



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, December 11, 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, Josh Denton, Brian Laster, Tyler LeMarinel, Jim Roberts, Mary Pearce, Lisa Marquardt, Kathy Worthington, and Scott Harrison.

Staff Members Present: Kelly Dannenfelser, Planning & Sustainability; Emily Huffer, Planning & Sustainability; Elizabeth Bulay, Planning & Sustainability; Jared Carter, BNS; Blake Harper, Law Department

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.)

Chair Roberts asked for citizen comments. There were none.

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 October Minutes

Sponsors:

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearce to approve the October 9, 2023, meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel. The motion carried 7-0 (Commissioner Harrison abstained from vote).

Consideration Of Approval Of November Minutes

Sponsors:

A motion was made by Commissioner Laster to approve the November 13, 2023, meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt. The motion carried 8-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Emily Huffer. A Design Review team meeting will be held next Monday, December 18, 2023, at 4 pm. As of now, there have been two submittals for the meeting. Applicants have until 11:59 pm (tonight), Monday, December 11, 2023, to request a spot on the agenda.

Kelly Dannenfelser announced that Chair Jim Roberts will be rolling off as a member of the HZC commission after 10 years of service with five years serving as Chair. Chair Roberts' leadership, facilitation skills, and dedication to preservation will be greatly missed by the staff and Commission members. Ms. Dannenfelser presented Chair Roberts with artwork by a local artist as a thank you for his 10 years of service to the Historic Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Marquardt thanked Chair Roberts for his leadership and calmness during the storm. "The Commission is sorry to see you stepping down from the HZC as we've all learned so much from your leadership."

Chair Roberts explained that he is thankful to have lived in Franklin, TN for 46 years. It's been a great place to raise three boys and now eight grandchildren in a historic house on Adams Street, a home we continue to learn from. Franklin has changed a lot and has changed for the better, in part from the guidance from the HZC. Chair Roberts stated that he's been honored to have served with all the Commissioners current and past. Chair Roberts expressed his appreciation of the city staff that prepare and support the commission with their dedication and expertise, providing explanations of the more difficult applications while buffering the Commission from the applicants. "It's been a joy to work with the Commission and staff and thanks to all of you, so let's get on with it."

APPLICATIONS

2. Consideration Of Alterations (Front Facade, In-Kind Replacement) At 348 Main St.; Timothy Wenner, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. The application proposes to replace, in-kind, the elements of the front façade including the storefront cornice box, crown molding, and ornamental elements. The application proposes to build back two decorative diamond blocks that are currently missing from the cornice on the right side of the entrance. Additionally, an 18" cap on top of the crown is proposed to be replaced. Currently, this cap is made of plywood with a rubber membrane covering and is proposed to be replaced with Cypress wood. As proposed, the application meets the Historic Design Guidelines. Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Steve Miller. Mr. Miller stated that he would be glad to answer any questions about the application.

Chair Roberts asked for a motion from the Commission.

MOTION

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve alterations (Front Facade, In-Kind Replacement) at 348 Main St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. The motion carried 8-0.

3. Consideration Of Signage (Three Post-And-Arm Signs) At 249 Fourth Ave. N.; Mike Hathaway, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. The proposal seeks approval for three post-arm signs. The guidelines recommend that a residential building should have no more than three signs, with the intent of using a combination of different sign types for the building. While the proposal meets the guidelines for the overall number of signs, the guidelines recommend that only one post-arm sign be utilized per building and the proposal includes three post-arm signs. Staff recommend approval of one post-arm sign with conditions.

Applicant: Mike Hathaway. The building is around 160 feet-long and designed to look like three houses that were combined into one. Because of the length of the buildings and considering the three lots that would have been there, each having an individual sign, the applicant is requesting three signs. Mr. Hathaway requested that two post signs be allowed along Fourth Avenue, designed appropriately for the historic downtown. The signs would be separated from the frame and appropriately spaced so that the signs are not on top of each other. One sign is requested along North Margin. The goal is to allow enough signage for the tenants of the building.

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

MOTION

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to approve signage (Three Post-And-Arm Signs) at 249 Fourth Ave. N., seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Marquardt stated her rationale for going against staff recommendations is based on the explanation from the applicant about the equivalent spacing of the signs.

Commissioner Pearce asked Mr. Hathaway if he had considered designing the posts so that each is different, allowing for a more organic look.

Mr. Hathaway explained that he would be happy to design each post differently.

Amendment to the Motion

Commissioner Pearce amended the motion to include that each post sign be of a different design and should return to staff for approval, seconded by Commissioner Denton. The motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Laster asked staff what they might envision as a single sign. Would there be smaller tenant panels or what would be the recommendation? Also, would each tenant be allowed to have an exterior wall sign? Commissioner Laster asked for confirmation that the building has one entrance.

Ms. Huffer stated that there is another location, possibly on Fourth Avenue, that has a single post sign with multiple hanging panels each listing a tenant of the building. The sign design guidelines allow for a sign above an entrance, but considering the proposed application, there is only one entrance to the building, creating a unique situation. The directory hanging sign is appropriate for this building. For the rear of the property, the guidelines do allow for a different type of sign to lead the customer to a parking lot, if there is a parking lot.

Ms. Huffer stated that the building at 249 Fourth Avenue N. has a single entrance.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioner to vote on the overall motion, as amended. The motion carried as amended 7-1 (Commissioner Laster voting against).

4. Consideration Of Alterations At 230 Franklin Rd. (Building 11); Victor Lecoffre, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. This proposal has several components.

Storefront Replacement

The first alteration is the replacement of a storefront. The alterations include the use of a salvaged window and salvaged brick. Ms. Huffer referred to application photos to illustrate the changes proposed. The replacement of the non-historic window is not supported by the guidelines and more information is needed to understand if the opening was originally a door opening or a window opening.

Removal of the non-historic silver awnings.

The removal of the silver awnings is appropriate within the guidelines. The applicant intends to replace the awnings to match the other awning at the Factory and is appropriate according to the guidelines.

Patio Door Replacement

The application includes the replacement of the existing non-historic patio door with steel double doors. The opening will require widening and removal of historic windowpanes and brick. The existing windows are not strong enough to support the double steel doors, requiring stronger material to support the new entrance. The patio door replacement plan does not meet the intent of the guidelines.

Skylights

The application proposes installing three skylights. The guidelines recommend positioning them so that they are not visible from the street. Although some of the rooftop mechanical equipment is being removed, the installation of new rooftop elements will be visible from the street view and does not meet the guidelines.

Recommendations

Staff recommend denial of the storefront replacement, patio door replacement, and the installation of skylights. However, staff recommend approval of the removal of the non-historic awnings and the replacement of the awnings to match the existing red-brown awnings at the Factory, with staff conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Victor Lecoffre. Mr. Lecoffre stated that they are proposing a list of exterior improvements to Factory Building 11.

Storefront Replacement

The applicant proposed replacement of the clear anodized aluminum storefront with salvaged brick and a window above that. The salvaged brick and salvaged window system from the Factory property has been donated by the landlord. The replacement of the existing storefront with the salvaged brick and salvaged window creates symmetry on the left side of the front façade.

Replacement of the Silver Awning

Mr. Lecoffre explained that he is proposing replacement of the silver awning with something that is more consistent with the front façade fabricated in the same manner as the existing front awning.

Patio Door

The clear anodized aluminum steel frame, not consistent with what is seen at the Factory, is proposed to be replaced with a steel fabricated window and door system that would support the fragile windows and allow for installation of a double door. Modification of the opening area above the door would be required. Although this method is the nonpreferred option, the window/door system would be consistent with what existed previously.

Skylights

Three low profile skylights are proposed to be consistent with the skylight that already exists above the Sapphire Restaurant.

Chair Roberts asked if there were any citizens who would like to speak about the current item.

Citizen Comment: Andy Blair. Mr. Blair explained that he supports the storefront replacement option and was also able to

speak to the question about the storefront opening, about whether it was a door opening versus a window opening. Mr. Blair explained that in most historic renderings or photographs of the Factory from the 1930s, 40s, 50s and 60s, a window opening can be seen. The window would have had 36 panes, 18 over 18. Mr. Blair stated that he is in support of the window being replaced with a historic window that matches and is consistent with the front façade of the Factory.

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

MOTION

#1 Motion (Awning)

Commissioner Harrison motioned to approve the removal of the non-historic awnings and install new awnings with staff conditions for the property located at 230 Franklin Road, The Factory, building 11, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

There being no discussion, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners to vote. The motion carried 8-0.

#2 Motion (Storefront Replacement)

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the storefront window as proposed by the applicant for the property located at 230 Franklin Road, The Factory, building 11, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Laster referred to a photograph from 1961 of the front façade of the Factory that shows a very similar window in the same location that the applicant is proposing.

Commissioner Pearce agreed with Commissioner Laster and added that the replacement would add to the historic fabric of the front of the building.

Commissioner Denton also agreed with Commissioners Laster and Pearce and further added that the photographic evidence supports the proposed replacement of the storefront.

The motion carried 8-0.

#3 Motion (Patio Door Replacement)

Commissioner Harrison asked why the applicant is proposing a replacement with double doors.

Mr. Lecoffre explained that the door would be the only access from the restaurant to the patio area, as the patio area can seat up to 70 guests. It would be challenging to provide service through a single door opening.

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve the patio door replacement as proposed for the property located at 230 Franklin Road, The Factory, building 11, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the proposal is consistent with other similar requests throughout the Factory buildings. The community is excited to have activities and restaurants open at the Factory and, from a practical standpoint, a double door opening is necessary and makes sense.

Commissioner Laster expressed his concerns about what would happen to the windows above the opening once the opening is made larger. In the past, when the openings were made larger, most of the windows required replacement, destroying the historic character of the windows. "I would feel more comfortable erring on the side of caution by replacing the single aluminum door with a single steel door and not risking damage to the historic windows."

Commissioner Denton also expressed his concerns about potential damage to the historic windows when the opening is enlarged. The windows above the opening are at risk of being compromised.

Chair Roberts noted that Mr. Lecoffre said, "this is not the preferred method to install the double doors."

Mr. Lecoffre explained that the windows are at the same risk for a single door replacement as they are for a double door replacement. If the existing window system isn't strong enough, modifications may be necessary either way. The existing door frame has been installed incorrectly, increasing the potential for window damage.

Commissioner Besser stated that she cannot support the motion and recommended proceeding slowly with the least intrusive method to maintain the historic windows. The applicant can always return to the HZC and explain that the process isn't working.

The motion failed 3-5 (Commissioners Besser, Denton, Laster, Pearce, and Marquardt voting against).

Commissioner Marquardt echoed Commissioner Besser's point about taking one step at a time, slowly.

Mr. Lecoffre agreed that serving 70 people through a single door would be very challenging and potentially, technically impossible. The window system may not be strong enough to support replacement of a single door or a double door.

Chair Roberts explained that the concern is the window support system above the double doors.

Commissioner Denton suggested additional analysis of the window section above the opening and the likelihood that the windows could sustain enlargement of the opening.

Chair Roberts. The applicant will have the opportunity to come before the Design Review meeting on Monday if additional information/analysis can be provided between now and then.

Mr. Lecoffre explained that he was unsure if he would have enough time to evaluate and provide new information in such a short time.

Commissioner Laster suggested finding someone who could engineer a way to structurally support the window above the opening so that a double door could be used.

Chair Roberts and Commissioner Pearce both agreed that several door openings, throughout the Factory, have required additional support systems and specific modifications to install functional doors. Holliday Properties would be the group to contact for this information.

#4 Motion (Patio Door Replacement)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to defer the patio door replacement to the January HZC meeting for the property located at 230 Franklin Road, The Factory, building 11, seconded by Commissioner Denton. The motion carried 8-0.

#5 Motion (Skylights)

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the skylights as proposed for the property located at 230 Franklin Road, The Factory, building 11, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Laster explained that because the Factory is a commercial building and in the early 1920s when one walked into a building such as the Factory, there would be a lot of natural light. The natural light mimics the natural light provided by skylights and is appropriate for this commercial environment.

Chair Roberts added that the visibility of the skylights would be limited from Franklin Road and Liberty Pike. The guidelines in relationship to the Factory need to be and have been flexible when considering proposed changes and modifications by applicants.

The motion carried 7-1 (Commissioner Besser voting against).

5. **Consideration Of An Addition (Principal) And Accessory Structure Relocation At 328 Franklin Rd.; Matt Christensen, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer.

Accessory Structure Relocation

The application proposes to rotate the structure 90 degrees, so that the garage door is no longer facing the rear of the

principal building and will face the side of the lot. As proposed, the relocation of the existing accessory structure is not supported within the guidelines.

Principal Building Alterations

Awning - The application includes the proposal to install a duck canvas awning over the front door and is appropriate following the design guidelines.

Screened Door Installation - The application includes the proposal to install a door within the screened-in patio on the front facade. The door will fit into the existing screened panels and will match the pattern. The proposed screen door installation is appropriate within the design guidelines.

Front Door Trim Restoration - The application also includes restoration of the trim work around the front door and is appropriate within the Guidelines.

Principal Building Addition

The proposal includes an addition at the rear of the principal building that will include an addition that will connect the existing accessory structure (after it is relocated). Once the principal building is connected to the accessory structure, then the footprint of the accessory structure becomes part of the existing principal building. With the historic accessory structure becoming part of the principal building by an addition, the addition equates to 55.52% of the historic building's footprint (including the garage). As proposed, the proposal does not meet the intent of the Guidelines. The Guidelines address that the dormer roof pitch should be at least 3:12 and no less than half the main roof pitch. The proposed dormer roof pitch is 1:12, which does not meet the Guidelines. The proposed materials meet the intent of the Guidelines, except for the use of a rubber membrane roof on the rear shed dormer. On the rear of the new addition, four skylights are proposed. The Guidelines recommend positioning skylights, so they are not visible from the street. The proposed skylights are appropriate within the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval of the awning, new screen door, and the restoration of the trim work around the door on the principal building with conditions. Additionally, staff recommends denial of the proposal to move the historic accessory structure and the addition to the principal building.

Applicant Speaker: Kara Christensen. Ms. Christensen noted that the reason for the request for the garage to be rotated and attached to the home is the homeowner bought the large property that ended up being three lots. Because of the configuration and the confusion about whether the property was one large lot or three smaller lots, it's been very difficult to meet both the zoning requirements and historical zoning requirements. The city viewed the property as one large lot with a 35-foot setback, but the house is on a 14-foot setback and has not complied from the beginning. The solution to the issue was to move or rotate the garage to a position so that it cannot be seen from the road. After the last design review meeting, per the recommendation of staff, the pitch of the roof was changed to comply with guidelines, making it possible to use a metal roof instead of the rubber membrane.

There being no citizen comments on the item, Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners for a motion.

MOTION

#1 Motion (Principal Building Alterations)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve the alterations to the principal building at 328 Franklin Road with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Denton. The motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Laster asked for confirmation that the garage is to be relocated/rotated so that the garage becomes part of the footprint of the original structure and that the addition is based on 50% comes from the combination of the garage and principal building.

Emily Huffer. Commissioner Laster's summary is correct because the garage is connected by an additional breezeway and becomes part of the principal building footprint.

Kelly Dannenfels. From a zoning perspective, the garage becomes part of the principal structure. The intent of the guideline is to make sure that the addition reads as subordinate to the main structure, which is the house. It isn't typical that a garage, connected by an addition, be included in the percentages for an addition to the overall house.

Commissioner Denton asked Ms. Dannenfelser, if everything is approved, could the property owner come before the Commission with an application for an accessory structure in the future? Also, what was the situation regarding the setback and the consolidation of lots?

Ms. Dannenfelser answered, "yes the owner could submit an application for an accessory structure in the future." Regarding setbacks and lot consolidation, there was a preexisting condition in which the garage was built incorrectly before the current zoning ordinance came into effect. The property owner was granted a variance to allow for the lot to have minimum reduced setbacks.

Commissioner Pearce stated that because the lot is so large, the overage on the percentage of the principal building footprint is not a problem. It would be better to state the correct overages, rather than to say that the garage, once relocated, is part of the historic footprint.

#2 Motion (Accessory Structure Relocation)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve the accessory structure relocation as proposed for the property located at 328 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Harrison asked for clarification from staff regarding inclusion of the garage that isn't heated or cooled as part of the main structure. It was understood that a garage would not be considered part of the main structure because it isn't heated or cooled.

Ms. Dannenfelser explained that those comments really refer to how the garage is attached. So, if the garage is attached by a breezeway that's open, it's not heated and cooled, and it's attached, and it's still considered an accessory structure but attached by a breezeway. When the area becomes enclosed space with the garage, then it becomes part of the principal structure, even though it's not heated or cooled.

Commissioner Pearce reiterated that she would like the motion to be approved without saying, "the garage expands the historic footprint."

Commissioner Denton added that acknowledgment of the real overage along with the large lot, creates a unique situation where exceptions to the guidelines need to be considered. There have been several situations in the past, where the Commission has approved additions to principal buildings (typically on large lots) where the addition square footage is over 50% ratio.

Commissioner Laster added that as far as relocation, 99% of the time he would stand with the guidelines that recommend not to relocate as restructures. In this situation, a 1970s ranch style home sitting on a large lot with alterations at the rear of the home allow for modifications of the guidelines. The historic form mirrors somewhat of the front facing gable on the front of the home almost like an accessory structure to the side and it's still being used as a garage.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the reason she is going against staff recommendations is because of the unique lot size and situation of a small house on three acres of land. Approval of the relocation would not hurt the integrity of the house or the integrity viewshed from Franklin Road.

Commissioner Besser stated that she cannot support the motion.

There being no further discussion, Chair Robert asked the commissioners to vote on the Accessory Structure Relocation.

The motion carried 7-1 (Commissioner Besser voting against).

Chair Roberts stated that the square footage of the principal building is 2541 square feet, and the addition is 1411 square feet.

Commissioner Denton asked staff if it would be appropriate, when considering the addition, to look at the original structure since the accessory structure is not yet connected.

Ms. Dannenfelser explained that the addition is 78.5% of the principal building which is the way that it should read when

considering the intent of the guidelines, because you're looking at the percentage of an addition compared to the historic original footprint.

Commissioner Denton stated that the answer perfectly addresses Commissioner Pearce's concern about the garage being considered as part of the historic fabric. The Commission is approving 78% of the historic footprint and not a falsely created number that includes the garage square footage as part of the historic footprint.

#3 Motion (Principal building addition)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve the addition to the principal building at 328 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Pearce stated that because of the large lot and the unique situation and that the home's front facing view toward Franklin Road is being protected is the reason for the motion to approve. There are only a handful of situations such as this property in the historical overlay.

Commissioner Besser stated that she cannot support the motion.

Commissioner Laster pointed out that the actual percentage may be higher than 78%.

Ms. Dannenfelser explained that the commission may not have seen a proposal like this one in the past. You are looking at a small original home on a very large lot and whatever number chosen to use will be a higher percentage of the historic footprint than is typically seen. The percentages are a guideline so it's really about the intent of the guidelines.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted a few architectural observations about the 70s-style homes. These homes can be very challenging because they have low, slung roofs, making it hard to hide anything behind the home. The Commission may begin to see more of these vintage homes as they roll into a historic status. Smaller homes on larger lots that need additions to accommodate families may become more common as people purchase small homes on large lots. The plans proposed are reasonable, and the applicant has done a really good job keeping the historic silhouette intact.

The motion carried 7-1, (Commissioner Besser voting against).

#4 Motion (Metal Roofing Material)

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve the use of metal roofing material on the rear dormer with all staff conditions for the property located at 328 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Amendment to Motion #4:

Commissioner Pearce amended the motion to include the metal roof must be a bronze or a slate gray to blend in with the roof for the property located at 328 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

The motion as amended carried 8-0.

Ms. Dannenfelser noted that staff's preference would be a general color (dark tone or galvanized tin color).

#5 Motion (Awning design and Color)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to include that the awning design and color come back to staff for approval for the property located at 328 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

The motion carried 8-0.

6. Consideration Of New Construction At 1841 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 5); Matt Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. The proposal includes the construction of a two-story cross-gabled residence with Queen Anne architectural-styled features. The height of the proposed building has been reduced since the last HZC meeting and is

now subordinate to Magnolia Hall and staff recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway. Mr. Hathaway thanked staff for their hard work in getting the home designs where they are today. Every modification has created an even more beautiful home that is respectful of the main Magnolia Hall structure. Relative to the height discussions of Magnolia Hall, it was decided that it would be important to measure and confirm the height of Magnolia Hall. The original height was 33 feet, but the height was actually 34 feet 9 inches. Mr. Hathaway referred to the application renderings to show the height comparison of 1814 William Campbell Ct. to Magnolia Hall. Regarding the mass of the face, not the roof, Mr. Hathaway believes all the modifications to the elevations have decreased the mass. To address the comments about the need for a simpler design, several of the turrets were removed. Mr. Hathaway stated that he agrees with staff comments and recommendations for approval and would appreciate a vote of approval.

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

MOTION

Commissioner Harrison motioned to approve new construction for the property located at 1814 William Campbell Court with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Pearce requested that the applicant use a different material on the left rear elevation along the side near the garage because of the length of the side. A painted brick could help break up the length of the side.

Mr. Smith recommended using a secondary material because the specific location is considered secondary and in terms of weight and mass, a lighter or lesser material would be more appropriate. For this house, one could consider keeping the material as is but with a different style or pattern.

Commissioner Laster asked if an inset would accomplish the same goal by creating a break in the wall expanse rather than a change in material. Also, how noticeable is the area as the homes sit side by side and would anyone ever notice the area.

Mr. Hathaway stated that one would have to stand in between the houses and look down at the gap to see the area Commissioner Pearce is questioning.

Commissioner Besser stated that this request is putting undue pressure on the applicant when it's not necessary. Typically, one would see the use of stone, brick, and then wood.

Commissioner LeMarinel agreed with Commissioner Besser. There's a large section of blankness and it's a lot of wall space. The area is all the way at the back of the house, and, in Commissioner LeMarinel's opinion, he said that the space could be left alone.

Commissioner Pearce amended the motion to change the treatment of the left elevation at the rear of the building by the garage for the property located at 1814 William Campbell Court, seconded by Commissioner Denton.

The amendment failed 2-6, (With Commissioners Besser, Laster, LeMarinel, Roberts, Marquardt, and Harrison voting against).

Commissioner Pearce noted that the area in question, of all the homes, is the only elevation that has such an expanse of wall mass.

Ms. Lombard mentioned placement of a window in a closet along the left elevation to break up the long section of wall.

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

The motion carried 8-0.

7. **Consideration Of New Construction At 1843 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 6); Matt Smith, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The proposal includes the construction of a two-story cross-gabled house with Craftsman architectural-styled features. The height of the proposed building has been decreased since the last HZC meeting and is now subordinate to Magnolia Hall and staff recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway. Mr. Hathaway stated that the team agrees with staff conditions except for two. The brackets have been reduced, and the team feels like the scale and proportion of those are now more appropriate. We would like to ask that condition number two be removed. Condition number three addresses the single gable. The team is concerned that if there isn't some element creating interest, such as the dormer, the overall feel of the design will be affected. If the Board feels strongly about this condition, the team is open to discussion because we would like to proceed and continue moving forward in the process.

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

MOTION

Commissioner Harrison motioned to approve new construction for the property located at 1843 William Campbell Court with staff conditions, excluding conditions 2 and 3, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Harrison explained that he agrees with the applicant that the small dormer will assist in keeping the architectural features in place while helping to break up the flow of on that side of the house. The brackets have also been minimized in size to accommodate staff comments.

Commissioner Pearce noted that comparing the proposed home at 1843 William Campbell Court to the historic inspirations provided, Ms. Pearce would be in favor of removing the dormer on the front elevation.

#1 Amendment to Motion:

Commissioner Pearce amended the motion to include staff condition #3, to remove the small dormer on the front elevation, for the property located at 1843 William Campbell Court, seconded by Commissioner Besser.

Commissioner Pearce noted that many of the new subdivisions have dormers and feels that Magnolia Hall should not read as a new subdivision.

The motion to amend carried 7-1 (Commissioner Harrison voting against)

#2 Amendment to motion:

Commissioner Besser amended the motion to minimize the brackets on the front elevation, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Besser explained that she feels like the brackets are dominating the front façade.

Commissioner Laster stated that he reviewed the discussion about the brackets from the November DRC meeting. Since then, the brackets have been reduced twice and suggested the Board provide guidance to the applicant about how small the brackets should be.

Mr. Smith explained that the brackets hold up an extended overhang (four feet) on the front façade. The brackets serve a unique and structural purpose, and the visual expression of the brackets serve as a support for the overhang.

Commissioner Besser withdrew her amendment to reduce the brackets on the front elevation because the applicant's explanation was reasonable.

The motion as amended carried 8-0.

8. Consideration Of New Construction At 1847 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 8); Matt Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The proposal includes the construction of a two-story cross-gabled residence with Tudor architectural-styled features. The applicant has reduced the height of the building since the last HZC meeting and is now subordinate to Magnolia Hall. The Guidelines recommend that the height of infill buildings should not exceed the height and width ratios for windows and doors of adjacent buildings by more than 10%. Window specifications were not included in the application. Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway. Mr. Hathaway stated that they agree with staff conditions, other than condition two. The transoms remain over the side windows due to concerns about the amount of blank gap between the top of the window and the window above. The size of the transoms has been reduced but are still present above the windows. Additionally, the size of the front door has increased to match the height of the sidelights on either side of the door.

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

MOTION

Commissioner Denton motioned to approve new construction for the property located at 1847 William Campbell Court with staff conditions excluding condition number two, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Denton explained that based on the applicant's explanation of the why the transoms need to remain above the windows and that the applicant reduced the size of the transoms, the application can be supported.

Ms. Huffer explained in response to a question from Commissioner Harrison that one of the project considerations and conditions is the requirement of a separate building permit for the pool.

Commissioner Laster asked staff for more information regarding the windows.

Ms. Huffer explained that within the guidelines it is recommended that the windows should not exceed the height and width ratios for windows and doors of adjacent buildings by more than 10%. The applicant did not provide window and door specifications in the application, resulting in the condition.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted that scale wise the transoms look appropriate as the windows appear to be the height of the ceiling. If the transoms were removed, the windows would look odd, but it's kind of a self-inflicted wound. The look is not a form seen in historic neighborhoods overall. The purpose is not to recreate old houses like a perfect Disneyland style but to follow certain guidelines to maintain the historical authenticity and to avoid creating self-inflicted wounds. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he can be onboard and support the proposal.

Commissioner Laster noted a comment from the DRC meeting about the width of the dormer. The relationship between the door and sidelights aligns symmetrically but the dormer is so large.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted the large size of the fascia board for a Tudor-style home.

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

The motion carried 8-0.

9. **Consideration Of An Addition (Principal) And New Construction (Accessory) At 112 Lewisburg Avenue; Jennifer Lombard, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer.

Addition

The addition is proposed to be 911 square feet, which equates to 94.94% of the principal building which meets the

guidelines.

Accessory Structure

If the addition to the principal building were to be approved, the total footprint would equate to 2,735 sq. ft. the addition would be 48.26% of the principal building which meets the Zoning Ordinance.

Driveway Alterations

The application includes the proposal to remove the existing driveway and install a new, wider driveway. The proposed driveway is 23'-5", which exceeds what the Zoning Ordinance allows. In the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District, the typical driveway width 9-12' at the street. The widest width on the same block face that staff found is 15' in width near the street. Information has not been provided on the intent of the material of the driveway. The use of asphalt or concrete would be appropriate for this property. Staff recommends denial of the driveway alterations. Additionally, staff recommends approval of the addition to the principal building and the construction of the accessory structure with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Jennifer Lombard. We agree with all the staff conditions except for the driveway. There was a misread on the dimensions of the driveway and she apologize for any confusion. We are happy to make the driveway narrower and propose that the material be concrete. We provided a dimension from the house to the setback that was over the driveway which is where the 23-foot number came from.

There being no citizen comments, Chair Roberts suggested approaching the motions by addition to the principal, accessory structure, then the driveway.

MOTION**#1 Motion (Addition)**

Commissioner Harrison motioned to approve the addition to the principal building located at 112 Lewisburg Avenue with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the applicant is very responsive to suggestions from the DRC meeting.

The motion carried 8-0.

#2 Motion (New Construction Accessory Structure)

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve new construction of the accessory structure with staff conditions for the property located at 112 Lewisburg Avenue with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

The motion carried 8-0.

#3 Motion (Driveway Alterations)

Commissioner Denton asked if staff's recommendation changes now the there are new dimensions for the driveway.

Ms. Huffer stated that the zoning ordinance allows for a maximum width of 20 feet, then the Commission would consider the request along with the ordinance requirements to determine approval or denial. Regarding driveway width, typically a width of 9-12 feet is common, but a driveway adjacent to the property has a driveway width of 15 feet, setting a precedent in the district.

Chair Roberts asked for confirmation that the 23-foot distance is the distance from the proposed fence to the house.

Ms. Lombard confirmed that the 23-foot distance on the site plan is the distance from the house to the setback.

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve widening the driveway by 3 feet using concrete material for the property located at 112 Lewisburg Avenue with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

The motion carried 8-0.

10. Consideration Of Alterations (Winstead House And Carriage House) At 423 South Margin St. (Franklin Grove); Brandon Priddy, Applicant.

Sponsors: Emily Wright, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The application has several components beginning with the **Sun Porch Alterations**

A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was previously issued for alterations to the Winstead House, Carriage House, and site alterations in October 2022. The application includes a historic photo that shows the side porch and the new plans to mimic it. The front elevation will utilize doors that will read as windows, which is in keeping with the Guidelines. Exterior hardware will not be used on the doors so that they will further radiate as windows. Utilizing doors that will read as windows meets the recommendations of the guidelines.

Elevator Addition

The elevator addition received a COA in October of 2022. At that time, the elevator was closer to the house, but the engineer noted concerns about digging the elevator pit in relationship to the historical home. Digging around the foundation or close to it could potentially upset the structural integrity of the home. With this information, a new elevator proposal became necessary. The proposed new location of the elevator addition appears to be skewed out away from the home. The guidelines recommend that additions should be appropriately placed at the rear of the building and should be subordinate to the historic building. As proposed, the elevator addition is appropriate and meets the guidelines requirements.

Rear Stair Addition

The rear elevation shows the area that will bump out to accommodate the rear stair addition as internal stair reconfiguration is necessary. As proposed, the rear stair addition meets the guidelines.

Rear Porch Enclosure

The rear elevation shows how the applicant proposes to enclose the rear porch with siding. As proposed, the rear porch enclosure meets the guidelines and is appropriate. Additionally, the detailing of the rear porch was approved at the October 2022 HZC meeting.

Carriage House

The proposal includes an addition on the elevation where the slope of the roof (non-historical) is to be removed. The guidelines generally support the proposed alterations as the changes are designed to be in keeping with the original building. The improvements to the structure also improve the overall appropriateness within the historic district.

Staff recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Brandon Priddy. Mr. Priddy thanked the staff for their feedback and suggestions during the DRC meetings. Mr. Priddy stated that he agrees with all staff conditions and can answer any questions.

Commissioner Laster asked Mr. Priddy about the little patio or dock that's on the front and asked if it was that part of the original proposal or is it something new. Also, has the driveway always been in the existing location?

Mr. Priddy stated that the area called a "landing" and was part of the original proposal. A place was needed to stage things so that when the door is opened, one doesn't step down three feet. Mr. Priddy explained that he was not part of the original design team but would assume the drive has always been in its current location as it seems to be a logical location.

Ms. Huffer confirmed that the "landing" part of the application was a component of the original proposal and approved as part of the COA approved in October 2022.

Chair Roberts stated that originally loading was going to be done from the side, but now loading will be done from the doors.

Mr. Priddy explained that there was a turning issue, and the challenging part, as discussed at the DRC meeting, was that originally no doors were shown. Mr. Priddy underscored the area on the site plan where the tight turning radius exists.

Commissioner Pearce stated that what was explained at the DRC meeting was that someone looked at the situation from a

practical point of view resulting in what currently exists.

Commissioner Laster wanted to know if this area was approved in the original application.

Chair Roberts stated that yes, this was approved by the Commission but because of practicality considerations and turning radius issues, it doesn't appear quite as it was proposed.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that it's a hard sell to put the equivalent of a loading dock on the front of the Winstead House. One of the most iconic homes in Franklin and one that should be protected, but instead is has a little concrete patio in front of it.

Mr. Priddy explained that he doesn't disagree with anything that has been said. "We intentionally did not add other components one would see on a loading dock." Aesthetically, the raised landing or base would be fronted with stone and would not read as a loading dock.

Commissioner Laster stated that it goes back to the intent of the patio/landing space.

Mr. Priddy explained that the intent of the patio/loading dock is to have a space where staging can take place before entrance into the building. No digging or excavating to create a well will be necessary. Essentially, the finished floor will be extended out to the loading dock which is about three feet above grade. The type of trucks expected to deliver to Winstead House are box trucks, but larger trucks or semis are not expected.

Commissioner Marquardt asked if there were any other solutions that would meet the need other than creating a loading dock.

Mr. Priddy stated that if the landing/loading dock is a dealbreaker, we'll exclude it from the application. The doors will need to stay locked so that no one opens the doors and falls out.

Commissioner Pearce asked if the applicant had considered bricking the top of the landing.

Mr. Priddy stated that he would be open to considering the bricking the top of the loading dock.

Commissioner Besser stated that she agrees with Commissioner LeMarinel and cannot support the application as the landing will certainly take away from the front elevation.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he's not against having a loading dock, but not in the proposed location. A loading dock should be constructed at the exterior of the building not the front elevation of an historic building. The stoop or loading dock may be required to have rails to installed to meet code requirements.

Commissioner Besser asked if there is a photo of the proposed location to see the elevation of the landing.

Mr. Hathaway stated that looking at the photo the area reads as a backdoor. The intent is to improve the feel and look of the area but to still have access to functionality. Stairs could be constructed so that the area reads as a porch that happens to be where loading and unloading takes place.

Commissioner Pearce asked how far from the front elevation is the area under discussion.

Mr. Priddy stated that it's about eight feet, but the intent is to keep the area as far from the front mass of the home as possible. Mr. Priddy asked if there are any issues with the sun porch itself other than the piece in front of it.

**MOTION - Commissioner Denton and City Staff member, Kelly Dannenfelser were not present for this item.
#1 Motion (Front Sun Porch)**

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to defer the front sun porch alterations to the next voting meeting, which is January 2024, HZC meeting for the property located at 423 South Margin St, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Chair Roberts stated that the applicant is on the right track but a deferral to the next meeting would allow time to work out

the details or come up with other options. The patio piece is the biggest hurdle.

The motion carried 6-1 (Commissioner Harrison voting against).

Commissioner Laster stated that it is highly unusual to have a tower on the exterior of a historic building. The guidelines recommend additions be constructed at the rear of the building, but with the public gardens at the back of this structure there will be public views from all sides of the building. The current proposal allows for the caveat that the construction can be reversed for the future.

Commissioner Pearce asked if it would be possible for the structure have a shed roof instead of the roof form.

Mr. Priddy stated that it could absolutely have a shed roof.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the proposed location of the elevator is a good location but said that he's struggling with the height and detailing of the structure. Commissioner LeMarinel suggested minimizing the cab height because it's not necessary to match the ceiling height of the mansion so that the mass of the overall building could be shortened. Commissioner LeMarinel also recommends simple detailing of the structure as seen on page 5 of application documents... the area with a small window and flat roof. If the height is required for the elevator, a cornice placed down lower treating it like a stepped parapet will do a lot to bring down the scale of the building.

Mr. Priddy stated that the model is based on a hydraulic elevator. Mr. Priddy agreed with the use of a cornice to reduce the scale of the building.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she agreed with Commissioner LeMarinel's suggestions.

#2 Motion (Elevator Addition)

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the elevator addition to the January 2024, HZC meeting for the property located at 423 South Margin St, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

The motion carried 7-0.

#3 Motion (Stair Addition)

Commissioner Harrison motioned to approve the stair addition with staff conditions for the property located at 423 South Margin St, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Laster asked where the stairs were approved in the original architectural rendering.

Mr. Priddy stated that the stairs were rotated 90 degrees or about 78 feet off the existing historic footprint. The stairs were exterior to the historical building but enclosed in the addition.

Commissioner Laster explained that some years back a museum curator associated with some important buildings in Washington facilitated the change by recommending a different slope which changed the staircase location. This change created more of a boxy look.

Mr. Priddy stated that the addition is intended to enclose the staircase and allow for some space outside of that. Feedback from the DRC meeting included replacement of double windows with single windows and to add some trim detailing softening the box look.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted that with the new box being built out, it appears that it will extend further by several feet making it visible from South Margin Street.

There being no further discussion, Chair Roberts asked the member to vote by raising their hand.

The motion failed 3-4 (Commissioners Besser, Laster, LeMarinel, and Pearce voting against).

#4 Motion (Stair Addition)

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the stair addition to the January 2024, HZC meeting for the property located at 423 South Margin St, seconded by Commissioner Besser.

The motion carried 7-0.

#5 Motion (Sun Porch Alterations)

Commissioner Harrison motioned to approve the sun porch alterations for the property located at 423 South Margin St, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Laster noted that the previous box structure was deferred and asked how the porch would integrate into the rear elevation, if the stair tower wasn't available.

Mr. Priddy explained that the sun porch would conclude finally into the museum piece off the back.

The motion carried 7-0.

#6 Motion (Carriage House Addition)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve addition to the Carriage House for the property located at 423 South Margin St, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

The motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Besser suggested a site visit because of so many moving parts.

Chair Roberts stated that the site visit should be confirmed with Mr. Priddy.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Roberts asked if there was any further business. There was none.

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

11. Rear Yard Fencing At 115 Harlinsdale Ct.; Milosi Landscaping, Applicant.

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

Commissioner Laster motioned to adjourn the December 11, 2023, HZC Meeting, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel. The motion carried 7-0.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:44 PM.


Chair

1/8/2024
Date

