



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, March 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 Jim Roberts called the meeting to order at 05:00 PM.

Board Members Present: Susan Besser, Kathy Worthington, Brian Laster, Tyler LeMarinel, Jim Roberts, Mary Pearce, Lisa Marquardt, Scott Harrison

Board Members Absent: None

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 February 13, 2023, meeting. The motion carried 8-0

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Rose introduced the new staff attorney Blake Harper who will be working with the Historic Zoning Commission.

Ms. Rose announced that the Design Review Team meeting will take place on March 20, 2023, at 4 pm. The meeting agenda will be emailed to everyone.

VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Chair Jim 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 provided an update on the development plans of St. Paul's Church. Ms. Turner along with other parishioners believe the addition of a second floor to the church building behind the sanctuary is not appropriate for the historic church. If a second story is added to the building one of the most disheartening results is the light will be blocked to the tiffany window of Jesus ascending. The church historian of 30 years, Scott Smith, is preparing a petition to the Heritage Foundation to include St. Paul's church on the 2023 list of sites to save. The church will also embark on a community awareness campaign to educate the community about the planned changes to St. Paul's Church.

APPLICATIONS**2. Consideration Of Alterations To Previously-Approved New Construction (Porches) At 725 W. Main St.; Michael Hathaway, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the applicant appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission (HZC) during its February 2023 meeting, where the application was deferred to allow for additional discussion at the March HZC meeting. The proposal is seeking approval to enclose two porches on the left facade of the building. The Guidelines recommend that porches on non-historic residential buildings be designed so that they are located on rear or side facades with minimal visibility and use designs, materials, and scale in keeping with the building's character. The application meets the intent of this guideline as the existing porch areas are located on the left facade of the building, which is approximately 180 feet to the face of the curb at West Main Street. The Guidelines recommend that windows are to maintain a traditional solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district. The applicant will utilize the same windows with transoms that are seen on the building to keep with the building's character. Surrounding the windows, white composite trim panels and composite trim columns will be utilized instead of brick, so that the enclosure reads like an enclosed porch.

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 Presentation: Mike Hathaway, 906 Studio Architects. Mr. Hathaway stated that he was not the original architect on record but is assisting the owner in getting the issues resolved. The use of the existing windows and transoms to create a sun porch feel is the goal as requested by the owner.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. There was none.

A motion was made to approve Item 2 with conditions by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Pearch. The motion carried 8-0.

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

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the applicant requests retroactive approval of the accessory demolition at 316 Bridge Street. 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 applicant has provided notarized affidavits from the three people who removed the structure from the property. The applicant has also asked that email correspondence from the aforementioned people, to staff, be included within the application materials for the HZC's consideration. The documentation outlines the perceived state of repair of the structure by those who removed it from the property. 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 to substantiate the criterion by which demolition is being requested (structural instability and deterioration). 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. The age of the structure dates to post-1913 but pre-1928, based on staff's assessment of historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the area.

It is recommended that the HZC deny issuance of a COA for Item #3, due to lack of 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 retroactive permit for demolition.

Applicant Presentation: Susan Comer. Ms. Comer stated that she would appreciate a certificate of approval for the demolition of an accessory building on her property. Ms. Comer stated that she had no idea that approval would be needed for the removal of an old shed on her property. Despite repairs over the years, the shed had become unstable and dangerous for her family. Ms. Comer stated that she has signed affidavits from everyone who helped remove the building. Ms. Comer finished by stating that it seemed like a logical decision to remove the unstable building from her property.

A motion was made by Commissioner Laster, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt to approve the COA based on the deterioration of the structure as described by the affidavits and photographic evidence.

Commissioner Laster stated that the affidavits serve the same purpose as an engineering report since there isn't a building left to be inspected.

Commissioner Pearce stated that because of the way some of the small historical accessory buildings are built, it's difficult to maintain the buildings despite our best efforts. Ms. Pearce stated that she agrees with Ms. Comer's comment about making a reasonable decision to remove the structure.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the Commission doesn't like to be in this type of situation but it is logical to make a decision to remove an unsafe structure from the property. Ms. Comer has been a good steward of the main historical building of the property.

Chair Robert stated that he understands Ms. Comer's reasoning for removing the structure, but he cannot support approval of the request. Much has been said about being weary of the removal of historic structures and the Commission has to be careful about setting a precedent.

Commissioner Pearce asked what happens if a certificate of Appropriateness is never granted by the Commission.

Mr. Squires explained that nothing happens other than the request remains unapproved.

Commissioner Pearce asked how a request for a new accessory building, on the same property, would be affected by the unapproved request.

Mr. Squires stated that for a new request for an accessory building on the property the Commission should look at the design guidelines in general. Even though someone did something unpermitted in the past, the new request should not be affected. Mr. Squires stated that he doesn't know of a state law or zoning ordinance that would place a stipulation on a new request because of a previously unapproved request, but the topic may require more research.

Commissioner Besser stated that there seems to be a disconnect between the City of Franklin requirements and the community.

Ms. Rose explained that every few years a letter is sent via USPS to homeowners living in the historical overlay that outlines procedures and requirements if demolition or new construction is going to be considered by the homeowner. Signs are also posted during this time along with public outreach meetings.

Commissioner Besser asked what the procedures are for moving forward in this situation.

Mr. Squires stated that if the request is not approved, the HZC is finished with the request and no further action is needed. Further research may be necessary prior to a request for a new construction consideration on this property.

The motion tied, 4-4. (Besser, Worthington, LeMarinel, and Roberts voting no).

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, and seconded by Commissioner Marquardt to approve the COA with conditions.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he believes that Ms. Comer was well-intentioned and has attempted to provide as much documentation to the Commission as possible. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he originally voted against the motion for approval but will vote in favor of the motion based on the process Ms. Comer has been through is punitive.

Commissioner Pearce stated that most of the historical outbuildings don't have a foundation but they are restorable.

The motion carried 5-3. (Besser, Worthington, and Roberts voting no).

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

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the proposal includes the construction of a new accessory structure. The application meets the intent of most of the Guidelines for new accessory structures. There appears to be a discrepancy in the size of the structure. Based on staff's calculations of the submitted floorplan, the upper story is 61% of the footprint of the lower floor. The applicant has indicated to staff that the upper floor is 59% of the footprint of the lower floor. The Guidelines recommend that upper floors of new accessory structures not exceed 60 % of the footprint of the lower floors.

Staff recommends that item #4 be approved with the following:

1. The square footage of the upper floor of the accessory structure must be confirmed by staff to measure no more than 60 percent of its footprint, in accordance with the Guidelines.
2. 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.
3. Accessory structures located within the floodplain shall only be used for parking or storage and shall remain unfinished.
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.

Applicant Presentation: Aaron Rietveld. Mr. Rietveld stated that he used the commentary from the last HZC meeting to simplify the volume of the building by adding a simpler porch and shutters to the primary building. The square footage of the second story has been adjusted to meet the proportional guidelines of the first story. Mr. Rietveld also stated that the accessory structure was revised to be more subservient to the primary building.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. There was none.

Commissioner Besser asked for more explanation regarding the use of shiplap.

Mr. Rietveld stated that the use of shiplap siding would mimic the Greek Revival detailing on the accessory building around the small windows above the garage.

A motion was made by Commissioner Marquardt, seconded by Commissioner Worthington to approve item 4 with conditions. The motion carried 8-0.

5. **Consideration Of Alterations (Dormer Construction) At 723 Glass Ln.; Matthew Powell, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that The applicant is proposing to construct a gabled dormer at the edge of the wall on the roof on the rear and left portion of the building, behind the garage area (see aerial photo below; red X

indicates proposed dormer location). The dormer is proposed to allow for the attic space to be finished on the interior. The materials are proposed to match those on the existing non-historic building.

The Guidelines recommend that dormers be appropriately sized and located to fit with the architectural style of the building. Dormers should relate to the style and proportion of the windows on the lower floors. Dormer roof pitch should be at least 3:12 and no less than half the main roof pitch, and dormers should be located below the main ridge of the building. Dormers should be recessed at least one (1) foot from the exterior building wall, and dormer sidewalls should be located at least 30 inches from the exterior building wall.

The application proposes the placement of the dormer sidewall near the edge of the exterior wall, which is not in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of Item #5 with the following conditions:

1. The dormer sidewall shall be recessed at least 30 inches from the exterior building wall, as recommended by the Guidelines.
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 Presentation: Matthew Powell. Mr. Powell referred to the proposal drawings of the existing elevation and the proposed elevation and stated that the spacing issues between the edge of the roof and the dormer are due to structural reasons which is stated on the engineering report. He stated that it may be possible to move the dormer but would require more engineering assessment resulting in more money spent. Mr. Powell appealed not to move the dormer as winter would be the only time that the area would be visible and would not affect the appeal of the home from the street.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. There was none.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Board.

A motion was made by Commissioner Worthington, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinal to approve with conditions Item 5.

Commissioner Marquardt asked if condition number one was included in the motion.

Mr. Powell stated that he is requesting that condition number one be excluded as one of the conditions for approval because the dormer location is not as visible from the street.

Ms. Marquardt asked for staff to comment on condition number one.

Ms. Rose stated that the dormer would be situated directly on the exterior wall or side wall and be flush with the exterior wall. There would be some roof overhang for the eave.

Chair Roberts asked for the exact dimensions.

Mr. Rose answered Ms. Marquardt's question by stating typically dormers have some recession off the wall. The updated guidelines state that 30 inches is enough of an inset for dormers.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked if the building was a non-contributing building within the historical district.

Ms. Rose stated that is correct.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that there are wall dormers already present on the building.

Ms. Rose stated that she believes that wall dormers were permitted previously due to the dormers not being visible from the street.

Commissioner Laster stated that normally dormers are placed over the window for aesthetic reasons. Mr. Laster asked if

there were other reasons for the dormer placement other than structural.

Mr. Powell explained that the placement of the proposed dormer is in the position for structural and square footage reasons. There would be more usable square footage with the dormer in the proposed position.

Commissioner Worthington stated that it seems like there could be a way to position the dormer in a symmetrical way that would follow the intent of the guidelines and still contribute to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she agrees with the staff comments. Ms. Pearce has concerns that the offset dormer will reflect poorly on the home in the future.

The motion carried 8-0.

Ms. Rose confirmed that the applicant can move forward with the filing of building permits but would have to show evidence that the dormer would be 30 inches from the exterior building wall, as recommended by the Guidelines.

Mr. Powell stated that if the dormer has to be moved, he would plan to move the dormer so that it is directly over the window.

Ms. Rose stated that the staff would certainly support placement of the dormer over the window.

6. Consideration Of Principal Structure Partial Demolition, Addition, Alterations (Siding, Chimney, Windows, Doors, Side Porch, Lighting, Hardscapes) And Accessory Structure Alterations (Siding, Lighting, Windows, Doors) At 1009 Fair St.; Amanda McCreary, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Amanda Rose, Emily Huffer

Chair Roberts suggested that Ms. Rose proceed through her presentation, then, at that time, the sections of the proposal will be broken down into multiple motions.

Staff Presentation: Amanda Rose. Ms. Rose stated that the proposal is broken down into portions due to the number of requests within the application. Ms. Rose noted that alterations to the front porch were discussed during the DRC meeting, but the applicant would like to postpone the request until more information has been gathered for the Commissions review.

Partial Demolition—The proposed partial demolition consists of the removal of a rear mudroom addition and the removal of a side porch from the right facade. The Guidelines recommend against the demolition of historic buildings or structures that maintain historic or architectural integrity. While the exact age of the addition and porch are unknown, the addition does not appear to be present on the 1950s Sanborn Map of the property, and it features non-historic building materials. Side porches of this nature have been added, typical, over historic entrances stoops, as is the case here. As such, the removal of both the addition and the side porch would not adversely affect the district's historic character.

Addition—The proposed 88 sq. ft. addition will be located on the rear of the historic building, in the same location as the area where the partial demolition is proposed. The addition is designed to be inset from the existing house. The application indicates that the addition will consist of a wood lap siding that will distinguish it from the proposed wood shake on the original portion of the building. As such, the addition is consistent with the Guidelines.

Siding—The application proposes to remove asbestos siding from the principal building in order to restore the wood shake that the investigation has indicated is underneath it. The application also proposes to remove asbestos siding from the accessory structure, as one of the interior walls indicates that wood shake was/is underneath it as well. The Guidelines support the removal of synthetic siding and restoring the house's appearance through restoration of original siding materials. If the original siding exists under the asbestos siding, the applicant should repair the original wood siding. The applicant must minimize replacement of wood siding to elements that are so severely damaged that replacement is the only option, with no more than 25 percent of a facade's total square footage being replaced unless significant deterioration can be demonstrated. Siding is also proposed to be replaced on the non-historic addition to the building. Wood lap siding is proposed. Due to its age, this is appropriate.

Chimney—The left facade chimney appears to have been parge-coated at some point in time, as evidenced by the appearance of the chimney from the attic space. The application proposes to resurface the chimney with brick. Further, the chimney does not extend to vent through the roof, so the proposal includes altering it to do so. The Guidelines recommend that one preserves and maintains chimneys and avoids covering them with stucco or any other treatment. Because evidence indicates that the chimney has been resurfaced in the past, removing the parge coating is appropriate. The Guidelines recommend cleaning the masonry by using the least abrasive means possible. Adding a brick veneer over the parge coating, however, is not entirely in keeping with the Guidelines, as repairing, or replacing the damaged masonry with new masonry that matches as closely as possible the historic color, texture, and profile of the original is more appropriate.

Principal Building Windows and Doors—A series of fenestration alterations are proposed, as described below:

- the replacement of the existing windows on the right facade of the historic addition with taller windows, sized to meet egress requirements.
- the placement of a new window on rear facade.
- the placement of new clerestory windows on the rear facade, at the location of existing windows.
- the placement of new double window at the location of an existing single window on the left facade.
- the placement of a new window at the location of an existing door, near the rear of the building.
- the replacement of an existing window at the far rear and right facade of the building with a new door and
- the replacement of the front door with a new door design.

Per Guidelines, windows should not be added to front or readily visible facades, and new windows should match the historic materials found on the building. As such, all proposed window alterations are consistent with the Guidelines. The Guidelines also recommend that original entrance doors be preserved and maintained; the application notes that the door is not original, as it does not have wavy glass. The proposed front door is a 2/3 lite profile, and it consists of solid wood. The Guidelines recommend that new entrance designs be appropriate for the style and age of the building, so the proposed alteration is appropriate.

Lighting—A new light fixture is proposed at the front facade of the principal building, next to the entrance. New lighting is also proposed at the accessory structure. The Guidelines support the use of period-appropriate lighting. No light fixtures have been included within the application for consideration, however.

Driveways/Walkways—The proposal includes extending the driveway area toward the principal building, in the area where the side porch is proposed to be removed. This request is consistent with the Guidelines. The proposal also includes the removal of the existing walkway that connects from the driveway to the front entrance and its replacement with a walkway that connects the front entrance to the street. This is also consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines, though the walkway materials have not been specified for review.

Accessory Structure Windows & Doors—The proposal includes the replacement of the non-historic garage doors with new fixed carriage doors. The design of the proposed doors is of similar proportion and materials to those on accessory structures traditionally found in the district. New windows are also proposed to be added to the left and rear facades, the latter of which is proposed within existing framing. These alterations are consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal with the following conditions:

1. The applicant may remove the parge coating from the chimney, but refacing the chimney in brick is not appropriate in light of the Guidelines.
2. Because light fixtures have not been submitted, the applicant must provide the proposed light fixture specifications to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval prior to work commencing.
3. The proposed walkway material must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval prior to work commencing.
4. The applicant must work with the Preservation Planner to determine the state of repair of the siding that is present underneath the asbestos siding and to determine the appropriate percentage of replacement, if needed.
5. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to the issuance of a building permit.
6. 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: Ben McCreary, Chisel Workshop. Mr. McCreary stated that Ms. Rose covered the application

requests, and he did not have any additional information to add.

Harriet Harms at 1010 W. Main St. Ms. Harms stated that her home backs up to the subject property and she is in full support of the changes the applicant would like to make to the property. Ms. Harms stated that the requests being made seem to be well within the design guidelines and she is hopeful that the HZC will approve the application.

Commissioner Pearce moved for approval with conditions of partial demolition of the principal building through the removal of the non-historic addition, removal of the side porch, and the construction of a new addition at the location of the addition proposed for removal, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. The motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Harrison moved for approval with conditions of the replacement of siding material on the principal building and accessory striction, the extension of the chimney through the roof and refacing of the external material, and various window and orr removals and replacements and additions on the principal building and accessory structure, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Commissioner Laster stated that he understands that staff will work with the applicant regarding the siding that is found once the asbestos siding is removed. Mr. Laster asked staff how they would address the siding issue if something different is found after removal.

Ms. Rose stated that depending on what is found under the asbestos siding, the siding would need to be restored as appropriate according to the design guidelines. If the applicant would like to request something different, the applicant would need to make a separate request to the HZC.

Commissioner Laster stated that his observations regarding doors of craftsman error homes in this area point to similar doors as on the subject building. Mr. Laster explained that he believes the beveled glass, as seen on the subject building door, is possibly the original door. Mr. Lasted proposed keeping the original door or for the applicant to provide more evidence that supports choosing the proposed door.

Commissioner Pearce suggested adding an amendment to the motion to keep the original door. Ms. Pearce stated that in her experience with craftsman-style homes, she believes that the subject building's current door is an original.

Commissioner Pearce moved to amend the motion to keep the current front doo and do not replace it, seconded by Commissioner Laster. The amended motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she hasn't seen a house of this error that has shingles all over the exterior.

Ms. Rose asked Mr. McCreary to speak to the evidence of shake siding found.

Mr. McCreary stated that evidence has been found in the eaves around the foundation of the building. Also, evidence has been found in the porch area.

Commissioner Laster asked if photographic evidence has been provided by the applicant and, if not, requested that photographs be taken and saved for the historic record.

Mr. McCreary stated the locations where the asbestos siding had been removed was difficult to get a usable photo but he stated a couple of photos have been provided.

Ms. Rose stated that the McCreary's understand that whatever type of siding is revealed under the asbestos siding is the type of siding that the home should be restored with.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the chimney would be supplemented with brick.

Mr. McCreary explained that the plan to find appropriate brick color, if needed, is to work with staff to find for brick approval.

Ms. Rose stated that an amendment could be added if the Commission thought it was necessary.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that it is essentially included in the motion so it wouldn't be necessary to add an amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Harrison moved to approve with conditions as amended of the replacement of siding material on the principal building and accessory structure, the extension of the chimney through the roof and refacing of its exterior material, and various window and door removals and replacements and additions on the principal building and accessory structure, seconded by Commissioner Worthington. The motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Pearce moved for approval with conditions of new light fixtures, alterations to the driveway and walkway areas, and replacement of the doors on the accessory structure, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel. The motion carried 8-0.

Ms. Rose thanked Mr. McCreary for providing such a thorough application.

Commissioner Pearce asked if the light fixtures would need approval from staff or the Commission.

Chair Roberts stated that the light fixtures would need to be submitted for review and approval.

Commissioner Laster asked if more evidence of siding could be provided to the staff and Commission.

Ms. Rose stated that in this situation, because of the evidence of asbestos siding, it was difficult to take photographs without disturbing the asbestos. Whatever siding evidence is found once the asbestos is safely removed, the applicant will be more than willing to proceed with the appropriate material.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Pearce asked about more training in the future.

Ms. Rose stated that the most recent training was in October, but more training is planned in the future.

Commissioner Besser clarified her comments regarding a disconnect in the community regarding procedures and guidelines for historic home alterations and demolition.

Ms. Rose stated that Ms. Besser's comment allowed her to speak on the record about what is involved when one purchases a home, commercial, or civic property that resides in the historical overlay. Anytime an opportunity arises to speak to the community regarding these types of procedures is a chance to educate. Ms. Rose stated that she has budgeted for another letter to be mailed to those living in the historic overlay community.

Chair Roberts asked about a site visit to Magnolia Hall that was discussed in the DRC meeting.

Ms. Rose stated that it has not been scheduled yet, but she would follow up on a time for the site visit.

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

ADJOURN

Commissioner Harrison moved to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner LaMarinel. The motion carried 8-0.

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

Chair

Date

