109 3rd Ave S
Franklin, TN 37064
(615) 791-3217

City of Franklin

Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, July 10, 2023 | **5:00 PM** | **Board Room**

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

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

Board Members Absent: Josh Denton

Staff Present: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Joseph Bryan, Randall Tosh, Blake Harper, Nathan Beck, Bill Squires

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Open for citizens to be heard on any issue or concern, including those related to items on the agenda. Please submit a Speaker Card at the beginning of the meeting if you would like to address the Commission. If you would like to speak on an agenda item, the Chair will hold your comment until the public comment period associated with the item. As provided by law, the Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments for items not on the agenda, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director/Staff for administrative consideration, or to a schedule the matter for consideration at a later date. Those addressing the Commission are requested to come to the microphone and identify themselves by name and address for the official record. The Chair may restrict the period for public comment, including the length of the public comment period, the number of individuals who can speak and the length of time each individual may speak. When time allows, the standard individual public comment time is two minutes.)

Comments on agenda items may be made in person at city hall or by emailing planningintake@franklintn.gov by noon on the day prior to the meeting. Emailed comments will be provided to the Commission and included in the minutes, but not read aloud in their entirety during the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes**

Sponsors:

Minutes: June 12, 2023
Motion to Approve the Minutes
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Pearce
Motion carried 6-0 (with Laster and Harrison abstaining)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Roberts asked if Staff had any announcements.

Ms. Dannenfelser announced that the next Design Review Committee meeting will be Monday, July 17, 2023, at 4 pm in the Board Room. Also, a Special Design Review Committee meeting will be held July 31, 2023, to discuss the City Hall architecture.

VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Jerry and Michael Cameron (1315 Adams Street) Discussing the property at 1309 Adams Street.

Mr. Cameron stated that he has made numerous complaints to the city regarding the property located at 1309 Adams Street. The property has been vacant for over 5 years, has an overgrown yard and weeds in the gutter, making it difficult to get someone to mow the grass. The shutters are falling off the house and there has been a blue tarp on the roof for a few years with skunks, possums, foxes, and other animals running in and out of the house. The buildings continue to deteriorate year after year. Mr. Cameron explained that he and his wife along with many neighbors have spent a lot of money on their homes on Adams Street. Mr. Cameron urges the city to act on the property. Mr. Cameron finished by saying that he is willing to file a petition and follow city procedures necessary to address this issue.

Chair Roberts announced that item #6, Consideration of a Cell Tower installation has been removed from the agenda.
There has also been a request to move the item for 306 Public Square to the first item on the agenda for family reasons.
MOTION TO MOVE 306 PUBLIC SQUARE TO THE FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA
Motion to move the item.
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner LeMarinel
Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

APPLICATIONS

2. **Consideration Of New Construction At 1835 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 2); Matt Smith, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Joseph Bryan

Project Leader: Joseph Bryan. Mr. Bryan stated that The development plan for Magnolia Hall was approved on December 14, 2021, prior to the adoption of the 2022 Historic District Design Guidelines. This proposal will be reviewed under the Guidelines in effect at the time the Development Plan was approved.

The Guidelines recommend that new construction is designed to be compatible in massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings and that new construction complement rather than detracting from the

character of the historic district.

The proposal includes the construction of a one-and-and-a half-story residence with Victorian architectural-styled features. The front elevation features a two-thirds porch with a turret feature on the left side and a double -door main entry. The entry doors, as well as the windows in the bay ornate double columns on the porch and a decorative bracket in the front gable. There is a dormer on the upper floor of the front elevation with decorative pilasters. The dormer as well as the small window in the front gable have arched windows. All other windows are either six-over-one or four over-one double-hung windows.
Placement/Setback:
The setback for the front yards was approved to be 10-20 feet, while the side and rear yards are to be 5 feet per the development plan. The actual number for the front yard setback was not included in the proposal.
Scale/Massing/Height:
The Guidelines recommend that the height of infill buildings on newly created streets should be compatible with the building height on the nearest block face within the established historic district.
New construction should be compatible with the massing, height, proportions, scale, size, and architectural features of adjacent buildings. Further, the Zoning Ordinance states that new buildings within view of the historic building shall be similar in scale and architectural character with the historic building; however, the historic building shall not be emulated to such an extent that it loses its prominence. Rather than attempting to mirror the scale of the historic building, new buildings shall be subordinate in their perceived scale to the historic building. The proposed overall height of this structure (lot 2) is 31' 8". Magnolia Hall is listed as 33' in height on the streetscape exhibit. Previous exhibits listed the height of Magnolia Hall at 32'. The height of Magnolia Hall will need to be confirmed by the applicant.
Materials:
The materials of the proposed new construction are listed as predominantly cement fiber siding with a 4" exposure, metal standing seam roofing above the turret feature, fiberglass composition roof, stone foundation, and brick chimney. The Guidelines recommend that lap siding exposure should be consistent with that which is found on adjacent historic structures. The colors of the materials were not included in the application. The Guidelines recommend matching surrounding historic masonry in the width of the mortar joints, size and scale of the bricks, color, and texture. Specifications on the windows were not included in the application.
Architectural Features:
The Guidelines recommend that architectural details should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of nearby historic structures. As suggested in previous Design Review Committee meetings, the proposal should limit the use of ornamentation so as not to directly compete with the Magnolia Hall mansion. While the overall design is simpler than the historic mansion, replacing the double columns on the front porch with single columns and removal of the pilasters from the front dormer would help the dwelling to not visually compete with the historic mansion.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the project with the following:
1) The double columns on the front porch are reduced to single columns.
2) Removal of the pilasters from the front dormer.
3) Show that 4" lap siding exposure is consistent with the property or modify to a 5" reveal.
4) Window specs are to be provided to Planning Staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
5) The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to 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 window feature on the front elevation, feature transom windows.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway & Matt Smith. Mr. Hathaway discussed the changes made to the project based on staff feedback at the DRC meeting.
1) The ornamentation of the house has been simplified.
2) The plan has been modified to break up the façade.
3) The ceilings have been lowered to 10 feet instead of 11 feet.
4) The transoms have been removed from the plan.
5) The chimney height has been reduced.

Mr. Hathaway explained the discrepancy between the 32 feet vs. 33 feet height of Magnolia Hall as the porch was not included in the initial measurement.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Marquardt
Commissioner Harrison

Discussion
Commissioner Pearce asked the applicant to confirm that the tallest point of the proposed home is 1 foot below the height of main building of Magnolia Hall.

Mr. Hathaway stated that Ms. Pearce is correct.

Chair Roberts added that if the elevation or grade of the property is considered, the proposed home will end up having a height of 37 feet.

Commissioner Laster asked the applicant how far away the home would be from Magnolia Hall.

Mr. Hathaway stated 300 feet.

Commissioner Pearce asked how much taller, if any, will this house be than the homes on Boyd Mill.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he believes the proposed home is consistent with the scale of the homes on Boyd Mill.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he doesn't have an issue with the double columns, but the porch area has an unusual design. It's unusual that the base of the columns has a more manufactured look. If a single column is used a smaller base would be a better choice.

Commissioner Besser stated that the reduction in building height is more consistent with the Queen Ann style. Ms. Besser expressed her concern about the support piers if a single column is used.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he would prefer to work with staff on final details as opposed to presenting in front of the Commission if that is acceptable to the Board.

Chair Roberts asked the Planning staff if they were comfortable with overseeing the final details.

Mr. Bryan said, "Yes, he's comfortable working with the applicant on the final details."

Chair Roberts stated that an amendment may be needed, and the Commission should not get into designing during the meeting.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that if a single column is used then the base would need to be adjusted.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the amendment would need to include an adjustment to the base.

Chair Roberts stated that he cannot support this application because of the height of the proposed home including the elevation, from the view of Boyd Mill, will overwhelm the view of Magnolia Hall.

Commissioner Pearce agreed with Chair Roberts.

Commissioner Marquardt asked Mr. Hathaway if the calculations of the home height along with the elevation of the land calculated to 37 feet.

Mr. Hathaway stated that, in his opinion, each home will be read/viewed one at a time and once landscaping is completed along with the existing trees, the overall viewshed will blend nicely with Magnolia Hall. The elevation from Magnolia Hall

rises but other than digging out the site and installing retaining walls, the home would not overshadow the principal home. The proposed home height is comparable to adjacent homes along Glass Lane.

Chair Roberts asked the Board to vote on the Motion to Approve, with conditions by raising a hand.
Vote: 7-1 (Roberts voting no)
Motion Passed

3. Consideration Of New Construction At 1837 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 3); Matt Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Joseph Bryan

Project Leader: Joseph Bryan. Mr. Bryan did not repeat the design guideline recommendations as they were discussed during the previous items. Mr. Bryan stated that the proposal includes the construction of a one-and-and-a half-story residence with Craftsman architectural-styled features with half-timber detailing on the upper floor. The front elevation features a full-width porch, and the entry door and sidelights feature transom windows. The front porch has decorative columns on brick bases. There are three roof dormers on the side elevations and all windows as shown on the elevations have six-over-one or four-over-one profiles that are in keeping with the Craftsman style. The proposed height of this property is 31' 6" as listed on the elevation. Magnolia Hall is listed as 33' in height on the streetscape exhibit. Previous exhibits listed the height of Magnolia Hall at 33'. The materials of the proposed new construction are listed as predominantly brick, cement fiber siding with a 4" exposure, cement fiber panels, metal standing seam roofing above the front porch, fiberglass composition roof, brick foundation, and masonry chimney. Lap siding exposure should be consistent with that which is found on adjacent historic structures. The colors of the materials were not included in the application nor were the widow specifications. The Guidelines recommend that architectural details should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of nearby historic structures. The design features detailing that is consistent with the Craftsman-style but does not visually compete with the Magnolia Hall historic mansion.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the project with the following:
1) Show that 4" lap siding exposure is consistent with the property or modify to a 5" reveal.
2) Window specs are to be provided to Planning Staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
3) The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to 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: Mike Hathaway & Matt Smith. Mr. Hathaway explained that the ceilings were lowered from 11 feet to 10 feet and simplified the details as a craftsman type home is naturally. The turret element has been removed along with a reduction in chimney height.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner LeMarinel

Discussion

Commissioner LeMarinel asked Mr. Hathaway about the materials of the pilaster base and the windowsills. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he didn't realize there were a pair of columns at the front entry.

Mr. Hathaway explained that the base would be made of real stone, a stone façade for the main part of the house and the windowsill material would be limestone.

Commissioner Pearce commented that the stone columns paired with the stone foundation have a heavy appearance and compared to the inspiration photos of 121 Lewisburg Pike, the columns in the photos are more compatible with the character of the neighborhood. Ms. Pearce stated that stone has been problematic, and a different material would take away the heaviness of the overall look of the front façade.

Commissioner Worthington commented by saying she didn't mind the stone, but a tapered column may help with the heaviness of the stone base.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he was open to suggestions.

Commissioner Besser stated that the design guidelines state that tapered columns are not recommended.

Chair Roberts stated that like the previous item, this house is 31.6 feet in height and with a four-foot elevation of the land, this house will impact the view of Magnolia Hall from Boyd Mill Avenue. Looking at the site plan, houses two, three and four all impact the view of Magnolia Hall.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts as the Commissioners to vote on the Motion to Approve 1839 William Campbell Court.
Vote: 6-2
Motion Passed, (Roberts & Pearce voting no)

4. Consideration Of New Construction At 1839 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 4); Matt Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer explained that she would highlight the details of 1839 William Campbell Court as Mr. Bryan had previously discussed the design guidelines. Mr. Huffer stated that the proposal includes the construction of a two-story cross-gabled residence with Tudor architectural-style features. The entrance and sidelights are recessed under a covered stoop. A three-bay window is located to the left of the entrance along with a singular window on the far left of the front facade. To the right of the entrance, there are two windows with transoms. A wall dormer with two windows is centered above the three-bay window. Centered in the gable is a singular window. The front elevation also features ornate double columns on the porch. The rear elevation features a singular gable with a window that is centered on the upper story and a window and a door on the main level. Four gables along with seventeen windows are located on the left elevation. While three gables, thirteen windows, a chimney, and three garage doors are located on the right elevation. The proposed height of this property is 31'2" with an added grade of +3' compared to Historic Magnolia Hall which is listed as 33' in height on the streetscape exhibit. The materials of the proposed new construction are listed as predominantly brick, wood siding with a 4" exposure, cement fiber stucco board, metal standing seam roofing above the three-bay window and garage doors, fiberglass composition roof, limestone veneer foundation, and brick chimney. The specifications for the windows in the proposal were not included in this application but should have historic profiles and dimensions. Use true divided-light (TDL) or simulated divided-light (SDL) windows as new or replacement windows. Windows should have a double-hung (or "double sash") appearance. Porches should be designed with depths of at least six feet and simple columns and balusters. Use square or round columns with a minimum of eight inches and a maximum of twelve inches in diameter. Do not use ornate milled columns, variations of Greek orders, or Craftsman-style columns on porches.
RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the application be approved with the following conditions:
1) The double columns on the front porch should be reduced to single columns.
2) The wall dormer on the front elevation should be altered so it is further off of the porch roof.
3) 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.
4) The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to the 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.

Ms. Huffer noted that staff would like the applicant to clarify whether the window lights in the left elevation should be consistent with the other windows.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway & Matt Smith. Mr. Hathaway stated that this was a mistake on the elevation and the grid is like the other windows. Mr. Hathaway went on to discuss the changes made to the home design.

1) The transoms have been removed.
2) The chimney heights have been reduced.
3) The structure has been lowered by the reduction of the ceiling height.

Mr. Hathaway responded to Chair Roberts' comments by stating that they have done their best to keep plenty of open green space that provides a full view of Magnolia Hall from Boyd Mill Ave. as well as Highway 96 West.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.
MOTION
Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Worthington
Motion Passed 8-0

Discussion

Commissioner Laster asked for information about the material used to the left of the 3-bay window. Mr. Laster also asked about the spacing and symmetry once the double columns were removed.

Mr. Hathaway explained that stucco and brick are the materials used to the left of the 3-bay window. The plan was to remove the columns in the center left of the 3-bay window.

Commissioner Laster stated that the double columns, in this instance, would positively add to the overall look of the home given the spacing and location of the windows.

1st Amendment to motion: Keep the double columns on the front porch.
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Harrison

Commissioner Besser stated that the balustrade is more of an eclectic design feature and not appropriate for the Tudor style of this home.

Mr. Hathaway explained that he is flexible on the balustrade and will follow the recommendation of the Commission. The goal was to add more detail to the home.

There being no further discussion about the amendment to keep the double columns on the porch, Chair Roberts asked the Commission to vote by raising their hand.
Vote: 8-0
Amendment passed.

2nd Amendment to motion: Remove the balustrade from the front porch.
Commissioner Besser
Commissioner LeMarinel

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote by raising their hand.
Vote: 8-0
Amendment passed.

Chair Roberts asked if there was any other discussion on the Main Motion.

Commissioner Pearce asked Mr. Hathaway if the brick around the front door was different in any way. Also, there appears to be a transom over the front door.

Mr. Hathaway explained that the brick around the front door is not different. During a DRC meeting or the last Commission meeting, Commissioner Laster stated that a transom is appropriate in a special location. The front door is considered a special location.

Commissioner Laster asked staff a question relating to condition number two and asked did staff think the wall dormer should be further off the porch roof. "Is there a clarification on how much further off the front porch roof?"

Ms. Huffer stated that the design guidelines recommend that the dormer be 30 inches setback from the front wall.

Mr. Hathaway explained that the dormer is 30 inches off the porch roof and the dormer is setback. The team believes that the look will be attractive and appropriate for the look of the home and would like to keep the dormer as it is presented. Mr. Hathaway also stated that if a change is necessary, he would make the change.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the dormer appears to be 3 feet back from the wall.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the appearance of the front door with the side lights ending at one level and the window of the door at another is not typical of this style of home.

Mr. Hathaway stated that the door is setback/recessed, and the sidelights provide more light for the entry.

Commissioner Laster explained that the 3-D rendering shows how it is a stoop with the door and window recessed back.

Mr. Hathaway asked if it would be necessary to move the dormer back further even though it is compliant with the guidelines at 3 feet back from the wall below. There is a "jog" in the roof below.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the dormer appears like it's sitting down on the roof and the roof below sits on top of the other roof as seen in the side elevation. There is a dormer well that can be seen in the side elevation.

Commissioner Besser stated that the dormer should be setback and there should not be a "well." Like Mr. LeMarinel said, it appears to be sitting on a shelf. The guidelines state that the dormer should not run onto the wall but should be setback.

Commissioner LeMarinel pointed out, looking at the side elevation, even though the dormer interrupts the shared roof, it is several feet behind the wall below. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he does not have a problem with a dormer placement in the well and noted this type of configuration can be found routinely in Middle TN.

Ms. Huffer confirmed this by stating that the zoning ordinance requires the dormer to be setback from the side by 12 inches.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that according to the diagram, the measurement is closer to 3 feet.

Chair Roberts explained that he is in favor of this proposal because the home has less height and would not interrupt the view of Magnolia Hall, if the other two homes were not there.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he was still unclear on the status of the dormer. Mr. Hathaway asked, if the dormer is compliant with the zoning ordinance, is the dormer acceptable, as stated in the application?

Mr. Tosh clarified that the dormer is not a codes issue. From the side view, the front wall aligns behind the columns by about 3 feet. The zoning ordinance requires 12 inches off the wall, so you've 3 times exceeded the minimum requirement. From the front elevation, the dormer is setback enough to meet the requirements.

Mr. Hathaway stated that if the application is approved, the way it reads would require movement of the dormer by 12 inches.

3rd Amendment to Motion: Remove the second condition (Wall Dormer) on the Staff report.

Commissioner LeMarinel
Commissioner Laster

There being no further discussion on the 3rd Amendment to the Overall/Main Motion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote by raising their hand.

Vote: 7-1 (Besser voting no)
Amendment passed.

There being no further discussion on the Main Motion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote by raising their hand.
Vote: 8-0
Overall Motion passed.

5. Consideration Of Alterations And Addition (Principal) At 1303 Adams Street; Hannah Terry, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Joseph Bryan

Applicant Speaker: David Swift (Owner)

Project Leader: Joseph Bryan. Mr. Bryan stated that the applicant has submitted an application for a proposed rear addition to the principal structure for the residence located at 1303 Adams Street. The addition includes a side-loaded garage that is located behind the historic home. The home is a gable-and-wing frame house with a two-thirds porch and does have older additions that are believed to be more than 50 years in age. Chapter 2 of the Design Guidelines provides recommendations for additions to historic residential buildings. Overall, the design, placement, materials, and fenestration of the proposed addition are in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines. In terms of size of the addition, the applicant has indicated that the historic footprint measures 2,167 square feet. The proposed addition, measuring 1,500 square feet, would be 69% of the historic footprint. The Guidelines recommend that, "The building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint of the historic portions of the building (portions to remain that are at least 50 years of age)." The placement of the addition entirely to the rear of the historic main form does limit visibility from public view.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends denial of the proposed rear addition and alterations to the driveway based on the following grounds:
1. The building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint of the historic portions of the building (portions to remain that are at least 50 years of age). The proposed addition is 69% of the historic footprint.

If the HZC decides to approve the COA, the following conditions are recommended:
1. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department 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: David Swift (Owner). Mr. Swift stated that the garage was moved based on the DRC meeting with staff. When the garage was moved, the space for turning into the garage was limited. The garage was enlarged to allow for a larger garage door that allows for turn-in space. Mr. Swift stated that percentage-wise the house with the proposed addition takes up 11% of the lot. Mr. Swift finished by asking the Commission to consider the size of the lot and the placement of the home on the lot when determining approval of the request.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

MOTION
#1: Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner LeMarinel

Commissioner Pearce

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that considering the lot size and the movement of the garage from one side of the home to the other which required increasing the garage size for turn in, it's reasonable to allow more space given the situation of the lot size.

Commissioner Besser stated that she could not support the addition and alteration because of the square footage requirements.

Commissioner Laster stated that during the DRC meeting the square footage came down to 55% of the total square footage.

Mr. Swift answered by stating that to accommodate enough space to turn into the garage, the garage square footage was increased and also increased at the back of the house.

Commissioner Laster stated that because of this change he could not support approval of the application based on the total square footage and because approval could set a precedent for future requests.

Commissioner Pearce stated that there would not be a lot of visibility from the Historic District which could allow the requirements to be more lenient.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote on the motion for approval by raising their hand.

Vote: 3-5 (With Commissioners Besser, Laster, Marquardt, Worthington, and Harrison voting no)
Motion Failed.

Mr. Squires suggested that since the motion failed, a new motion in affirmative action would need to be made.

Commissioner Laster suggested deferral of the application to the August 2023 HZC meeting.

#2: Motion to Defer to the August HZC meeting.
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Besser
Discussion
Chair Roberts explained to the applicant that he could attend the DRC meeting to discuss a reduction in the overall square footage.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that if Mr. Swift would like to attend the DRC meeting, she would need to know as the agenda will be set tomorrow.

Motion to defer to the August 2023 HZC Meeting
Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed.

6. Consideration of Alterations (Awning And Signage) At 99 E. Main St.; Shaun Sullivan, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that this application contains several sections to be discussed. The first portion will be discussion about the awnings. Ms. Huffer explained that The Guidelines recommend that awnings should cover only the storefront display windows or transoms and fit within their openings (p. 100). By moving the awnings down from their current location to cover the windows without extra space above the window, it meets the intent of the Guidelines. As the awnings were previously installed too high and did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness. Changing the awning color from green to black is appropriate within the Guidelines as it will match the windowpanes of the building.

Lighting-
The Guidelines recommend placing new light fixtures so that they should not be obtrusive to historic architectural features (p. 112). And use concealed lighting if possible. If not possible, use projecting fixtures appropriate to the historic period of the building (p. 121). The proposed lighting plan is to utilize two bar sign lights in a museum bronze color. Each of the bar sign lights are 28.3" in length. The utilization of the bar sign lighting is appropriate within the Guidelines.
Sign-
The Guidelines recommend that all signs should be designed to have a dark background and light lettering (p. 120). The proposed signage will utilize Red Oak wood slats vertically placed with black metal pin lettering and black metal frame attached on top of the wood background. The background color and lettering color of the sign does not meet the intent of the Guidelines, as the background color should be darker than the lettering. Wall signs within the Guidelines are recommended to measure 1 linear foot of width of the building façade or storefront (p. 120). The width of the proposed sign is 12', which is keeping in line with the Guidelines. The sign will measure 3'6" in height and 12' in width, which measures 42 sq. ft.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the repositioning and changing of the color of the awning and the lighting for the sign at 99 E. Main St.

Staff recommends denial of the proposed sign, due to the following grounds:
1. The Guidelines recommend that signs should be designed to have a dark background and light lettering (p. 120).
If the proposal is issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the awning, lighting, and signage, then the conditions should be as follows:
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: Frank Pullara. Mr. Pullara stated that the main goal for Bestia Mare was to have the sign match the sister restaurant across the street. The preference would be to use the red oak with aluminum or iron lettering.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts stated that the application would be broken down into 2 motions 1) the awning and then the 2) sign.

MOTION
#1: Motion for Approval with Conditions of the Awning
Commissioner Pearce
Commissioner Harrison

Commissioner Pearce stated that she is enthusiastic about the awnings that will improve the streetscape.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote on the motion for approval by raising their hand.
Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed.

#2 Motion for approval of proposed signage
Commissioner Marquardt
Commissioner Harrison

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the sign would be consistent with the other signs in the area.

Commissioner Laster explained that if you look at the First Farmers Bank, the letters are on the brick of the building. The sign would be more appropriate if the letters were attached to the brick and the signage wouldn't cover up the architectural details of the building.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she would support Mr. Laster's points but would recommend dark lettering.

Chair Roberts explained that he believes Mr. Laster is correct with the recommendation to attach the letters to the brick of the building. A lighter color lettering would be more visible to the public.

Commissioner Besser agrees with Commissioner Laster and Chair Roberts about the appropriate type of sign with lettering directly attached to the brick.

Commissioner Harrison stated that he believes the proposed sign is consistent with the signs in the area.

Commissioner Marquardt withdrew her motion for approval with Commissioner Harrison in agreement.

Mr. Pullara asked about signage prior to the final approval of the sign.

Ms. Huffer stated that a temporary sign is permitted for 90 days following the guidelines of a darker background with lighter color lettering.

#3: Motion to defer the signage to the August HZC meeting.
Commissioner Marquardt
Commissioner Harrison

Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed

Commissioner Marquardt told the applicant that deferral will give him the opportunity to take what was discussed in the meeting and come back with other ideas.

Chair Roberts explained that there were comments at the DRC meeting about putting the lettering on the building brick.

Mr. Pullara stated that at the previous DRC meeting, he understood that what was proposed was acceptable.

7. Consideration Of A Cellular Tower Installation At 257 2nd Ave. S.; Seth Ottinger, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Application was withdrawn by the applicant.

8. Consideration Of Alterations (Window, Masonry, Doors) At 306 Public Square; Sharon Davis, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Joseph Bryan

Project Leader: Joseph Bryan. Mr. Bryan stated that The applicant has submitted a series of alterations for the building located at 306 Public Square. The scope of work includes replacement of the single-pane windows on the second floor of the front elevation, restoration of the transom windows above the front entry, removal of the secondary front door and non-historic front steps, installation of a window to the left of the main entry that matches the right window, removal of window units and repair work to rear and side elevation windows, replacement of the side elevation windows on the first floor, and mortar repair work. The alterations were discussed at the June 2023 meeting of the Design Review Committee. The masonry and mortar repair work and removal of non-historic alterations are consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines. The Guidelines recommend using photographic evidence when restoring and making alterations to a historic building. Clear glass is recommended for new transom windows. One-over-one windows are proposed for the windows second story windows on the front elevation, which matches what was there previously. The scope of window work for the front, rear, and 2nd floor side windows are consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines. Replacement windows are recommended to be compatible with the originals in terms of material, profile and dimensions. Given that the side windows

on the first floor have limited to no public visibility, the
proposed replacement privacy clad windows can be supported.

Staff recommends approval with the following:
1. If new transom windows are needed, they are to be clear glass.
2. Windows specs to be reviewed and approved by Planning Staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to 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.

Owner: Jason McConnell. Mr. McConnell stated that the goal for this project is to restore the building to its to what it looked like in 1901 using materials like the materials used in 1901. Mr. McConnell explained that Brent Ogles will supervise the installation of the windows by a man from Kentucky who primarily works with historic windows.

Applicant Speaker: Sharon Davis. Ms. Davis stated that the driving force of the project is the replacement of the windows (patch and repair) on the front façade to allow for HVAC installation. Replacement of the window on the left of the front façade with a 1 over 1 window that follows the design guides to complete the look of the front of the building. The wood covering the transoms on the front of the building will be removed to expose the transom. The staff during the DRC meeting requested that the door be returned to a window, which Ms. Davis said they were happy to do. Ms. Davis explained that the alley would be better suited if a clad material was used creating a more permeable surface that will help guard against deterioration of the building.
Contractor: Brent Ogles

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with conditions
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Laster asked the applicant if the windows were painted.

Mr. Ogles indicated that the transom windows were painted.

Commissioner Marquardt thanked the applicant for the historical photos along with the care and consideration of the historical building.

Chair Roberts noted that the proposal was very well outlined and presented, making the intent of the project very clear. Chair Roberts stated that the project will be a great addition to downtown.

Commissioner Worthington asked the applicant if stairs were present on the elevation showing the secondary door that will become a window.

Ms. Davis stated that staff had recommended returning the door back to the original window.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked about the mortar and brick final approval.

Amendment to motion #1: The mortar to come to staff for approval.
Commissioner Pearce
Commissioner Laster
Amendment, passed 8-0

Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners on the Overall Motion.
Overall Motion Passed 8-0

9. Consideration of Addition (Principal) At 106 Lewisburg Ave.; Noel Jones, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The property at 106 Lewisburg Ave. is in the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District and was constructed in 1915. The proposal includes an addition to the rear portion of the building to serve as a garage and bonus room. The application appeared before the Design Review Committee during its June 2023 meeting. Per the Guidelines, 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 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 two-story, side gable design on a concrete block 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. Additionally, one should use lap, weatherboard, or clapboard siding for frame additions. Lap siding exposure should be consistent with that on adjacent historic buildings. The materials for the addition to the principal building will be wood siding with a 4" reveal, which meets this guideline due to the principal building being composed of wood siding with a 4” reveal. The addition will also utilize arch shingles that will match the existing house. On the right elevation, the proposal includes the utilization of a garage door on the bottom level and six double-hung windows with a window lite pattern that blends with the existing windows on the principal building. On the left elevation, two windows on the bottom level and two windows on the top level are proposed that will utilize the existing window lite pattern. This window choice is appropriate due to the age and architectural style of the house. On the rear of the proposed addition, are three windows that will match the other proposed windows, a louvered vent near the top of the gable, and a six-paneled door on the bottom floor. On the existing wing of the building that faces the driveway, a French door with window lite will be centered in between four double-hung windows that will match the existing windows. A new standing seam roof is proposed to be utilized. Additionally, a wood deck and stairs is proposed in the space in front of the existing wing to connect the new addition to the building. Vertical siding is proposed to be used under the stairs. Since the property in located in the R4 district, the rear yard setbacks are to be 7'. The Guidelines recommend sizing the overall building footprints (of all portions of the existing principal buildings, accessory structures, and proposed additions on the lot) so that it does not exceed 35 percent of the lot. The proposal meets the recommendation of the Guidelines.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of this application with the following conditions:

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: Noel Jones. Mr. Joes stated that there were two changes based on discussions at the DRC meeting. The changes include a side 7-foot setback instead of a 5-foot setback. The percentage of the historical footprint compared to the addition was not clear at the DRC meeting. The architect has made an adjustment so that the addition is not more than 50% of the historical home footprint.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asks the Commissioners for a motion on the item.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Harrison

There being no discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote.
Vote: 8-0

Motion Passed,

10. Consideration Of Alterations (Window And Ramp) At 230 Franklin Rd. (Bldg 13); David Collier, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The proposal includes the installation of a door into a window opening and a ramp at building 13. The alterations will serve as an accessible emergency egress path from the main seating area and it will also be an accessible route to terrace dining. The proposal will use the previously approved new ramp on the other end of building 13 as the design basis for this ramp. The Guidelines recommend orienting additions to historic commercial buildings so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained. The alterations to building 13 will face Old Liberty Pike and will be visible from the right of way.
Window Alterations- Part of the proposal includes utilizing the single window that is next to the triple window and converting it into a doorway. The door specifications were not included in the submittal.
Ramp Installation-The Guidelines recommend positioning ramps and lifts on rear or side facades where there not readily visible. As proposed, the ramp will be on the front elevation of the building.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends denial of this application based on the following grounds:
1. The Guidelines recommend orienting additions to historic commercial buildings so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.

If the HZC decides to approve the COA, the following conditions are recommended:
1. Specifications on the door be approved by the Preservation Planning staff.
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: David Collier. Mr. Collier stated that the design of the window was based on a previously approved entrance at the other end of the building. Originally, this application was submitted for two separate tenants. The plan was to take the three-bay window, altering them and adding doors into those units up at the level of the existing sidewalk. Now, the new tenant is a restaurant with an assembly occupancy. There must be a second means of egress from the seating area for the patrons and you're not allowed to egress through the kitchen. The door serves both as an accessible route and the emergency egresses from the restaurant seating. Mr. Collier stated that both the window and door alterations would be completed by the same company that will make approved alterations on the other side of the building.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asks the Commissioners for a motion on the item.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner LeMarinel
Commissioner Pearce

Commissioner LeMarinel stated his reason for going against staff recommendations as the Commission had previously approved two openings that are similar to this request. Also, the proposed alterations reduce the amount of interruption to the existing historic features.

Ms. Dannenfelser asked if the motion is to include the staff conditions as noted in the staff report.

Chair Roberts and Commissioner LeMarinel both stated yes.

Commissioner Laster noted that the ramps behind the retaining wall shouldn't be noticeable from the street.

Chair Roberts agreed with Commissioner Laster.

Mr. Collier noted a photo in the application documents that provides a view from the street.

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

Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed

11. Consideration Of Alterations (Canopy And Fence Barrier) At 230 Franklin Rd. (Bldg 3); Scott Wenz, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the proposed application includes the installation of a canopy and fence barrier to building three on the Factory Campus. The canopy will be partly behind building one (Mafiaoza's) but can be seen on Franklin Road. The project materials will consist of steel posts, reclaimed brick, black metal railings, and roofing materials that will be consistent with what has been approved previously at The Factory Campus. The project materials are consistent within the Guidelines that state that design details or ornamentation elements should be compatible with the historic building and the district. No alterations to the existing windows to create a doorway are included in the scope of this proposal. The Guidelines recommend avoiding adding canopies to historic buildings where they did not exist historically. Where deemed appropriate on rear or secondary facades with minimal visibility from the street, size and place new canopies in locations that respect the design of the building and do not obscure architectural features or detailing. Canopies should be proportional with and complimentary to nearby buildings and canopies.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends denial of this application based on the following grounds:
1. The Guidelines recommend avoid adding canopies to historic buildings where they did not exist historically. Where deemed appropriate on rear or secondary facades with minimal visibility from the street, size and place new canopies in locations that respect the design of the building and do not obscure architectural features or detailing. Canopies should be proportional with and complimentary to nearby buildings and canopies.
If the HZC decides to approve the COA, the following conditions are recommended:
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: Scott Wenz & Greg Gamble. Mr. Wenz stated that looking at the photographs submitted you can see there the trees showcased and how little the courtyard is addressed. The plan promotes a very minimalistic approach. The proposed materials include a brick veneer on the columns, corrugated metal roof, and a minimalistic approach to the railing.

Mr. Gamble stated that he is the landscape architect for Holladay Properties. Mr. Gamble explained that the context of the restaurants courtyards is meant to activate the outside of the Factory as well as the inside. Mr. Gamble handed out the approved site plan, landscape plan to the Commissioners and Staff that may help with understanding the overall context of the site. When Edley's first began discussion of the canopies, the site plan was still in the design phase for this space. Referring to the photos submitted with the application, Mr. Gamble stated that the deck is no longer part of the project and instead they are introducing magnolia and arborvitae river birch trees. Beside the existing cypress trees are proposed 8-10 feet Red Bud trees along with two varieties of hydrangeas and hollies to create more of an evergreen experience in this space. Also proposed are cinnamon ferns and hostas for the shadier environment. The cypress trees will stay green and screen the majority of the canopy from view. The outdoor patio is meant to be a pleasant outdoor experience that offers some seclusion and refuge. Mr. Gamble stated that the canopy addition is complementary to the uniqueness of the Factory and believes that Edley's BBQ is the perfect way to activate the outdoor space.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item.

Citizen Comment: James Blair (Nashville). Mr. Blair is in support of the changes to the Factory by Holladay properties and Mr. Gamble. One concern is the addition of a permanent structure of a canopy in such a prominent location. Mr. Blair explained that he would like to see as much of the original Factory façade maintained as possible.

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

MOTION
#1: Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Marquardt

Commissioner Harrison explained that the area is a new and evolving district, and the proposed canopy is mostly screened from Franklin Road with outdoor dining becoming more popular it will attract more people to the Factory.

Commissioner Besser stated that she cannot support approval of the canopy.

Commissioner Worthington stated concerns about more requests for canopies from other tenants if this canopy is approved. The plan of the Factory or the intent of the campus didn't include canopies all around the outside of the buildings. Other concerns include the size of the canopy, how the canopy will drain water and general safety of the patrons during rain. Ms. Worthington stated that she could not support the proposal at this time as she would like to understand the bigger picture first.

Commissioner Pearce agreed with Ms. Worthington's points.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he could not support the proposal because of the prominent location of the proposed canopy.
Vote: 2-6 (With Besser, Laster, LeMarinel, Roberts, Pearce, and Worthington voting no)
Motion failed.

Mr. Gamble stated that he would welcome a deferral to the August HZC meeting, if the Commissioners agreed it was a good idea.

#2: Motion to Defer the item to the August HZC meeting.
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner LeMarinel
Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed

12. Consideration of Alterations (Canopy And Signage) At 230 Franklin Rd. (Bldg. 14); James Carroll, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The application includes the proposal to install a canopy in the existing location of a non-historic canopy that previously received approval to remove in April 2023 and two signs.
Small Projecting Sign:
The proposal includes the installation of a small projecting sign that will measure 34.5" x 27.5" which equates to 6.59 sq. ft. Per the Zoning Ordinance, and what was approved within the recommendation request on July 2022 is that small hanging/projecting signs are small signs that either hang from beams, brackets, or poles or that project from poles or brackets from a building. They are limited to a maximum of one per building main entrance, in addition to other building signage, and may measure up to 4.5 sq. ft. in size. The size of the sign proposed exceeds what was approved. A larger sign

cannot be approved without a revision to the development plan/MOS or variance. The background of the sign is proposed to be bright red and white lettering. The Guidelines a
maximum of 3 colors, and with a darker background color than the lettering color. One should use muted colors that complement the facade, although vibrant colors may be considered as an accent. The proposed sign does not meet the Guidelines due to the accent color covering the background of the sign.
The small projecting sign is proposed to utilize slim white LED illumination. The Guidelines recommend using only external illumination and downlights, no spotlights. Fixtures such as gooseneck fixtures, in a dark bronze or black color or a color that matches the facade color and
warm-colored lighting are appropriate for this type of signage. Additionally, neon should be avoided, as sign materials that are compatible with the facade and the district should be utilized. The proposed sign lighting does not meet the Guidelines.
Canopy & Canopy Sign:
The proposal includes the installation of a canopy that measures 13'-5" in length and 5' in width. The
proposed canopy will replace the existing non-historic canopy that was previously approved in April 2023 to be removed. The canopy will consist of metal and will be attached to the building by hanging rods. The Guidelines recommend avoiding adding canopies to historic buildings where they did not exist historically. Where deemed appropriate on rear or secondary facades with minimal visibility from the street, size and place new canopies in locations that respect the design of the building and do not obscure architectural features or detailing. Canopies should be proportional with and complimentary to nearby buildings and canopies. New canopies should be simply designed to match historic equivalents and paint them muted colors that are complementary to the building and surrounding historic district. The proposed location faces Old Liberty Pike and will be seen from street view. The proposed sign on the canopy will measure 29" in height by 97" in width, which equates to 19.53 sq. ft. The application shows that the sign would measure 14.4 sq. ft. The Guidelines recommend that canopy signs measure a maximum of 90 percent of the canopy face or 120 square feet, whichever is smaller. Based on the proposed signage in relation to the canopy, the canopy will measure 161" (13'5") and the proposed signage will measure 97" (8'-1"). 90% of 161" equates to 144.9, which exceeds the Guideline and should be reduced. The Guidelines recommend that canopy signs shall not project above or below the canopy or be located above the building roofline. The MOS for The Factory Campus, approved in July 2022, allows for the sign to be installed above the canopy. The proposed sign will utilize a red background and red LED tetra contour lighting. A line of LED contour lighting is also proposed on the canopy The Guidelines recommend a maximum of 3 colors,
and with a darker background color than the lettering color on canopy signs. One should use muted colors that complement the facade, although vibrant colors may be considered as an accent. Additionally, the Guidelines recommend using only external illumination and downlights, no spotlights. Fixtures such as gooseneck fixtures, in a dark bronze or black color or a color that matches the facade color and warm-colored lighting are appropriate for this type of signage. Additionally, neon should be avoided, as sign materials that are compatible with the facade and the district should be utilized.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends denial of this application based on the following grounds:

1. The size of the small projecting may measure up to 4.5 square feet, per the Guidelines. A larger sign cannot be approved without a revision to the development plan/MOS or variance.
2. The Guidelines recommend that the background colors of the small projecting sign and canopy signs should use muted colors that complement the facade. Vibrant accent colors should be used as an accent.
3. The Guidelines recommend the use of external illumination on the small projecting sign and the canopy signs. The use of concealed lighting to mimic neon lighting is not recommended in the Guidelines.
4. The Guidelines recommend avoiding adding canopies to historic buildings where they did not exist historically.
5. The Guidelines recommend that canopy signs measure a maximum of 90 percent of the canopy face or 120 square feet, whichever is smaller. Based on the proposed signage in relation to the canopy, the canopy will measure 161" (13'5") and the proposed signage will measure 97" (8'-1"). 90% of 161" equates to 144.9, which exceeds the Guideline and should be reduced.

If the HZC decides to approve the COA, the following conditions are recommended:

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: James Carroll. Mr. Carroll stated that the size of the original blade sign proposed measured 4 and ½ feet but due to the scale of the building he is requesting that the sign be larger. They began to explore the enlarging the same sign

to 6 and ½ feet keeping the same shape. The colors are in keeping with the Hatti B logo. Mr. Carroll explained that the signage guidelines provided by Holladay Properties do call for a display sign and a canopy sign over the main entrance. The existing canopy was not historic and not feasible to host a canopy sign which led to exploration of the requested canopy sign. The sign canopy is a simple minimal rectangle that covers the entrance and will allow some protection from the weather as well as host the signage. Mr. Carroll noted that the neon red line in the script is a strong part of Hatti B's logo. The simple canopy form would be made out of black metal that ties in with the rest of the Factory standards.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners for a motion.

Chair Roberts asked Ms. Dannenfelser to give a quick summary of the modification of standards that was completed over a matter of months for more than 80 signs throughout the Factory.

Ms. Dannenfelser explained that a very thorough review of a master sign plan was completed for size, location, and placement knowing that each individual tenant/signs would need approval from the Commission. There are a couple of items that cannot be approved by the HZC because they also exceed the zoning ordinance maximums or standards. One of the items relates to the size of the sign and the other is the type of illumination of the signs. The zoning ordinance also limits lighting to external illumination only for canopy signs and small projecting signs.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the HZC does not have the authority to approve something that exceeds what the zoning ordinance requires. The signs proposed do not seem to meet any of the sign guidelines set forth for the Factory. Mr. LeMarinel stated that it would be great to see options that address what the HZC approved for signage. The best option may be to defer this item to the next voting meeting to give the applicant time to explore other options.

Commissioner Pearce stated that it appears that Hatti B's has other color options to choose from.

MOTION
Motion to Defer the item to the August HZC meeting.
Commissioner Pearce
Commissioner LeMarinel

Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote on the motion to defer the item to the August HZC meeting.

Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed

13. Consideration Of Addition (Principal, Accessory) At 345 4th Avenue South; Kevin Coffey, Applicant.

Sponsors: Joseph Bryan

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that she lives a few doors down from the applicant at 345 4th Avenue South and will step away from the discussion and voting.

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the applicant has submitted an application for a proposed rear addition to the principal structure for the residence located at 345 4th Avenue South, as well as an addition to the existing detached garage located to the left of the historic dwelling. The home is a gable-and-wing frame house with a two-thirds front porch and Italianate style bracketing along the eave line. The historic home dates to ca. 1900. Chapter 2 of the Design Guidelines provides recommendations for additions to historic residential buildings. The Guidelines recommend that additions to historic residential buildings be located to the rear of the building and that they be subordinate in appearance to the historic building through size, massing, scale, height, and materials. The rear addition is a long, linear design that utilizes insets, offsets, and roof breaks to differentiate it from the historic main form of the dwelling. The proposed materials would be brick for the foundation and base as well as composite or woof lap siding with an exposure to match that of the historic home. The applicant has also indicated the use of one-over-one or 2-over two double-hung windows. Overall, the design, placement, materials, and fenestration of the proposed addition are in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines. Different

exterior materials and a lap exposure that is different from the main form of the home would further differentiate the addition to the historic dwelling. In terms of size of the addition, the applicant has indicated that the historic footprint measures 2,258 square feet. The proposed addition, measuring 1,220 square feet, would be 55% of the historic footprint. The Guidelines recommend that, "The building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint of the historic portions of the building (portions to remain that are at least 50 years of age)." While the footprint does exceed the recommended limit by 5%, the placement of the addition entirely to the rear of the historic main form does limit visibility from public view. The application also includes a proposed addition to the existing non-historic detached garage to be located behind the structure connected with a hyphen. A new side-facing garage is at the rear of the addition. Overall, the design, placement, materials, and fenestration of the proposed addition are in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines. The Guidelines do not give specific recommendations about size of additions to accessory structures. They do recommend that the total building footprint of all structures not exceed 35% lot coverage. The total lot coverage including proposed additions is 20.6%.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval with the following:
1. Additional materials or a differing lap exposure be incorporated into the principal addition design.
2. Window specs be provided to Planning Staff for review and approval.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to 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: Kevin Coffey. Mr. Coffey clarified that the 1220 square foot addition is 54% of the historical footprint. The total accessory square footage is 1622, which is 47% of the house structure once completed with the additions. Mr. Coffey highlighted the changes to the plan based on comments from the DRC meeting. The footprint of the accessory building has been reduced along with the screened porch being removed from the plan. There are two distinct areas that are step downs into the additions that were not marked clearly on the application documents (stepdown to family area and stepdown to the bedroom wing). Mr. Coffey noted that the Sanborn (1913) map shows that there were four separate accessory structures plus the main house. Mr. Coffey clarified where the original house was and where the additions will be. One accessory structure will extend 5 feet further than one of the previous accessory structures on the lot. Mr. Coffey stated that he is open to staff comments and suggestions about the siding.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners for a motion.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with staff Conditions 2-4
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Marquardt

Commissioner Laster stated that the lap siding exposure should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings.
He commended the applicant for the work to reduce the overall square footage percentage down to 54 % from 69 %.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioner to vote on the item.
Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed

14. Consideration Of Alterations (Windows, Skylight) At 800 Fair Street; Amanda McCreary, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Joseph Bryan

Project Leader: Kelly Dannenfelser. Ms. Dannenfelser stated that this was Mr. Bryan's item, but he had to leave unexpectedly. The applicant has submitted an application for several alterations and an addition to the home located at 800 Fair Street. The scope of work includes removal of a door entry from the non-historic addition, installation of a new rear window, and the installation of three skylights, two to the main form of the home and one to the 80s-era addition. The

skylights were previously discussed at the May 8th Historic Zoning Commission meeting. The entry that is requested for removal is located on the left side elevation of the non-historic addition, so its removal can be supported. The applicant is requesting to add a new window opening with a one-over-one lite pattern on the rear elevation of the historic home. The Guidelines recommend to avoid adding new windows to the front facade or readily visible facades. Given the location of the new window opening being entirely out of public view, the request for the new opening can be supported. The one-over-one pattern matches the established pattern on the historic structure. Window materials have not been provided. The applicant is proposing the addition of three skylights. The application specifies a flat, tunnel-style skylight that appears flush with the roofline. The Guidelines recommend that historic roof forms should be preserved and that skylights should be positioned so they are not visible from the street. The two skylights on the right side of the home are sufficiently placed to the rear of the home or obscured from view from the street. The skylight on the left side is positioned in front of the existing chimney, so it may be more visible.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the following:

1. The applicant must submit window specs to Planning Staff prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The applicant must remove the left side skylight from the proposal, or to relocate to a location that better meets the intent of the Guidelines.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to issuance of a demolition 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: Amanda McCreary. Ms. McCreary stated that they would like to remove the door in the 1980's portion of the house allowing for more floor space and would like to add a wide wood window where the new bathroom area will be. After a discussion with the client about the skylights, Ms. McCreary is requesting the flat sun tunnel version because it's the least visually intrusive option. The measurements are 14" in diameter with 41% visible light transmission. They arrive from the factory tinted at 61% which means from a distance it will appear dark. Ms. McCreary noted that she is ok will all the staff comments including removal of the skylight on the left side of the chimney.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners for a motion.

MOTION
Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Pearce
Commissioner Worthington

Commissioner Besser thanked Ms. McCreary for her research on the sky lights.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioner to vote on the item.
Vote: 8-0
Motion Passed

15. Consideration Of Alterations (Roof) At 324 3rd Avenue South; Scott Nicodemus, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Joseph Bryan

Project Leader: Kelly Dannenfelser. Ms. Dannenfelser stated that the subject property at 324 3rd Avenue South received a Certificate of Appropriateness in April 2022 for a series of alterations and demolition in regards to constructing a new rear addition to the historic dwelling. No alterations to the historic roofline were approved under that COA. On June 1, 2023, members of City Staff were notified that the roof structure on the main form of home had been completely removed without a permit. The scope of this kind of roof work requires a building permit from Building & Neighborhood Services, and because it is in the historic preservation overlay, a COA is required prior to issuance of a building permit. A stop work order was placed on the property immediately. The applicant has submitted an application to reconstruct the roof. The applicant has supplied photos showing the structure's current condition. For alteration to roofs on historic residential buildings, the City of Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines recommend to "Preserve historic roof forms and materials. Roofing sections on

main and other visible facades should remain unaltered," and that "If localized damage occurs, replace the damaged materials only. If partial or wholesale replacement is needed, use materials whose composition and appearance match the historic materials." The applicant has provided a letter from an engineer describing the condition of the original roof; however, this was not part of the original application submittal. Once issues with the roof had been discovered, the applicant should have returned to the Historic Zoning Commission with a modified application addressing the roof concerns. An alternate plan may have been established that would have preserved as much of the roof as possible rather than its entire removal. Entire roof replacement on historic structures is not recommended, however, given the circumstances and the current state of the dwelling, in this instance the application can be supported. The roof must be reconstructed to match what was there previously using materials that match the original.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval with the following:
1. The roof must be reconstructed to match what was there previously using materials that match the original.
2. Any additional damage to windows or exterior walls outside of what was approved with the April 2022 COA must be repaired.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to 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 Speakers: Scott Nicodemus (Contractor), Brandon Hutchenson (Owner), Jim Myatt (Architect)
Mr. Hutchenson expressed his apology and surprise when he realized the roof was removed. The intent was not to change the dimensions, angles, gables, or anything about the roof. Mr. Hutchenson stated that he hopes that there is a way to move forward. Moving forward, Mr. Hutchenson stated that he would do whatever was necessary to work with staff and to work within the guidelines.

Mr. Nicodemus explained that he takes full responsibility for the misunderstanding between himself and the subcontractors, resulting in the removal of the roof. The removal of the roof was a mistake and Mr. Nicodemus deeply apologized. The roof will go back on the house exactly as it was including the same dimensions, pitch, and gables. Mr. Nicodemus noted that the windows were not damaged and are intact.

Chair Roberts asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment on this item, there being none, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners for a motion.

MOTION
#1: Motion for Approval with Conditions
Commissioner Marquardt
Commissioner Besser

Chair Roberts stated that once the roof is replaced with the same angles, dimensions and pitch, and Mr. Tosh with Building and Neighborhood Services has inspected and approved the new roof, the applicant can come back to HZC with approval of the inspection (before any other work is done). Chair Roberts further stated that there isn't room for any more mistakes on the alteration of this house and no other work should be completed on the site before the rebuilding of the roof takes place.

Mr. Tosh stated that once the Commission issues a COA, the contractor will be required to submit revised plans to show how the roof structure is going to be built. The process may involve putting in walls below for weight-bearing purposes.

Commissioner Worthington asked if a new permit would be necessary.

Mr. Tosh stated that the revision will fall under the same permit number as the revision to that submittal.

Commissioner Pearce asked how quickly this can be completed.

Mr. Tosh explained that if Mr. Nicodemus has his drawings ready, he would be eligible for an inspection next Wednesday.

Mr. Hutchenson stated that the roof plans were in the submittal documents.

Chair Roberts stated that the main point is that no other work can be completed on the house until the roof is completed, inspected, and approved.

Commissioner Pearce stated that there will have to be additional work on the house because there isn't anything left inside of the house. Weight-bearing walls will be needed so other work will have to be completed.

Commissioner Laster stated that the plans have an April date which would be the original submittal documents. The documents say the roof pitch was 7:12 but there is a note that says the existing roof should be raised 24." Now that the roof has been torn off, what will be the pitch on this part of the roof? Plans would need to be submitted for approval so that the roof can be replaced.

Mr. Hutchenson stated that the details were noted in the original submittal documents.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that there was a COA in June of last year that reflected no changes to the historic addition which sits behind the main portion of the house. So, the plan from April 2023 is showing the green area where there would be roof changes. (Mr. Hutchenson offered a document) This version shows the existing roof to remain.

Commissioner Laster circled back to his question about the "L" addition roof pitch. "What was the height of the roof on the "L" addition?"

Mr. Myatt stated that where the addition joins the main house the pitch is 3:12. Mr. Myatt stated that he did not have information on the height of the "addition" roof.

Commissioner Laster stated that the height of the addition must be known before it can be replaced. How do we proceed without this information?

Chair Roberts stated that the original documents from April 2022 should be consulted for this information.

Commissioner Laster explained what is needed is the original pitch and height of the ridge and how it relates to the roof that's parallel to the road.

Chair Roberts asked Ms. Dannenfelser if she could access the original submittal documents.

Commissioner Pearce noted that there were modern materials thrown into dumpsters along with old materials, documented in the engineering report.

Commissioner Laster also noted the vagueness of the engineering report about rot.

Commissioner Pearce stated all historic and older non-historic homes have some sort of rot.
Mr. Nicodemus explained that he did not have the original height of the roof where the addition meets the original house, at the meeting tonight, but all the other information needed for the Building & Neighborhood Services site visit.

Commissioner Laster suggested deferral of the application to the next voting meeting to allow the applicant time to locate the measurements needed.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that the ridgeline of the most historic portion of the house measures 18 feet 6 inches, which was located from a previous submittal. We were not able to locate on the fly, the height of the very front historic addition that was lower in height.

Commissioner Pearce stated that we are in an unprepared situation.

Chair Roberts asked if the original pitch and height of the roof in the front of the house can be located so that the home can be stabilized. The main point is to get the front of the house stabilized and go from there.

Mr. Hutchenson located measurements from the April 2022 application documents. What is shown is 1 foot and 1 ½ inches below the ridge where the lower "L" roof addition begins.

Commissioner Laster and LeMarinel noted that based on the drawings the difference is more than 1' and 1 ½."

Commissioner LeMarinel explained that the roof needs to be constructed to that of the original drawings whatever the numbers may be. Pg. A7 – April 2022

Multiple Commissioners commented that a decision is needed tonight to stabilize the structure.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he would expect to see a full set of drawings including elevations and benchmark bearings. The drawings provided by the applicant appear to be mixed and matched with new drawings.

Mr. Hutchenson suggested working with staff to provide the original drawings and measurements.

Chair Roberts stated that this was not a good idea because he didn't want to burden staff with the problems and issues with this project.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the applicant has access to the information needed by the Commission, but it hasn't been provided in the format the Commission requested.

Mr. Nicodemus stated that after the DRC meeting, he followed up with staff and he was told that everything submitted seemed to be enough to proceed with the meeting. If a full set of drawings were needed, Mr. Nicodemus explained that he was not aware of it.

Ms. Dannenfelser explained that what staff requested was plans that reflected the existing conditions of the house prior to the demolition of the roof.

Mr. Nicodemus stated that he thought that was what he provided for staff.

Commissioner LeMarinel explained that we need to know that the applicant knows what the varying heights of the roof are for each addition to the house. In other words, full details about how the roof will be reconstructed including dimensions on elevations.

Commissioner Laster stated that he understands the urgency to correct the situation with the roof, but it's important to get it right, this time. The structure can be stabilized with braces and is the responsibility of the applicant to do so.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she would like the applicant to be required to stabilize the structure.

Looking at a photo of the structure, Mr. Tosh recommended supporting the gable.

Mr. Dannenfelser noted that the photo was not accurate, and the gable was removed, at some point, after the photo was taken.

Mr. Nicodemus explained that he took the photos himself and did not know that the gable was removed or missing.

Commissioner Laster recommended deferral to the August 2023 meeting.

Commissioners Marquardt and Besser withdrew the motion to approve with conditions.

Commissioner Pearce strongly recommended more bracing to stabilize the building.

Chair Roberts recommended the applicants work closely with Mr. Tosh about stabilizing the structure.

#2: Motion to defer to the August HZC meeting.
Commissioner Laster
Commissioner Besser
Vote: 8-0

Overall Motion Passed

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business.

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

16. **Signage (Wall) At 126 3rd Ave. N.; Mike Alexander, Applicant.**
Sponsors:

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 08:13 PM p.m.

James T Robert
Chair

8/14/2023
Date