manner. Therefore, the applicant is requesting to have several options for elements such as doors, skylights, and transoms, to be considered for approval. The first option is for the doors to consist of either two bi-fold doors on each elevation or to have one larger bi-fold door on each elevation. The second option is for transoms to be located on the north and south elevations, above the doors, or to have two skylights on the roof in lieu of transoms.

Materials - The materials of the new accessory structure will utilize masonry and metal to complement the other buildings on the Factory site. At the bottom of the structure, the banding will consist of a cast-in-place concrete base. Above the concrete base, a brick veneer will be used along with other brick details to be used for a header to break up the massing on the structure. Additionally, black metal panels will be used on the facade, which are also seen in other places at the Factory. For roofing, a black, metal, standing seam roof will be utilized. As requested during the January DRC meeting, the applicant provided additional renderings of the proposed structure to better show the unique shape of the structure and how the structure looks with the doors closed.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that item #2 be approved with the following:

1. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building 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: Luke Dougal. Mr. Dougal explained how the door operation would work on the carousel building. The north, south, and east doors are bi-folding overhead doors with the northeast and southeast doors being operable storefront doors. The carousel building is closely tied to buildings 6 and 8 elevations.

There being no citizen speakers, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Harrison moved to approve with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Marquardt asked Mr. Dougal how many options they are looking at.

Mr. Dougal explained that there are 3 options based on material availability. Option 1) Instead of having 2 bi-fold doors there would be 1 larger bi-fold door. Option 2) To include a transom window above the doors. Option 3) To include a skylight. Mr. Dougal stated that the goal is to allow as much light as possible into the building.

Commissioner Marquardt asked if the Commission approves this item, the applicant will have a choice of the three options, correct?

Ms. Rose stated that Staff approves of all the choices.

Chair Roberts stated that the choices will allow flexibility for the applicant.

The motion carried 8-0.

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

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the proposal includes the construction of a brick enclosure to screen trash receptacles and compactors fronting Liberty Pike and a location located near the water tower. One of the locations, near the intersection of Liberty Pike and Franklin Road, will remain as approved, while the location to the right will change from being parallel to Liberty Pike to being perpendicular to the road. Additionally, a third location for trash compactors is being proposed behind an existing retaining wall, near the water tower. As noted on the site plan, the new location for one of the existing refuse areas is noted in red, while the new location by the water tower and the existing refuse areas are in blue. The proposed screening near the street is to measure 31'-8" in length, 11'8" in width, and 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. While the proposal for placement along Liberty Pike is not consistent with the Guidelines, a position parallel to the street is currently approved, and relocation of the red enclosure to be perpendicular to the street minimizes its impact on the pedestrian view sheds. As such, the proposal is supported.

RECOMMENDATION: 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 the issuance of a building 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: Greg Gamble & Benton Smothers. Mr. Smothers stated that after the last meeting the group researched more into compactors. Although the new compactor locations are close to the patio with some pass through, the consultant explained that the noise is not as significant of a concern as in the past. Mr. Smothers expressed concerns, after construction is complete, that the refuse areas cannot handle the amount of trash. Mr. Smothers discussed retaining the approval of the original refuse plan which would include permitting and prepping for utilities, but not building the enclosure. The area would basically function as a parking lot unless additional refuse is needed.

Mr. Gamble mentioned the replacement of cedar doors with a metal patina rusty type door that is more consistent with the Factory trim.

Andy Blair at 533 Plantation Ct. Nashville, TN. Mr. Blair, the grandson of O.L. Dortch, added his support for Holladay Properties and Centric Architecture. Mr. Blair's concern is how the compactors will affect the public areas of the factory. Mr. Blair stated that he likes the perpendicular position of the compactors as opposed to the parallel position in the previous submittal. Lastly, Mr. Blair stated that the more natural light, including transoms and/or skylights, that can be provided for the carousel building, the more beautiful it will be.

Ann Johnson at 159 Sturbridge Dr. Ms. Johnson stated that she has worked in the garbage business for many years. She

recommends metal doors for the containment areas. Ms. Johnson expressed concerns about the turning radius of the garbage trucks. Not only will the trucks tear up the pavement but also the landscaping. Ideally, easy access for the trucks is recommended. Ms. Johnson also mentioned the importance of a self-contained compactor that reduces leaking from the compactor. A compactor for recyclables is also necessary on the property. Ms. Johnson finished up by stating that noise will also be a concern for residential homes and condos in the area.

Mr. Smothers stated that through this extensive research process, a turn radius has been completed. The dumpsters will have a concrete apron in front of the refuse areas to cut down on the damage to the asphalt. Mr. Gamble stated that the compactor will be housed behind an existing retaining wall that will not be noticeable at all.

There being no additional citizen comments, Chair Roberts asked the Commission for a motion.

Commissioner Marquardt moved for approval with conditions, with the option for the applicant to work with Staff for approval of metal doors in lieu of cedar doors, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she appreciated the extra effort of the applicant to address the viewshed issue from the last meeting.

The motion carried 8-0.

4. **Consideration Of Demolition (Accessory) At 724 Fair St.; Jeff Rietveld, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer explained that the proposal includes the demolition of the historic accessory structure (shed). Per the Guidelines, demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met:

- 1) If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity, its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character. Loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues.
- 2) If the denial of the demolition will result in unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the HZC.
- 3) If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition and construction of a comparable structure. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future actions on the site.

The current accessory structure appears to be historic in form, and the applicant has assessed the age to be circa 1920. The DRC requested that the applicant provide a detailed report itemizing the cost for replacement versus rehabilitation of the accessory structure, per the Guidelines recommendations. The applicant has provided a structural engineer's report, a contractor's assessment, photographs of the structure, and an itemized contractor's report that defines the need for demolition. The applicant's estimated costs for rehabilitation of the existing structure is approximately \$60,000. This estimate appears to include work that addresses existing framing and roofing issues. The applicant's estimated cost to demolish the structure and to rebuild it so that it is code compliant is approximately \$74,000. Based on this information, it appears that rehabilitation is less costly than demolition and construction of a comparable structure. As such, the Guidelines criteria have not been met.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that item #4 be denied, based on the Staff Analysis and Recommendation dated February 13, 2023.

If issued a COA, the following conditions shall apply:

1. The original structure must be photographed satisfactorily by the applicant, and the photos must be submitted to staff for HZC records.
2. The applicant shall obtain a floodplain development permit prior to any disturbance of the Floodplain Fringe Overlay.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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 Speaker: Jeff Rietveld, 724 Fair Street, homeowner. Mr. Rietveld stated that he attended the DRC meeting with staff, provided information that was requested, and hosted an on-site visit for staff and members of the HZC. The contractor and the engineer believe that the structure has lost its historical and structural integrity. The \$60,000 estimate doesn't include a floor and once a floor is constructed the building would not be considered historical, in his opinion.

There being no citizen speakers, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Denton moved to deny #1, seconded by Commissioner Besser. The motion failed 3-5 with Commissioners Besser, Denton, Worthington voting yes.

Commissioner Denton stated that he wanted to explain the demolition criteria, according to the Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines.

- 1) If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character. Loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues.

Commissioner Denton stated that architectural integrity involves the elements of the structure, material and colors. Whereas historical integrity connects the building historically to its use over the years. Commissioner Denton stated that according to the first criteria for demolition approval, criteria one has not been met.

- 2) If the denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the HZC. Please refer to the Economic Hardship Considerations Section. The HZC will use this information to assist with the review of economic hardship claims.

Commissioner Denton stated that this criterion is not applicable to the situation under discussion.

- 3) If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition and construction of a comparable structure. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

Commissioner Denton explained that the Commission doesn't have the authority based on the demolition approval criteria to grant demolition of this structure.

Commissioner Besser stated that she agrees with Commissioner Denton's well-spoken rationale as to why demolition cannot be supported.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she disagrees because she believes the standard has been met. She stated she planned to provide a motion to approve demolition.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the situation is complicated by a number of factors including the flood plain and the fact the structure is an accessory building. Mr. LeMarinel stated that it appears to be a good candidate for demolition. The family can make better use of the money by building a structure that is practical and functional. Based on the photos of the structure's condition, Mr. LeMarinel stated he's not sure how the building contributes to the historical character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Laster stated that the building is basically a shed. It's a difficult situation, the building has a unique form and style. Mr. Laster stated that he supports the demolition of the structure.

Chair Roberts stated that he is in support of the demolition and complimented Mr. Rietveld on the wonderful job of restoring the home on Fair Street. The shed/accessory building is in deplorable shape. Demolition of the structure would allow the family to build a garage or other useful structure.

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

Commissioner Marquardt moved to approve with conditions #2, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Laster stated that the homeowner may want to pay tribute to the historical building by choosing an element of the building to include in future new construction plans.

Commissioner Denton stated that if the reasoning for demolition of a historical structure is structural instability, the applicant is required to provide a report from a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Also, the applicant should provide a report documenting the future action of the site. Mr. Denton stated that approval is contingent on the HZC receiving both reports.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that her motion includes the conditions of the COA.

Commissioner Denton stated that for demolition approval under the rationale of structural instability, the third criteria states that a report from a structural or architectural engineer is needed and a separate report that details future action on the site.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the homeowner may not have any plans.

Commissioner Denton stated that a report would be needed.

Ms. Rose stated that the applicant chose not to provide future plans until approval of the demolition of the structure. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant's intent is to build an accessory building. Mr. Denton is correct on what is needed for demolition approval.

Commissioner Marquardt suggested deferral of the item to give the applicant time to provide additional documents needed for a decision to be made.

Commissioner Harrison stated that a motion has been made and seconded and he calls the question to a vote.

The motion passed, 5-3, with Commissioners Besser, Denton, Worthington voting no.

5. **Consideration Of Partial Demolition & Additions At 264 Natchez St.; Cleveland Salmon, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Project Leader: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that two areas at the rear of the building are proposed for demolition: the first-floor den and the second-floor bathroom dormer. Per the Guidelines, demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met:

- If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity, its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character. Loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues.
- If the denial of the demolition will result in unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the HZC.
- If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition and construction of a comparable structure. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

The application is supplemented with information from a preservation-minded structural engineer with respect to the condition of the area, a contractor's estimation of costs for rehabilitation versus demolition/rebuild, and a physical assessment by State Historian/Center for Historic Preservation Executive Director Dr. Van West. This information states the bathroom-area dormer on the roof above the den is damaged, and that this has caused extensive water damage and

(potentially) structural damage to the den. Contractor estimates state that rehabilitation would cost is approximately \$150,000, with addition if this portion of the building were to be demolished and rebuilt to code. This indicates that rehabilitation would be less costly. According to a member of the Williams family who once lived in the house, however, the addition dates to 1972 (see letter in submittal), which is just around 50 years in age. The State Historian's letter indicates that removal of the addition would not be consequential to the historic or architectural value of the building, however, meaning that the building would remain as a contributing element to the Natchez Street National Register Historic District if the addition were to be removed. Thus, the criterion of the Guidelines related to historical and architectural integrity has been met. To replace the den and second-floor bathroom areas, the application proposes the construction of a new, ADA-complaint addition that would house an elevator to serve the building's civic use. The Guidelines recommend that additions be located at rear facades. Further, additions should be designed to be compatible with the historic building, yet clearly identifiable through the use of differentiating methods such as roof breaks, wall insets, wall off-sets, material changes, and lower eave lines. A combination of these methods should be considered based on the specific context of the building and the site. The addition should have a lower scale and height than the historic building, and roof shapes, pitch, and level of complexity be similar to but subordinate to the historic building. The applicant responded to staff and DRC comments related to scale congruency, revising the proposal to read more clearly as a single-story addition with a large dormer. The original building is unique in that the existing dormers are set on the same plane as the main form's respective side facades, and heavy eaves were used so that the existing dormers read as inset from the facade planes. Because of this, the proposal follows suit and allows for a new dormer to replace the existing one, on that same plane, and for a new upper-level addition to be inset from both the rear and side facades. This area is proposed to be gabled and be situated lower than the main roofline. The proposed footprint is less than that of the existing by 11 square feet (1923 sf existing; 1912 sf proposed). The proposed fenestration is in keeping with the rhythm and spacing of that on the original portion of the building. Materials include wood siding and asphalt shingles; the foundation material has not been indicated. A concrete ramp and metal railing are proposed for the small porch/ramp for ADA access from the parking area.

Staff recommends that Item #5 be approved with the following conditions:

1. The foundation material must consist of a masonry material chosen to be compatible with the foundation material on the original portion of the building. The foundation material must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. Any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Applicant Speaker: Cleveland Salmon. Mr. Salmon stated that the intent of the building is to be used as a community center. ADA accommodation will be necessary to make the building compliant. Mr. Salmon stated that an elevator would allow access to the second floor.

There being no citizen speakers, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner LeMarinel moved to approve with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Commissioner Denton stated that he could not support the application because the engineering report is a draft and is not signed. Also, Mr. Denton questions if demolition is applicable since it is a partial demo.

Commissioner Besser stated that she is very excited about the project and looks forward to seeing it move forward.

The motion carried 8-0.

6. **Consideration Of Additions (Principal And Accessory) At 803 Fair St.; Michael Lee, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was previously approved in December 2020 but has since expired. Since the COA was granted, the applicant has only completed the retaining wall and sidewalk portion of the project and would like to proceed with the additions to the principal building and accessory structure.

Ms. Huffer explained that for the principal building, additions are to be subordinate in appearance to the historic building. Considerations include placement, size, massing, scale, height, setbacks, and materials. Character-defining features of the historic building should not be removed, damaged, or obscured. Wherever possible, construct additions in such a manner that, if an addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic building would be unimpaired. The Guidelines state that one-story attached additions should be properly placed at the rear of the dwelling and be distinguishable from the original in the clear inset and differing materials. The location of the proposed addition to the principal building will be located at the rear of the house. The addition will be a single-story, front gable design on a concrete foundation.

The Guidelines state that additions are to be compatible with the historic building yet clearly identifiable through the use of differentiating methods such as roof breaks, wall insets, wall off-sets, material changes, and lower eave lines. A combination of these methods should be considered based on the specific context of the building and the site. The materials for the addition to the principal building will be wood siding with a 5" reveal, which meets this guideline due to the principal building being composed of brick, and it will also match the building's existing rear addition in appearance. The addition will also utilize wood trim details that will match the existing house. On the right elevation, the applicant is proposing the utilization of a three-panel window on the right elevation. This window choice is appropriate due to the age and architectural style of the house.

The footprint of the proposed new addition to the principal building measures 126 sq. ft. which equates to nine percent of the footprint of the building. This meets the recommendation of the Guidelines.

Per the Guidelines, alterations and additions are to be designed so that the entirety of the accessory structure is compatible and visually subordinate in size, mass, and height to the principal building they support, but in no case should they exceed one-and-a-half stories. The Guidelines state that additions should be properly placed at the rear of the dwelling and be distinguishable from the original in the clear inset and differing materials. The location of the addition is on the left side of the accessory structure. The addition is a single-story, side-gabled design on a concrete foundation. The Guidelines state that additions are to be compatible with the historic building yet clearly identifiable through the use of differentiating methods such as roof breaks, wall insets, wall off-sets, material changes, and lower eave lines. A combination of these methods should be considered based on the specific context of the building and the site. The materials for the addition to the accessory structure will be wood siding with a 5" reveal, which meets this Guideline due to the principal building being composed of brick. On the left elevation, a 6'-8" x 3' door with a window will be utilized. On the front elevation, the applicant is proposing to utilize three wood, double-hung windows with a three-light feature on the top sash. The footprint of the proposed new addition to the accessory structure measures 126 sq. ft., which equates to 40 percent of the footprint of the building. This meets the recommendation of the Guidelines. Cumulative Lot Coverage The Guidelines also recommend sizing the overall building footprints (of all portions of the existing principal buildings, accessory structures, and proposed additions on the lot) so that they do not exceed 35 percent of the lot. The existing building coverage is 1,740 sq. ft. and the proposed additions would increase coverage to 2,011 sq. ft. which equates to 27 percent of the lot coverage. This meets the recommendation of the Guidelines.

Staff recommends that item #6 be approved with the following conditions:

1. The windows must have a historic profile and dimensions and consist of either wood or composite material with the appearance of wood. The window specifications must be approved by the Preservation Planner or the HZC prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. The roofing materials must match the existing materials on each of the principal building and accessory structure additions, respectively.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to the issuance of a building permit.
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 Speaker: Michael Lee & Sam Whitson (Owner). Mr. Lee and Mr. Whitson stated they are at the mercy of the Commission and here to hopefully renew the project.

There being no citizen speakers, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Laster moved for approval with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. The motion carried 8-0.

7. Consideration Of Demolition (Accessory) At 316 Bridge St.; Susan Comer, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Project Leader: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of a historic accessory structure. An authorized representative of the applicant submitted a DRC application in September 2022 for discussion of a new accessory structure, at which time it was realized that a historic accessory structure was no longer located on the property and was removed without required permitting. Ms. Rose referred to a photo from 2021 in which the accessory building was present. Then, a more recent photo shows that the building has been removed. Per the Guidelines, demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met:

- If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity, its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character. Loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues.
- If the denial of the demolition will result in unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the HZC.
- If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition and construction of a comparable structure. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

Staff contacted the applicant to provide some guidance on what types of materials may be presented to substantiate the demolition, all based on the DRC's recommendations to the applicant's contractor. These items are listed below:

- Information on the outbuilding, including its general dimensions/size, materials;
- Date of removal from the site; and
- Any photographs that show the building from various angles on the site.

The proposal includes two photographs of the building from the recent past, which demonstrate its general form and materials, though its dimensions are unclear. Unfortunately, this is a situation in which the building has already been removed, so the applicant is not able to provide the information recommended by the Guidelines for demolition requests. The structure appeared to be historic and to maintain architectural integrity within these photographs and those accessed within the City's Historic Resources Inventory and from Google Streetview. In 2006, a similar situation involving the demolition of a principal building without the requisite COA and building permits occurred. The HZC ultimately worked with the owner/applicant to approve the reconstruction of the building using photographic documentation.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the HZC either deny issuance of a COA for Item #7, due to lack of supporting documentation to substantiate the Guidelines, OR that the HZC defer review of Item #7 until such time that the applicant can submit the requisite supporting documentation to substantiate the Guidelines. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a building permit.

Applicant Speaker: Susan Comer, homeowner. Ms. Comer stated that she has lived at 316 Bridge Street since 1989 and in Franklin since 1986. Ms. Comer explained that it never occurred to her that the old broken-down unsafe shed could be historically important. For safety reasons, she decided to have the structure removed from the property. Ms. Comer explained that 2 of her sons-in-law and a friend were the ones who removed the structure. Ms. Comer read a notarized statement from each of them, regarding the condition of the building.

Cody McCaskle. Mr. McCaskle's foot went through the floor of the shed during removal. As the sheet metal roofing was removed the building swayed back and forth. Much of the wood contained rotted and decayed wood making it hazardous and unsafe.

Carl Ware. Mr. Ware explained in his letter that much of the flooring had holes and was not attached to any sort of foundation as there was no foundation. The siding was either missing or deteriorated. There were large gaps in the roof and no structural stability at all. Mr. Ware's letter further stated that he believed the building to be a safety hazard to the homeowners and to the property adjacent to 316 Bridge Street.

Ethan Groom. Mr. Groom stated in his letter that most of the shed consisted of rotten wood. The studs were floating and not connected to the roof. The siding was falling off and the back wall had been spliced together at one point. All the wood was compromised because of the termite infestation. While on top of the shed removing the roof, the structure swayed

back and forth. The roof was rusted allowing water into the shed. The shed was near collapse.

There being no citizen speakers, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Marquardt moved to defer #1 to March 13, 2023 HZC, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. Commissioner Marquardt rescinded her motion.

Ms. Rose stated that the applicant believes she has provided all the documentation she can provide at this point. If the Commission can advise her on further documentation.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that his concern is there may not be any more documentation that can be provided, and the motion may need to be reconsidered.

Commissioner Besser stated that Ms. Billingsly may need to weigh in on the issue.

Ms. Billingsly stated that the Commission, as a group, should provide the applicant with feedback as to what type of documentation is needed.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that along with a copy of the affidavit, a printout of the Sanborn map to document the presence of the shed.

Commissioner Denton again stated that close attention should be given to chapter 10 of the Historic Design Guidelines that explains demolition and relocation, but also may provide ideas of what types of additional documentation to provide the Commission.

Ms. Comer stated that the only other information to provide the Commission would be an economic statement.

Chair Roberts stated that photos or anything that might provide more information so that the Commission can justify approval of demolition. Mr. Roberts further stated that any type of information related to one of the 3 demolition approval criteria will help the Commission move in the direction of approval.

Commissioner Laster stated that there are three options before the Commission. We can approve, deny, or defer. What would happen if we denied the demolition? Nothing?

Ms. Comer stated that the only other item she could supply would be to have people who have seen the shed to speak to the Commission.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the Commission has to avoid this situation in the future with another applicant. The Commission needs to have a way to document history.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the Commission can certainly deny the application which would push the application to another city governing body.

Commissioner Denton asked Ms. Billingsly if the Commission could deny the request.

Ms. Billingsly said yes, the Commission could deny but another issue is there was not a demolition permit.

Commissioner Denton moved to defer #2 to March 13, 2023, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Chair Roberts stated that now is a good time to handle any other issues related to the subject structure before the March 13, 2023, meeting.

The motion carried 8-0.

8. Consideration Of Alterations To Previously-Approved New Construction (Porches) At 725 W. Main St.; Michael Hathaway, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Project Leader: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the enclosure of an upper-level porch located just forward of the center of the left facade of the building at 725 W. Main St. (the Arlington). This is a retroactive COA proposal, as the work has already been completed. The proposal seeks approval for the enclosure of the two previously approved porches on the left facade. Brick and windows have been utilized; the area no longer appears to read/function as porches. The subject property is a non-historic infill condominium building designed in the Federal Style, and the porch enclosure location is visible from public viewsheds. As originally approved, the building's side porch recesses helped break up the heavy massing created by the building's length and masonry materials; the brick enclosure decreases the effectiveness of the porches as massing breaks. This, in turn, increases the project's impact on the historic district. Further, the Guidelines for alterations to non-historic residential buildings recommend that details and ornamentation be designed to minimize the impact on the historic district. As such, the porch enclosure does not meet the intent of the Guidelines. If the enclosure were to be altered by removing the brick and instead introducing glass within a configuration that matches that approved originally, with minimal horizontal and vertical framing members, it would blend more seamlessly with the existing architecture and lessen the impact of the alteration to the building itself and the overall historic district.

Note: A similar request was submitted to the HZC for consideration at its August 2022 meeting. That request was specific to the two foremost porches on the left facade; the application proposed the enclosure of the foremost left facade's upper-level porch by adding new windows and transoms with casings within larger wood columns. The proposal also included replacing the iron railing on the lower-level porch with a solid brick railing with wider wood columns. The HZC denied the issuance of a COA for the proposal due to massing concerns, noting that the location was highly visible and adjacent to the front facade wall. It is recommended that the HZC deny issuance of a COA for Item #8, based on the Staff Analysis & Recommendation dated February 13, 2023.

- If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a revised building permit, and any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the HZC for review and approval.
- If issued a COA, any additional changes to the approved plans must be returned to the Preservation Planner or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval.

Note from Building & Neighborhood Services:

- Emergency escape and rescue openings are required from each proposed sleeping room. If sleeping room windows are/will be inside the porch enclosure, the configuration will not meet IBC requirements. The sleeping room windows serve as the required emergency escape and rescue openings and cannot be enclosed inside the porch.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway & Bernie Butler. Mr. Butler stated that he is the owner of the Arlington located at 725 West Main Street which has been under construction for four years. He explained that the subject "enclosed" porches are located 200 feet back front sidewalk (along the side of the building) on West Main Street. The porches were enclosed using the same type of windows used throughout the outside of the Arlington. Mr. Butler stated that over the last 20 years during a large "build", minor changes have been made at the request of the homeowner without requiring notification of the city. Based on this experience, Mr. Butler didn't realize the importance of requesting approval for the porch(enclosure) construction and would have absolutely requested approval of the city. Mr. Butler noted that landscaping including large trees will be planted to screen and add privacy from the large electric and meter boxes of the neighboring building and will also screen the subject porch enclosures.

There being no citizen speakers, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Harrison moved to approve #1, but there was no second. Motion died.

Commissioner Marquardt moved to defer #2 to the March 13, 2023 HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Besser.

Commissioner Marquardt invited the applicant to attend the next DRC meeting to explain the context in which it was determined to enclose the porches and to provide more information.

Mr. Butler explained the porch enclosures are located somewhat in the middle of the building (180 feet from the front sidewalk). The enclosed porches don't appear to look much different than the open porches.

Commissioner Worthington stated that the enclosed porches add to the massing of the building and the Commission is struggling to provide approval because the original intent was a porch, not an enclosed room with windows.

Commissioner Laster asked Mr. Tosh about the emergency escape and rescue openings that are required for sleeping rooms.

Mr. Tosh stated that it was discussed with the contractor, and it was determined that a sleeping room window which is the emergency escape/rescue opening could not be enclosed by a porch.

Commissioner Laster noted that even if the enclosed porches were approved, the emergency escape opening would not meet the code.

Mr. Butler explained that the windows have cased openings giving emergency access through the porch to the bedroom.

Mr. Tosh stated that with a cased window opening, the room becomes an extension of the bedroom and would meet the code requirements.

Commissioner Harrison asked Mr. Butler if the rooms were intended to be sunrooms.

Mr. Butler stated that the enclosed porch is 200 feet from the sidewalk, and one would have to drive very slowly to notice the enclosed porches.

Chair Roberts explained that the problem is that the Commission did not approve the enclosed porches.

Mr. Butler stated that he is under the wire to finish the building. It's been a difficult process because of the hybrid type of building it is. According to Mr. Butler, the incomplete building costs \$120,000 month.

Commissioner Marquardt moved to defer to the March 13, 2023 HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Besser. The motion carried 5-3, with Commissioners Laster, LeMarinel, Roberts voting no.

9. Consideration Of Preliminary Historic Zoning Commission Recommendation For Conceptual Subdivision (The Middle Eight) Proposed At 228 Franklin Rd.; Gary Vogrin, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Ms. Dannenfelser provided answers to questions about the review of the proposal in relationship to the preliminary recommendation of the HZC and the Envision Franklin comprehensive update. The Envision Franklin update has already begun and will identify a vision for the Factory and the surrounding properties. There will be a community workshop held at the Factory on February 16, 2023. The Envision Franklin update may include changes to the Factory district's visioning. The staff has encouraged the applicant of the Middle Eight Development to wait until the update is complete. The applicant has chosen to move forward and submit the preliminary application. Staff has reviewed the application and provided a preliminary recommendation based on the adopted guidelines. The HZC's role is to review the applicant's development plan according to the guidelines and provide a recommendation to the Franklin Planning Commission and to the Board of Mayor and Alderman, according to height, scale, mass, form, and setback of the development. The recommendation is not based on land use or the interior of a building. The recommendation does include the physical characteristics of the exterior and context and compatibility as it relates to the surroundings and the historic resources of the district.

Project Leader: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose explained that The Historic Zoning Commission (HZC) provides preliminary recommendations to other City review bodies on development applications in the Historic Preservation Overlay (HPO), where certain contextually sensitive design features become entitled prior to Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) review. The Historic District Design Guidelines (Guidelines) are used by the HZC to consider exterior alterations that may affect the historic integrity and context of properties within the HPO. The development is proposed along Liberty Pk., near its southeast intersection with Franklin Rd. Two (2) multifamily buildings (one of which is massed as two buildings), three (3) houses, and three (3) townhouses, are proposed within the HPO boundaries. Additional houses and duplexes are proposed outside of the HPO and are not under review by the HZC. The subject property is immediately adjacent to the Alpheus

Truett House, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for significance in history and architecture. Adjacent and across the street is the Factory at Franklin, listed on the NRHP for its significance in the areas of commerce and industry. Harlinsdale Farm is also within viewshed of the proposed development; it is listed on the NRHP for state-level significance in the areas of agriculture and architecture. All of these NRHP sites, as well as a portion of the subject property fronting Liberty Pk., are part of the Franklin Road Historic District of the HPO. The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal for its November 21, 2021, December 19, 2021, and January 16, 2023, meetings.

The Guidelines include general design policies and goals for each historic district. Within the Franklin Road Historic District, the following is recommended:

- Historic buildings should be preserved, and the scenic view shed and defining topography and other landscape features around Harlinsdale Farm should be preserved;
- Building height should be limited to one or two stories.
- An uncongested gateway into downtown should be provided that emphasizes the historic character of the community;
- The established rhythm and spacing of buildings relative to the established context of the immediate area should be maintained.
- New construction should maintain a balance of buildings and roads and open space so as to continue to project an open, rural appearance; and
- Any changes within the district should be designed to reflect and maintain the key characteristics of the established context.

The Guidelines also include specific recommendations for exterior alterations. In this case, the proposed alterations to the subject property that relate to the Guidelines include building elements such as location, form (height, massing, scale), and setbacks. Chapter 2, New Residential Buildings, is applicable to the single-family, duplex, and townhome forms. Chapter 3, New Commercial Buildings, is also applicable, including specific guidance for new buildings within larger redevelopment areas. It is recommended that one “design the height of new buildings to be consistent with the height of historic commercial buildings in the district, which should not exceed two to three stories or be any taller than the commercial buildings on Main Street.” Further, the Guidelines recommend that one transition the height of new buildings to be within ten percent of the height of any adjacent historic building through the use of building stepbacks of 20 feet from the stories below, dividing into smaller parts to reduce effective visual bulk, and/or utilizing other technique that break up the scale of a building.”

Because the proposed development is adjacent to a property listed on the NRHP, the Zoning Ordinance requires the implementation of a Historic Resource Edge Treatment (“Edge Treatment”) as part of the development proposal. The application proposes using the Naturalistic Screening edge treatment, which requires a 75’ opaque screen of evergreen trees mixed with existing vegetation between the historic resource and the proposed development. The proposed edge treatment and its location allow for the historic building and its general context to be preserved and maintained.

The use of houses and townhouses between the edge treatment and the West Residential Building is appropriate and supported. The Guidelines recommend that one transition the height of new buildings to be within ten percent of the height of any adjacent historic building, and it appears that the general height of the proposed houses and townhouses meets the recommendations in relation to the Truett House. For adherence to the Guidelines, these buildings must be maintained at a scale no greater than two stories.

The proposed multifamily forms are outlined below:

West Residential Building: Along Liberty Pike, this building is proposed at two stories plus a recessed third story as it fronts Liberty Pk., measuring 36’ in height. The DRC is supportive of the height and scale of the front facade of this building, as situated on Liberty Pk., as it is proposed at a two-story scale with a recessed third story. The rear of the property appears to be proposed at a taller scale of four stories with a fifth-story recessed at the rear (see pages 15-16 of submittal). East Residential Building: Along Liberty Pike, this building is proposed at four stories with a recessed fifth story, measuring 57’ in height. The proposal is designed so that the first two stories are one color/material to try to mitigate the scale of the building, and the upper floors are another color/material to differentiate them. The applicant is proposing to try to have the first two stories read as one story, which would result in a 22’-tall -floor-to-ceiling height. Like the West Building, the rear of the property appears to be proposed at a taller scale (see page 16 of submittal); it appears that five stories with a sixth-story recessed is proposed at the rear. Scale The proposed scale is not consistent with the Guidelines. The Design Goals and Policies for the Franklin Road Historic District recommend constructing new buildings at one or two stories. Further, the Guidelines specific to new buildings in larger redevelopment areas recommended that one “design the height of new

buildings to be consistent with the height of historic commercial buildings in the district, which should not exceed two to three stories or be any taller than the commercial buildings on Main Street.” As such, the proposal is inconsistent with the scale recommendations of the Guidelines. In order to understand the proposed building scale at the locations where the grade changes/falls and how this scale will look along Liberty Pk. and Franklin Rd., additional information and vantages are needed.

The Guidelines recommend that the architectural features of a new building should be aligned with those of nearby historic buildings, including floor-to-ceiling heights. If the first two stories were counted as one, the proposed ceiling height of 22’ is inconsistent with the street-level ceiling height of other multifamily or mixed-use buildings in the area:

- Jamison Station retail building (adjacent to subject property)—16’ to bottom of second floor
- Harpeth Hotel (downtown Franklin)—17’-6” to bottom of second floor
- 231 Public Square retail building—14’-6” to the bottom of second floor

Color/material changes are proposed to be used to express the bottom two stories as a single floor; the rendered fenestration, however, does not appear to mimic that of a single story. There are two levels of windows, some including balconies, which is not typical for ground-level floors in the HPO. The Guidelines also recommend that one reinforces the appearance and rhythm of historic horizontal patterns by maintaining a distinction between the street level and upper floor facades on buildings of two or more stories. Expressing the first two stories as the same, in an effort for them to read as a single story from the exterior, is contrary to the intent of this guideline.

Along the western edge of the proposal, the mix of houses and townhouses appear to transition appropriately in scale and height from the historic houses along Franklin Rd. in the HPO. This is further complemented by the proposed Naturalistic Screening edge treatment. The proposal includes information that has responded to DRC requests for viewshed analyses, three-dimensional renderings, and setback information. The applicant is to be commended for providing this additional information for consideration. The West Residential Building has an appropriate scale as situated at the frontage on Liberty Pk. The proposed setbacks and courtyard areas are also appropriate for the district. Regarding the East Residential Building, the proposal has not yet been altered to the degree necessary to achieve the intent of the Guidelines and the recommendations of the DRC, as it exceeds the scale recommendations of two-to-three stories. Transitional height is an important consideration of the Guidelines for larger development areas to ensure compatibility with historic buildings. As such, height should transition from Jamison Station (three stories with a recessed fourth story) down the block face toward the one-to-two-story historic houses along Franklin Rd. This will ensure that the established rhythm and spacing of buildings is maintained and that the new buildings will reflect the key characteristics of the established, historic context. More information is also needed to understand how the additional scale at the rear of each multifamily building is proposed to look from the HPO area along Liberty Pk. Thus, it is recommended that the HZC make a preliminary recommendation for denial of the proposal to the FMPC and BOMA for the elements of the proposal related specifically to the Guidelines, based on the staff analysis dated February 13, 2023. Please note that the HZC is providing only a preliminary recommendation to FMPC and BOMA on whether this conceptual proposal, as presented today, meets the intent of the Guidelines. The HZC is not bound by today’s preliminary recommendation if and when the applicant requests a COA from the HZC at a future date.

- Applicant Speaker: Gary Vogrin, Toby & Amanda McKeehan (Owners), Joe Antunovich

Mr. Vogrin stated it is his hope that by the end of the meeting tonight enough information has been provided to the Commission to receive support and preliminary approval of the project. He also stated that throughout the planning process, the group’s focus has been adherence to the design guidelines and Envision Franklin. Mr. Vogrin explained that Mr. and Mrs. McKeehan have 4 goals for the Middle Eight development; 1) to protect the value of Franklin’s unique charm, 2) to provide diversity of housing where infrastructure exist, 3) to support the creation of the Factory District and 4) to expand Franklin’s downtown area beyond the river and into the Factory District.

Mr. McKeehan stated that he and his wife, Amanda, have lived in the Alpheus Truett House for 29 years. Over the years many developers have approached with ideas for the 7 acres of land but none of the plans ever felt right. Mr. McKeehan stated that he has always felt very protective of the land and loves and respects the town of Franklin. Once Envision Franklin was adopted by the city, it became apparent that diversity in housing was needed.

Mrs. McKeehan stated that they have assembled a team of people to create a development/plan that focuses on their goals and the goals of Envision Franklin. She explained that they are anxious to move forward with the Middle Eight development, although staff recommended waiting for the Envision Franklin update to be complete.

Mr. McKeehan thanked the staff for their support and input regarding the development plan and believes that the plan has

improved because of this collaboration.

Mr. Antunovich began by thanking staff and the Commission for their input and collaboration in the Middle Eight development and explained the site plan. Mr. Antunovich stated that he believes the site plan beautifully reflects the historical characteristics of the neighbors in the Factory District. All parking for the Middle Eight development is below grade to create more open space and pedestrian connectivity throughout the site. A private road around the perimeter of the development will provide entrance/exit to the parking garage along with accessibility to a main lobby for deliveries as all parking is off the street. The East building design, consistent with the requirements, was based on transitional zoning similar to the existing Jamison Station. The development provides generous setbacks as buildings are accessible from the street per the guidelines. Generous landscaping and screening are reflected in the application documents including courtyards, parks, and an English garden. The greenhouse is a historical tribute to the history of Franklin. Mr. Antunovich stated that the application documents address site coverage, site openness and building height among other questions/concerns from staff. Mr. Antunovich concluded by thanking the Commission for their consideration.

Andy Blair at 533 Plantation Ct. Nashville, TN. Mr. Blair explained that he is speaking in support of the Middle Eight development. He is especially supportive of the diversity of housing that the development will provide for. Mr. Blair stated that his only concern is the height of the East residential building.

Lynne McAlister at 723 Fair St. Ms. McAlister stated that she is speaking in support of the Factory district and the Middle Eight development. Middle Eight will be more desirable and affordable for younger professionals and families who want to live and work near downtown Franklin.

Allen Arender at 230 Franklin Rd. Mr. Arender stated that as managing partner of Holladay Properties/Factory, he believes the Factory district will benefit from the Middle Eight development and will help set the precedent for what the Factory district will be in the future.

David & Stephanie Vozza at 14 Daniels Dr. (Jamison Station). Mr. Vozza stated that the McKeehan's have been very forthcoming and communicative about the development plans of Middle Eight. He believes that Middle Eight will help further develop the Factory district as a vibrant and cultural landmark and he supports the project.

Craig Morrison at 320 Liberty Pk. Mr. Morrison stated that he and his wife live in Jamison Station and enjoy a sunset view over Harlinsdale Park. The view will probably change but the benefits of the Middle Eight development outweigh any perceived losses, according to Mr. Morrison. Reducing the East building by one story takes away a level of homes for people and makes the development less economical for the developers.

Sharon & Steve Brugman at 203 Old Liberty Pk. Ms. Brugman stated that she and her husband are thrilled about the Middle Eight development and look forward to having neighbors. The development will allow their property to have walkability to the Factory.

Jacquire King at 217 Old Liberty Pk. Mr. King stated that he is in support of the Middle Eight development and the transformation of the area. Especially the walkability into downtown Franklin, the Factory and to Harlinsdale farm. Mr. King asked that the Commission consider the development and work with the developers to move the application to the next step.

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

Commissioner Harrison moved for approval of a recommendation to FMPC and BOMA, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Harrison explained that comparing the Middle Eight site to the surrounding property there is a buffer between the single-family homes on Liberty Pike and the East and West Buildings. The Middle Eight buildings are compatible with Jamison Station and the apartments further east on Liberty Pike. Middle Eight blends well with the Factory buildings and provides affordable housing that Franklin needs.

Commissioner Laster stated that in considering the guidelines, one of the historic gateways into Franklin is Franklin Road. The Truitt house is about a football field distance from the Middle Eight, West building. The context of the Middle Eight is not the Truitt house but Jamison Station and the Factory. Mr. Laster stated that this is why he seconded the motion for approval.

Commissioner Besser stated that she cannot support the motion because she believes Middle Eight will overshadow the Factory. Ms. Besser noted the “Cool Springs effect.” The height of the East building is concerning.

Commissioner Marquardt agreed with Ms. Besser and stated that exhibit 5 clearly points out the significant mass and scale of the Middle Eight buildings compared to Jamison Station and the Factory. Ms. Marquardt noted that the treasured part of the Factory is directly across from the Middle Eight development. The Middle Eight buildings will overshadow the Factory. Ms. Marquardt also noted her concerns about the residential density of the Middle Eight development.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he believes the scale of Middle Eight is appropriate compared to its neighbors. The flat elevation images on the screen are misleading as much time and effort have been spent designing the buildings so that they don’t sit flat. The buildings don’t sit right at the street and the full height of the building is seen at the corners. A massive building has been broken down into smaller pieces with a courtyard interjected in the middle. Every architectural tool available has been used to break down the massing of the building. The proposal deserves a positive recommendation because by showing the transition to Franklin Road and down Liberty Pike and stepping up incrementally in height and plan. Every effort has been made to create a development that fits the context of the surroundings.

Commissioner Worthington stated that the property is unique, and the guidelines don’t cover every single situation that arises. Ms. Worthington has concerns about the rear scale of each multifamily building as staff recommended more information about the scale of the rear elevation.

Chair Roberts asked Mr. Antunovich if he could speak to the scale of the rear elevation.

Mr. Antunovich stated that the scale of the rear elevation could be reduced by adding an additional setback and could be softened with terracing.

Mr. Vogrin stated that assistance from staff regarding the HPO line and where it bisects the property would be helpful.

Commissioner Denton stated that as much as the guidelines attempt to address many situations, it’s impossible to foresee every situation.

Chair Roberts stated that once the Factory renovation is complete, the Factory will not be overshadowed by other buildings or developments. Mr. Roberts also stated that he can accept the additional height of the East building because the plan is so well designed. There is no reason not to move forward with a positive recommendation to FMPC and BOMA.

The motion carried 6-2, with Commissioners Besser and Marquardt voting no.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Roberts asked if there was any further business.

Ms. Dannenfelser reminded and encouraged the Commissioners to attend the Factory district workshop on Thursday, February 16, 2023.

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

10. Rear Yard Fencing At 404 Main St., Michael Martin, Applicant.

Sponsors:

11. Signage (Post-and-Arm) at 230 1st Ave. S. Erin Sevigny, Applicant.

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

Commissioner Harrison moved to adjourn at 8:22 PM, seconded by Commissioner Denton. The motion carried 8-0.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 08:22 p.m.

Chair

Date

