HISTORIC FRANKLIN TENNESSEE

City of Franklin

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

Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, February 12, 2024 | **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

Vice Chair Pearce called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM.

Commissioners Present: Bob Barrett, Lisa Marquardt, Brian Laster, Tyler LeMarinel, and Mary Pearce

Commissioners Absent: Kathy Worthington, Josh Denton, Susan Besser, and Michael Orr

Staff Members Present: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay, Jared Carter, and Blake Harper

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.)

Vice Chair Pearce 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 before noon on the day of 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:

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the January 8, 2024, HZC Meeting Minutes, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel. The motion carried 5-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Huffer stated that the next DRC Meeting will be on Monday, February 19th at 4 PM and a special DRC Site visit on February 27th at 231 Myles Manor Ct./ Jasmine Hall at 3 PM.

APPLICATIONS

2. Consideration of Site Alterations At 331 Franklin Rd. (Harlinsdale Farm); David Hodnett, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff: Elizabeth Bulay. This application previously appeared before the Historic Zoning Commission in November 2023 and was approved. In January 2024, this application returned to the Design Review Committee for feedback on an alteration to the plans. The site alterations entail a stamped concrete walkway along a proposed multi-use path. The 400' long stamped concrete walkway features an already approved stamp of a train track pattern that pays homage to the Historic Interurban rail line that went through Harlinsdale Farm. This application proposes a solid, monotone stamp and background to all be featured in the color Yosemite sand. The previously approved plans featured a blue-gray background with a stamp featuring colored elements.

The Guidelines recommend the following:

1. Use sidewalk materials that were historically typical, such as concrete, brick, and stone.
2. Design new sidewalks and walkways to follow historic patterns of alignment, configuration, width, and materials.
3. Generally, site and setting alterations should be considered as appropriate when they are undertaken in locations that are not visible from public view, do not involve the removal of historic features, and do not detract from or overwhelm the context of the historic districts.

The proposed alteration to the approved plan meets the Guidelines and is respectful to the context of the buildings, their setting, and the surrounding district.

Applicant Speaker: David Hodnett. Mr. Hodnett stated he believed this alteration to the plans was a better homage to the interurban. This alteration is supported by the parks department and our department.

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to approve alterations at 331 Franklin Rd. (The Park at Harlinsdale Farm) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

There being no discussion, Vice Chair Pearce asked the commissioners to vote. The motion carried 5-0.

3. Consideration Of Site Alterations At 117 3rd Ave. N.; Brandon Priddy, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff: Emily Huffer. This application includes the proposal for a series of alterations at 117 3rd Avenue North. A portion of this application includes a new pergola to be constructed.

Pergola
There is an existing pergola on the site and while the new pergola will be larger in size, it will be located on the interior of the property and will not be highly visible from street view. As proposed, the new pergola meets the intent of the Guidelines.

Accessory Structure
The application indicates the proposal to replace the non-historic roof and replace areas of the cement board siding. These changes are supported, as these materials are non-historic to the structure. New French doors are proposed to replace the triple panel of doors. This change is also supported, as the doors are non-historic.

Cooler Screening
Based on feedback from the DRC meetings, the screening beside the structure has been set back 12" and the screening utilizes 8 ft. vertical fence boards to screen the equipment.

New Fence
The application includes the proposal to replace the existing fence with a new 6' vertical board fence. The height, material, and location are all appropriate within the Guidelines.

New Concrete
A portion of the application includes the proposal to pour a new concrete patio under the proposed pergola. This alteration will not be seen from street view and is appropriate within the Guidelines.

Artificial Turf
The application proposes to utilize artificial turf in the rear yard. While the use of this turf is not typical to the historic districts, it will be located behind the fence and will not be visible from street view.
Staff recommends approval of this application with conditions.
Ms. Huffer noted two project considerations.

Project Considerations:

1. Be advised that Parking must be provided for the new use. The Downtown District provides exemptions for additional parking when the use was legally established prior to the effective date of the ordinance.
2. If the fence is 8' in height, engineered plans and a building permit will be required through the BNS Department.

Applicant Speaker: Brandon Priddy. Mr. Priddy thanked staff and the Board for their feedback but did not have any additional information to add.

Vice Chair Pearce asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment this item, there being none, Vice Chair Pearce asked the Board for a motion.

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve alterations at 117 3rd Ave. N. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner LeMarinel thanked the applicant for the well-organized site plan.

There being no discussion, Vice Chair Pearce asked the commissioners to vote. The motion carried 5-0.

4. Consideration of Alterations (Windows and Doors) At 221 Lewisburg Ave.; Madeleine Wyatt, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff: Elizabeth Bulay. This proposal appeared before the Design Review Committee in January 2024. The house at 221 Lewisburg Avenue is in the Lewisburg Avenue Historic District but is not designated a contributing residential building. The current application proposes a series of alterations to the rear of the principal building. The application proposes to alter two door openings on the rear elevation into window openings. Currently, both openings lead out onto a rear-facing covered porch. The first door on the rear façade leading from the kitchen is proposed to be altered into a window opening. The second door alteration on the rear of the primary bedroom entails shifting the window to the left of the door over to the right and enclosing the remaining space with matching siding. By utilizing the existing openings and the alterations being located on the rear of the building, the application meets the intent of the Guidelines. Additionally, the application proposes to replace a window on the rear façade with a triple casement wood window above the kitchen sink. This application proposes to utilize the existing window space and window material that is typical of the neighborhood and existing home. This proposal meets the intent of the Guidelines. The application proposes to replace the French doors in the dining room. The proposal to replace the French doors is appropriate due to its location on the rear facade. The application proposes to enclose a window on the rear facade due to a closet proposed within
house. The application includes two options for the enclosure. The first option is to enclose with matching siding to what is existing. The second option is to enclose and apply a faux shutter in the location of the existing window. The enclosure of the window and the utilization of a faux shutter do not meet the intent of the Guidelines.

Staff recommends denial of the enclosure of the closet window on the rear facade based on the following grounds:

1. Maintain a traditional solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is like those seen on historic buildings in the district.

Staff recommends approval of the alteration of the kitchen door and primary bedroom door into windows, the replacement of the window in the kitchen, and the replacement of the French doors with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Madeleine Wyatt. Ms. Wyatt stated she hoped more clarity on the alterations would give a better the Commissioner idea of the proposed alterations. Ms. Wyatt also mentioned that the alterations requested are for a nonconforming historical property and are primarily at the back of the property.

Vice Chair Pearce asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment on the item, there being none, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION
Commissioner Marquardt motioned to deny the closet window enclosure on the rear façade. A second on the motion was not provided so the motion dies.

Commissioner Barrett motioned to approve all alterations (against staff recommendation) for the property located at 221 Lewisburg Avenue, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Discussion
Commissioner Laster asked for more details regarding the rear window alteration.

Ms. Wyatt stated that the intent was to maintain the appearance of a window while offering the functionality to the homeowner.

Commissioner Laster encouraged Ms. Wyatt to consider keeping the window opening with the surrounding trim and use the shutter to fill the opening to allow reversibility in the future.

Amendment
Commissioner Laster amended the motion to include maintenance of the surrounding trim and for the shutters to fit within the window opening, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted that the Commission should not get into recommending what an applicant should or should not do on the rear façade (completely out of view) of the home. The question to be considered is the alteration of the window which is not an old window.

Commissioner Laster agreed with Commissioner LeMarinel but stated that it is important to recommend best practices to applicants.

The motion to amend carried 3-2 (Commissioners Barrett and LeMarinel voting against).

The motion as amended carried 5-0.

5. Consideration Of Alterations (Dormer) At 203 2nd Ave. S.; Amanda McCreary, Applicant.

Sponsors: Elizabeth Bulay, Emily Huffer, Kelly Dannenfelser

Staff: Elizabeth Bulay. This application proposes to add a shed dormer to the left elevation at 203 2nd Avenue South. This building is located on the corner of 2nd Avenue South and Church Street, which makes the left elevation highly visible. The dormer is recessed two feet from the edge of the building. It is located below the ridgeline and is 32" from the sidewalls. The roof pitch is proposed to be 1:12. The Guidelines recommend the following for dormers:

1. Add dormers to the rear and side facades with minimal visibility.
2. A dormer roof pitch should be at least 3:12 and no less than half the main roof pitch.
3. Dormers should be designed to be similar yet subordinate in detailing, scale, width, and massing to existing dormers. As proposed, the application does not meet the intent of the Guidelines.

Staff recommends denial of the application based on the following Guidelines:

1. Place dormers in locations with obscured visibility from the front façade or street.
2. Dormer roof pitch should be at least 3:12 and no less than half the main roof pitch.
3. Dormers should be designed to be similar yet subordinate in detailing, scale, width, and massing to existing dormers.

If the commission approves the application, staff recommends approval with conditions stated in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Amanda McCreary. Ms. McCreary stated that this project has been before the Board, previously. As the project progressed it became necessary to add a shed dormer to create enough usable space for a bedroom. Although the left elevation is visible from the street, the dormer is to the rear and side on the main house. Even though the dormer is street facing and considering the adjacent Brownstones, the dormer will not seem as large. Because the room is a bedroom and requires egress, the windows proposed are sized to be as small as possible to meet the egress requirements. The window sizing is also compatible with the window sizes on the front elevation and the proposed dormer is smaller than the dormer on the right side.

Vice Chair Pearce asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment on the item, there being none, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION
Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to deny the dormer alterations at 203 2nd Ave. S based on staff recommendations, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that because the left elevation of the home is side street facing and in public view, going against the guidelines to accommodate a bedroom is not something he can support.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chair Pearce asked the Commissioners to vote. The motion carried 5-0.

6. Consideration of Alterations At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory, Bldg. 7); Luke Dougal, Applicant.

Sponsors: Elizabeth Bulay, Emily Huffer, Kelly Dannenfelser

Staff: Elizabeth Bulay. The applicant has returned to the Historic Zoning Commission with options for consideration of alternative design elements on Building 7, the Carousel building, at the Factory. A COA was issued in February 2023 for the construction of an accessory structure of mixed masonry and metal materials behind the Main Factory Buildings.

Doors
This application proposes to utilize glazed coiling doors or traditional overhead doors as an alternative to the previously approved vertical bi-fold doors. The glazed coiling doors have a narrower horizontal groove pattern. The traditional overhead doors have a wider 10-light pane pattern. The previously approved bi-fold doors had an 18-light pane pattern and the alternative option that was also approved at that time was a singular overhead door with a 42-light pane pattern. The utilization of a traditional overhead door would be appropriate as previously approved. The use of a glazed coiling door for the proposed alternative option would not be appropriate as it utilizes a more modern finish and appearance.

Materials
This application proposes alternative materials for the façade. The COA from February 2023 features a brick-clad building with a gray masonry plinth at the base of the building. The current application proposes to utilize metal paneling in a matte black steel color for the exterior with two alternatives for the base materials. The first base material option is a trend stone

architectural CMU masonry plinth in gray. The second proposed base material option is a reddish-brown brick base to match the adjacent historic brick that is seen on the Factory Campus. The Factory features a mix of base materials including brick and masonry on all the buildings. The utilization of matte black metal paneling as the primary material for the structure is not appropriate. However, if approved, the utilization of a brick base on Building 7 would be more appropriate and align with the Guidelines to reflect the historic setting that is seen on The Factory Campus. If the Commission does not approve the new siding material presented, the facade materials and base materials will default to what was previously approved in the COA from February 2023, which featured a brick-clad building with a masonry plinth base.

Transoms
This application proposes an alternative transom design to the previously approved design from February 2023. The currently proposed transom appears minimally diminished in size and is appropriate.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the traditional overhead door and large transom windows with conditions noted in the staff report.
Staff recommends denial of the change in primary facade material to matte black metal paneling based on the following Guidelines:

1. Use materials and exterior finishes typically used in historic equivalents.
2. Use materials that are similar in character to nearby historic buildings, such as brick, stone, concrete, or painted or parged concrete blocks.

Applicant Speaker: Gina Emmanuel and Benton Smothers. Ms. Emmanuel explained that the original mechanism that powers the carousel movement was no longer available from the manufacturer prompting a change in the construction of the building. The material change to a brick base with metal panels is more consistent with the surrounding building buildings 6, 11 & 12) and enhances the constructability of the building. Ms. Emmanuel requested flexibility regarding the glass doors openings. The track required to raise the doors would hit the carousel making it necessary to reduce the height of the doors to 9 feet with a transom above the glass doors. One option would be to install large store front doors that open outwardly into the plaza.

There being no citizen comments, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION #1 (MATERIALS)
Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve a brick base with metal panels against staff recommendations for the alterations at the property located 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory, Bldg. 7), seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner LeMarinel explained that the material change appears to be more consistent with the surrounding buildings at the Factory.

Commissioner Laster pointed out that according to page five, carousel building area one, the buildings on the left and right are brick with the metal portion facing the parking area. The public view from the parking area is metal first. Mr. Laster also stated that he agrees with staff that brick is more in keeping with the surrounding buildings.

Ms. Emmanuel stated that part of the area on the right is more of a wall instead of a building.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he agrees with Mr. Laster that the previously approved exterior brick material provides a more permanent and substantial feel to the building opposed to the metal material. "We want to avoid a cheapened down version of the building." The board is being asked to approve a "lesser" version of the originally approved building material.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that use of a non-historic material next to historic brick doesn't typically turn out well.

Commissioner Laster amended to motion to include approval of the brick base color by the Preservation Planner, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel. The motion to amend carried 5-0.

The motion as amended carried 4-1 (Commissioner Laster voting against).

MOTION #2 (DOORS)
Vice Chair Pearce stated that it appears that the Commission is being asked to vote on large doors without detailed information and renderings.

Ms. Emmanuel stated that a reduction in height of the overhead doors would allow clearance for the track. The proposed transom would provide additional light into the building.

Commissioner Laster stated that he would like to have more details about the storefront opening doors along with a rendering to vote and make good decision. "Would the doors open accordion style?"

Ms. Emmanuel explained that the doors would be double doors that would open (not fully) with a transom above.

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer alterations of the doors (The Factory, Bldg. 7) for the property located 230 Franklin Rd. to the HZC March 11, 2024, along with an invitation to the next DRC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt. The motion carried 5-0.

MOTION #3 (TRANSOM)
Ms. Huffer noted that the transoms were minimally changed from the previous approval.

Ms. Emmanuel noted that the transom changed due to the change in the type of front door construction.

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the transoms as presented with staff conditions for the property located 230 Franklin Rd conditions (The Factory, Bldg. 7), seconded by Commissioner Barrett. The motion carried 5-0.

7. Discussion Of Relocation And An Addition (Accessory Structure) At 425 Boyd Mill Ave.; Stephanie Bach, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff: Emily Huffer. This application has attended several Design Review Committee Meetings to discuss the proposal and the DRC attended a site visit at the property. The application proposes to relocate the existing accessory structure and then construct an addition to it.

Relocation
The application includes the proposal to shift the existing 288 sq. ft. structure to the interior of the property. The applicant has incorporated the feedback from past DRC meetings so that the structure is saved, and its unique front features remain. The relocation of the structure is appropriate within the Guidelines.

Addition
The application includes the proposal to construct a new 662 sq. ft. addition to the existing 288 sq. ft. accessory structure. Feedback on this application was incorporated from previous DRC meetings into this design. The importance of the historic accessory structure was emphasized during these meetings and the addition is similar in form from the street as the original accessory structure appeared from the street. The principal building's footprint equates to 4,090 sq. ft. and the total square footage of the accessory structure with the addition will equate to 950 sq. ft. As proposed, the addition is not subordinate in size and mass as the form of the building will be taller than the original accessory structure. The proposed addition does not meet the intent of the Design Guidelines.

Materials
The addition is proposed to be clad in wood siding and will utilize asphalt shingles. The proposal does not state what the material for the new windows and the foundation is proposed to be. As proposed, the materials meet the intent of the Guidelines, but the specification on the windows and foundation is needed.

Recommendation
Staff recommends denial of the application based on the following grounds:

1. Design alterations and additions so that the entirety of the accessory structure is compatible and visually subordinate in size, mass, and height to the principal building they support, but in no case should they exceed 1 1/2 stories.

If the HZC were to approve the application, staff suggests following the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Blake Daniels. Mr. Daniels stated that they would like to relocate and restructure the previously altered historic shed so that it becomes a usable space for the owners. The neighbors beside and behind the property have detached garages with living space above. The goal was to maintain the historical significance like the context of the neighborhood while creating a structure that has a functional purpose. Mr. Daniels stated that he believes the proposed alterations are subordinate to the main/principal building.

There being no public comments regarding the item, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

MOTION #1:
Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the relocation and addition of (Accessory Structure) located at 425 Boyd Mill Ave with staff conditions 1-4, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Laster stated that the proposal appears to be subordinate to the principal building in height, scale, and square footage. The applicant should be commended for the thoughtful design elements that compliment the historical home and the historical district. The proposed addition helps mitigate the space intrusion of the adjacent rear property.

Commissioner Le Marinel asked the applicant about the square footage/footprint of the home.

Mr. Daniels stated that the conditioned space of the home is just over 4,000 square feet.

Vice Chair Pearce asked about the height difference between ridge line of the home compared to the ridge line of the outbuilding/shed.

Mr. Daniels explained that the difference is one foot but because the outbuilding is set back further, it will appear to be shorter than one foot. The accessory building is 1 foot shorter than the principal building and is subordinate.

Vice Chair Pearce asked about the relationship between the back windows and the property behind the accessory building.

Mr. Daniels stated that the view is of the entry court/driveway of the home.

Commissioner Laster stated that if the difference is 1 foot, the building/home behind the accessory building should not be visible.

Vice Chair Pearce asked the Commissioners to vote on the item. The motion failed 0-5.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted that more details/data are needed in relating to perspective and the footprint of the principal building. The drawings are beautifully done but more information is needed to confidently make a final decision on the proposal.

Vice Chair Pearce noted that the applicant should consider the relationship between the accessory rear elevation and the adjacent rear property considering windows (proposed) on the rear elevation.

MOTION #2:
Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to defer Relocation and An Addition (Accessory Structure) At 425 Boyd Mill Ave to the March 11, 2024, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Laster. The motion carried 5-0.

8. Consideration Of New Construction At 1845 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 7); Matt Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff: Emily Huffer. The proposal includes the construction of a two-story cross-gabled residence with Colonial Revival architectural-styled features. The Historic Magnolia Hall is 34'-9" in height, measured from grade to the roof ridge. The application provides the height of the building from the first-floor elevation to the roof ridge, which is 32' 4". Additionally, there is a 2' increase in grade elevation on Lot 7 compared to Magnolia Hall. The location of Lot 7 is directly beside the mansion. The materials of the proposed new construction are listed as predominantly brick and lap siding, shingle roof, stone foundation, two stone chimneys, cementitious siding on the front porch details, and brick chimney. The colors of the materials were not included in the application. Dormers shall be set back a minimum of one foot from the exterior wall of a front or side elevation per Zoning Ordinance requirements. The proposed wall dormers on the front elevation should be altered to be roof dormers instead of wall dormers to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of this application with the conditions included in the staff report.

Vice Chair Pearce stated that no vote would be taken as the applicant representative wasn't present. If the applicant arrives before the end of the meeting, it may be possible to hear the presentation and vote on the proposed application.

Ms. Dannenfelser requested Mr. Harper's interpretation of whether the item isn't heard or if a vote should be taken.

Applicant Speaker: Jennifer Lombard. Ms. Lombard explained that there were a few changes since the DRC meeting. Taking into the account the DRC discussion, the changes include the removal of the front facing gable and the screen porch has been pushed back. Ms. Lombard stated that the team agrees with staff recommendations other than the removal of the wall dormer. The application includes examples of wall dormers in Franklin like the proposed wall dormers of this application. The team feels that the wall dormers are appropriate for the style of the home. If the dormers were pushed back two feet from the front facade, the windowsills would end up being 7 feet above the floor.

There being no public comments regarding the item, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

Commissioner LeMarinel asked for clarification in the staff report regarding "wall dormer setback, per the zoning ordinance." "At what point does the HZC trump the zoning ordinance requirements?"

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that the setback is a zoning ordinance requirement regarding transitional features. There must be something specific in the design guidelines that conflicts with the zoning ordinance for the historical design guidelines to take precedence over the requirement. There doesn't appear to be anything in the design guidelines that directly conflicts with the zoning ordinance requirements.

MOTION
Commissioner Marquardt motioned to defer new construction at 1845 William Campbell Ct. (Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision, PD, Lot 7) to the March 11, 2024, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that she would like to see new renderings of the design once the applicant changes the dormers to comply with the zoning ordinance. The motion to defer the vote carried 5-0.

Vice Chair Pearce encouraged the applicant to attend the DRC meeting for discussion of options.

9. Consideration of Signage (Monument) At 1205 Columbia Ave.; Laurie McPeak, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff: Emily Huffer. The application includes the proposal to install a 71" granite monument sign at 1205 Columbia Avenue, facing Carter Hill Park. The proposed sign is classified as a monument sign. The Zoning Ordinance permits one monument sign

per lot, and it is limited to six feet tall. As proposed, it appears to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Typically, a sign can be issued an administrative Certificate of Appropriateness if the proposal meets the intent of the Design Guidelines; however, the Design Guidelines consider monument signs to be an inappropriate sign type in the Historic Preservation Overlay District. In cases when the Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance conflict, the Design Guidelines take precedence. The Historic Zoning Commission may approve a sign that does not meet the Design Guidelines if it does meet the Zoning Ordinance. Typically, monument signs are in the front yard near the street for maximum visibility for motorists. This sign is proposed to be in the rear yard of the property, behind the existing building and the driveway/parking lot. It is proposed to be double-sided and face the side lot line that borders Carter Hill Park, which will be more viewable to visitors of the park than from Columbia Avenue. Since the proposed sign is located within the HPO, the sign would require a COA and a sign permit. Since a monument sign is not an appropriate sign type per the Design Guidelines, the recommendation would be denial of the application.

Recommendation
Staff recommends denial of the application based on the following grounds:

1. The proposed sign type is considered an inappropriate sign type within the Design Guidelines.If the HZC were to approve the application, the following recommendations are suggested:
2. A sign permit must be issued prior to installation.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin prior to the issuance of a sign 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: Laurie McPeak & Eric Jacobson. Mr. Jacobson thanked staff for their thoughtful comments during the submittal of the application for this historical monument. The Texas Historical commission approached the Miller House Committee of the Battle of Franklin Trust with the request to place a monument recognizing the Texas soldiers who fought in the Battle of Franklin. The commission believes that this type of monument provides more integrity to the battlefield. The Texas Historical Commission has placed monuments on 19 battlefields. Some of those include Vicksburg-MS, Chickamauga-GA, Kennesaw Mountain-GA, Pea Ridge-AR, Fort Donelson-TN, Shiloh-TN, Corinth-MS, Second Battle of Bull Run-VA, Richmond-KY, Antietam-MD, Galveston-TX, Bentonville-AR, The Wilderness-VA, Gettysburg-PA, Gainesville-VA, and Mansfield-LA. Aside from the request from the Texas State Historical Commission, the Battle of Franklin Trust group would like for this commission to consider addressing procedures and guidelines specific to historical monuments differently than as it is now, under historical signage.

Vice Chair Pearce asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment on the item.

Julian Bibb. Mr. Bibb explained that the state of Texas has presented a unique request. The request is for a historic battlefield monument that commemorates a person or event in remembrance of historic times or cultural heritage due to political, artistic, architectural, or cultural importance of a social group. Similar historical monuments are prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and have met strict guidelines from the Department of Interior and the National Parks Service. Mr. Bibb noted that a description borrowed from the Stones River Battlefield further enlightens the essence of what a historical monument commemorates. In summary, it says a monument reflects efforts to remember those who fought in the conflict, documents events of the battle and aids in understanding the legacy of the American Civil War. A historical monument's purpose is not to advertise or entice people to spend their money in a restaurant or retail business but to provide an opportunity to reflect and understand the history of the Civil War or other historical event. Mr. Bibb stated that it would be nice to see other states make similar requests. At a later date, this unique request provides an opportunity for the Commission to consider initiating the process of adoption of similar procedures and standards, mentioned previously, for inclusion in the COF Historical Design Guidelines. Mr. Bibb finished by asking the Commission for approval of a COA for the Texas historical granite monument without the need for a sign permit, with the conditions and that any changes to placement or language would require approval of the Preservation Planner and/or the Commission.

Jim Roberts, 1327 Adams Street. Mr. Roberts explained that the purpose of this historical marker/monument is to further commemorate the Battle of Franklin. As visitors are walking through Carter Hill Park the monument will stand alongside the interpretative signs, cannons and cannon balls telling the Battle of Franklin story. The monument is proposed to be 184 feet from Columbia Pike and 300 plus feet from the direction of Cleburne Street and Columbia Pike. The Commission was provided a representational view of the figure showing how little the monument can be seen from the street view. As Mr.

Jacobson and Mr. Bibb stated, it is the hope that the HZC can work through and better define and adopt a new application process for historical monument requests, in the future, through the Historical Design Guidelines.

Ron Crutcher, 1324 Adams Street. Mr. Crutcher stated that he supports placement of the monument on Columbia Pike as it will help with the expansion of Carter Hill Park. He does not see the monument as a distraction from Columbia Pike or Claybourn Street.

Angela Calhoun. Ms. Calhoun stated that she supports the addition of the monument because of the stringent criteria required for approval by the Secretary of the Interior and the approval by the Tennessee State Historical Commission. The monument addition compliments the existing markers as it adds a significant physical presence to visitor's experience as they are walking through Carter Hill Park.

Bob Ravener, 221 3rd Avenue South. Mr. Ravener supports the addition of the monument as it enhances the story of the Battle of Franklin. The monument further heightens the visitors learning experience and is complimentary to the existing markers.

There being no further citizen comments, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the board.

MOTION
Commissioner Laster motioned to approve a monument sign for the property located at 1205 Columbia Ave with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Commissioner Laster explained that he understands staff's position and typically when the Commission reviews a sign for approval, the purpose of the sign is to advertise a product or service. In this instance, the monument is meant to inform the public of an event in history. These are two very different situations to consider for approval.

Mr. Harper cautioned the Commission about discussion regarding the content on the monument.

Vice Chair Pearce further stated that the content included on the monument would be approved by the property homeowner or by BOMA, if the property was city owned.

Commissioner Barrett asked why 1205 Columbia Avenue was chosen for the location of the monument.

Mr. Jacobson explained the Texas troops, a Brigade of 900 men were located on the east side of Columbia Pike. The Texans were commanded by Hiram Granbury, one of six Confederate Generals killed during the Battle of Franklin, in Pat Cleburne's division, also killed during the battle. The Texas Brigade fought on the area east of Columbia Pike and to the east of where the Cotton Gin stood before they were turned back. The monument would mark the center point of where the Texans fought.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that one of the applicant's mentioned bypassing the sign permit. "Could staff explain the sign permitting process?"

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that following the approval of a COA, the Building and Neighborhood Services Department would review the COA and issue a sign permit. The monument sign appears to meet the zoning ordinance, but BNS would review the COA to confirm its appropriateness. The Historical Design Guidelines do not specifically address the uniqueness of a request for a historical monument and its specific characteristics. In the future, the HZC may want to consider an appropriate standard for the application process for historical monument placement.

Mr. Harper stated that for the purposes of the HZC, for this application, the HZC would approve or deny the COA.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the design guidelines fall short when it comes to directions for historical monument placement.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the language in the design guidelines, unintentionally, refers to a monument sign that represents advertising for a service or product. Commissioner LeMarinel agrees with Commissioner Laster that this monument "sign" purpose is to document and inform the public about an event in history and not to advertise a business.

The motion carried 5-0.

10. Consideration of Alterations at 417 Boyd Mill Ave.; David Judy, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff: Emily Huffer. The application includes the intent to replace an exterior wall, replace the foundation, utilize cement board siding, and replace windows on the building due to mold. The application does not provide information that is needed to provide a recommendation. The condition of the existing siding, foundation, and the windows has not been provided. Information should be provided as to where on the building these alterations are being proposed. Additionally, information from a mold remediation specialist is needed as to why complete replacement of all materials is the proposed solution instead of repair/treatment using other means. The Guidelines recommend that one should maintain as much historic integrity as possible, preserving and maintaining a feature is the priority. If preservation is not possible, it is better to repair a feature rather than replace it to maintain a higher degree of integrity for the historic property. Exterior alterations should not impair the historic integrity of buildings, site features, or the historic districts.

Recommendation
Staff recommends deferral of the application due to lack of information within the submittal.

Applicant Speaker: David Judy. Mr. Judy noted that the four windows in the photos would not be replaced but removed and then reinstalled once construction is complete. Sagging of the exterior wall has created separation of the window trim allowing water to get through. The plan is to remove the exterior wall to reinforce it with a new footer and replace with material close as possible to the existing Hardi cementitious siding. Mr. Judy also stated that the mold report was uploaded.

Vice Chair Pearce asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment on the item, there being none, Vice Chair Pearce asked for a motion from the Board.

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve alterations at 417 Boyd Mill Ave based on the applicant's explanation of in-kind materials to be used, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that there appears to be a mold report in the application documents. Even though the photos clearly show the single side of the home where the alterations are requested, it would be helpful to a broad perspective of the home. Also, it appears the mullions are wrapped in aluminum, will those be replaced with Hardie trim?

Mr. Judy noted that on the side of the home requiring the alterations, the framing is original, although the windows have been replaced previously. The windows can be removed and then reinstalled as they are usable. As a result of the sagging, the windows are not sitting on the framing and the flashing is separating. The materials would remain the same as much as possible.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that his preference would be to replace the mullions with hardie plank to match the siding.

Vice Chair Pearce agreed with Commissioner LeMarinel and suggested that any part of the window that is aluminum be replaced with Hardie plank.

Amendment #1
Commissioner LeMarinel amended the motion to include all window casings (sills, aprons, mullions) be replaced hardie trim, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Laster asked if the applicant had considered replacement with wood.

Mr. Judy explained that the material of the addition completed in 2016 was completed with hardie siding.

Commissioners LeMarinel and Pearce both commented on the fact that aluminum is more likely to allow water in and behind

the window without a place for it to escape.

Commissioner LeMarinel commented that although the application is not detailed, its important for the homeowner to be able to make repairs without the requirement of an architect and elaborate architectural plans. The applicant is making a reasonable request and with the addition of the amendment, the application can be supported.

The motion to amend the main motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Laster stated that given the slope of the floor and the porch to the right of bank of windows, one might believe that this area was, at one time, part of a porch.

Mr. Judy stated that to his knowledge, this section of the home was the kitchen. The framing around the windows point to evidence that the framing is original because of the two by fours used. If the exterior was changed, it would have been many years ago when two by fours were used.

Commissioner Laster explained that if there is a possibility that this area of the home was a porch, simply jacking the building up could create more pressure on the structure. A way to confirm evidence of a porch it to compare the angle of the floor joist of the existing porch to the angle of the floor joist where alterations are proposed. The best way to correct the sloping of the floor, if the floor joist angles match, is to level the floor then build the floor back.

Mr. Judy explained that as part of the construction of the addition in 2016 included an addition of a double two by twelve girders installed in the crawl space. The exterior wall appears to be continuing to shift.

Commissioner Laster asked for more information about one of the photos submitted in the application that appears to be a bay window.

Mr. Judy explained that one of the bedrooms has bay windows that are original but have been painted shut and the ropes broken. As part of this application, the windows would be replaced with like windows.

Commissioner Laster noted that the rails and styles appear to be in good shape. The HZC recommends repairing and maintaining original windows when at all possible. The weights and ropes can be repaired or replaced so that the historic original windows can be maintained. Commissioner Laster asked if the bay window is on the front elevation of the home.

Mr. Judy stated that the room is not on the front of the home and is set-back twenty-five feet on the west side.

Amendment #2
Commissioner Laster amended the motion to include the that the applicant should retain and repair the historic bay windows and deny replacement of the bay window, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

The motion to amend the main motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Laster asked the applicant if there is any other scope of work that hasn't been addressed during the meeting. Commissioner Laster suggested that the original two by fours could be retained and used for the alterations.

Ms. Huffer asked the applicant if the foundation repair would be altered in appearance from the outside view.

Mr. Judy explained that a footer would be installed to provide a continuous foundation, but the appearance would be that of the concrete blocks.

Commissioner LeMarinel noted that if there were piers present at one point, a porch could have existed where the exterior wall replacement is proposed. It could have been a porch a very long time ago.

Commissioner Laster noted that it appears that an exterior chimney existed and was reconstructed to become a working chimney.

Vice Chair Pearce noted that the intent of the application is to repair the exterior wall and to repair the components of the

historical bay window.

Commissioner Marquardt asked the applicant if he had any questions or needed clarification on any repairs discussed.

Mr. Judy stated that he understands and prefers using the hardie trim to replace the aluminum frame/parts of the windows as part of the exterior wall alteration, as discussed by the Commissioners.

The motion as amended twice carried 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Vice Chair Pearce asked if there was any further business. There was none.

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

11. **Outdoor Café Barrier At 414 Main St.; Natasha Hendrix, Applicant.**
Sponsors:

ADJOURN

A motion was made by Commissioner LeMarinel, seconded by Commissioner Barrett, to Adjourn. The motion carried 5-0.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:56 PM p.m.

Chair

March 11, 2024
Date