



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, June 10, 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

Chair Denton called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM.

Commissioners Present: Josh Denton, Lisa Marquardt, Michael Orr, Bob Barrett, Tyler LeMarinel, Kathy Worthington, Brian Laster, and Mary Pearce

Commissioners Absent: Susan Besser

Staff 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.)

Chair Denton 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 LeMarinel motioned to approve the May 13, 2024, HZC meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Laster. The motion carried 8-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Huffer announced that the regularly scheduled DRC meeting will be held on Monday, June 17, 2024, at 4 PM in the Boardroom.

An emergency authorization was issued by Building and Neighborhood Services for repairs to the coping on top of the building at 231 Public Square. Once decisions on the next steps have been made, the Commission will be updated via email.

The legal training scheduled (City of Franklin Law Department) for Commissioners on June 26, 2024, has been canceled. The Law Department will follow up with a link to the previous legal meeting for training purposes.

APPLICATIONS

2. Consideration Of Alterations At 99 E. Main St.; Shaun Sullivan, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The proposal is to alter the wall on the recessed top floor of the building to accommodate a window opening for a pass-through window and alter the doorway. There is an existing opening for a double door and the intent is to widen the door entrance to allow for a window to be located to the left of the double door. The alteration to the wall is located on a recessed wall that is set back from the exterior wall of the building and has minimal visibility from the street. Below the window opening, wood will be utilized.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Shaun Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan did not have new information to add but would be happy to answer questions.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve Of Alterations At 99 East Main Street with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Commissioner Pearce thanked the applicant for his patience during the design process and noted that the result is a design fitting for a historical home.

The motion carried 8-0.

3. Consideration Of Alterations (Accessory) At 1003 Fair St.; Ben McCreary, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The existing structure is historic and is located one foot from the property line. The shifting of the structure and the addition has previously been approved, but to meet the requirements from the Building and Neighborhood Services Department, detached garages located within 2' of a lot line are permitted to have a roof eave not exceeding 4". Currently, the structure is located 1' from the property line and the roof overhang is approximately 6". The proposal is to reduce the overhang by 2" on the rear of the structure so it comes into compliance with the International Building Code (IBC). Due to this alteration being located on the rear of the structure, it will not be seen from street view, and therefore meets the intent of the Guidelines.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Ben McCreary. Mr. McCreary did not have new information to add but would be happy to answer questions.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve Alterations (Accessory) At 1003 Fair Street with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Discussion: None

The motion carried 8-0.

4. Consideration Of Alterations (Door Replacement) At 113 2nd Ave. S.: Kimberlie Leisinger, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff Presentation: Elizabeth Bulay. The proposal includes the in-kind replacement of a set of doors located on a recessed wall that is highly visible from Main Street and is located behind the statue in the courtyard. The existing non- historic metal door is proposed to be replaced due to maintenance issues. The proposed replacement doors maintain the 6-panel design and materiality of the existing doors.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Kimberlie Leisinger. Ms. Leisinger did not have new information to add.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Alterations (Door Replacement) At 113 2nd Avenue South with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Discussion: None

The motion carried 8-0.

5. Consideration Of New Construction (Accessory) and Driveway Alterations At 316 Bridge St.; Eric Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The placement of the proposed accessory structure will be situated in the right rear corner of the lot behind the principal building. The Guidelines recommend the following:

1. Locate accessory structures behind the rear plane of the principal building.
2. Orient an accessory structure's front facade to be parallel with the principal building front facade and place them in traditional locations in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.

The location of the proposed structure is not a location that was historically accurate to this site or that is seen with the other accessory structures within the district. The previous location of the historic accessory structure was located near the driveway. It would be appropriate to have the new accessory structure where the previous structure was located or to position the structure at the end of the driveway behind the principal building to align with the Design Guidelines.

Building Form: As proposed, the accessory structure meets the intent of the Guidelines for building form and the Zoning Ordinance for building footprint.

Materials: The proposed materials of the new accessory structure will be a lap siding and asphalt shingle roof. Within the application, it is noted that the windows will be Pella Reserve Wood and Aluminum Clad windows. A sample of this window was brought to the May DRC meeting where there was support for its historic form and detailing. The materials are appropriate and are supported by the Design Guidelines.

Driveway Alterations & Walkway: The proposal includes extending the existing driveway and adding a new path/walkway around the new accessory structure. The existing driveway is gravel and the extension to the new accessory structure will be situated behind the principal building, which would be appropriate. It appears that the design of the driveway extension will utilize a ribbon driveway pattern. The use of a gravel driveway extension is appropriate within the Guidelines, but it should not utilize a ribbon driveway pattern to align with the recommendation of the Guidelines. The use of a ribbon driveway is not utilized as the main driveway design and would be introducing a new design that may not be historically accurate to the building and site. It would be recommended that the existing driveway design be continued on the new portion of the driveway and that the same gravel material be utilized.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the application be denied based on the following grounds:

1. Orient an accessory structure's front facade to be parallel with the principal building front facade and place them in traditional locations in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.

Should the HZC approve the application, staff have outlined suggested conditions in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Eric Smith. Mr. Smith explained that suggestions from the DRC meeting were incorporated into the accessory structure design.

1. The gable pitch was changed.
2. Window heights were adjusted to the taller proportions.
3. Driveway extension to the accessory structure
4. Window specification added.

Mr. Smith also noted that photographs of homes with rear accessory structures were added to the application documents.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to approve New Construction (Accessory) and Driveway Alterations At 316 Bridge Street with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that placing an accessory structure in the traditional location, for this property, would not accomplish the desired street view.

Commissioner Laster stated that the way the driveway is positioned, it appears that staff's recommendation would allow more ease for cars to turn around and be a better design.

Mr. Smith noted this adjustment to the plan.

Commissioner Orr noted the unusual orientation of the accessory structure in relationship to the house, as it appears the structure should be rotated 90 degrees to face the same direction as the principal structure.

Mr. Smith noted that the porch faces the front, but the front door is positioned so that it opens to the side yard.

Chair Denton stated that he cannot support the motion for approval because of the location of the accessory building. Chair Denton noted that a historic accessory building was demolished on this property. The proposed placement of the accessory structure is not in keeping with the guidelines.

Mr. Smith stated that the location of the accessory building was purposefully placed behind the principal structure so that it couldn't be seen from the street view. The new accessory structure would not appear to replace the once standing historical accessory building. From feedback during the DRC meeting, Mr. Smith understood that the preference would be to have the

new accessory structure hidden.

Commissioner Laster asked for further explanation about which side would be considered the front of the house. If the front door faced Bridge Street, would the problem be solved?

Chair Denton stated that the doors and windows face the side street.

Ms. Huffer explained that staff was more concerned about the positioning of the accessory structure based on what the design guidelines recommend for placement of an accessory structure.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that several jurisdictions don't allow a door on the front of the building because the building is not the primary building, and it avoids the appearance of two homes on one lot. Commissioner LeMarinel noted that he thought the orientation of the accessory structure was intentional.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she can support the applicant placement of the accessory structure behind the principal building because the accessory is not historical.

No further discussion.

The motion carried 7-1 (Chair Denton voting against).

6. **Consideration Of Fencing At 239 Franklin Rd. (Harlinsdale Farm); Lisa Clayton, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The proposal includes installing 790 feet of horse fencing along the north entrance of Harlinsdale Farm, 68 feet of horse fencing close to the parking area by the Hayes House, screening of mechanical equipment, and 136 feet of fencing to fill in the gap of fencing near the interurban trail. The fencing will be white, three horizontal board fencing, that is 48" in height, that will match the existing fencing that is seen on the property. While the proposal is unique in the fact that the fencing will not be fronting Franklin Road, and it will not be surrounding a specific building, the intent of the Guidelines is met by the application. The agrarian character of the site is being maintained, and no new fencing designs are proposed with the installation of the three-board horse fencing. While the use of horse fencing does maintain consistency with what is seen on the property, the Guidelines recommend utilizing screening and landscaping to fully conceal the equipment. If both fencing and landscaping is utilized, then the landscaping should be positioned in front of the fencing to help fully screen the equipment. Since this is a City project, staff does not make a recommendation but there are recommended conditions, outlined in the staff report, should the HZC approve the proposal.

Applicant Presentation: Lisa Clayton. Ms. Clayton stated that Ms. Huffer summarized the application nicely. Ms. Clayton noted that, upon the suggestion from Commissioner Pearce, fencing may not be necessary for the entire perimeter of the park as originally proposed. Allowing the fields to grow will mark the perimeter of the park. Ms. Clayton stated that fencing a portion of the perimeter is a good starting point and, if necessary, in the future, as needs of the park change, we can revisit the plans.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Fencing At 239 Franklin Road. (Harlinsdale Farm) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Discussion:

Commissioner LeMarinel asked if the material for the fencing would be wood.

Ms. Clayton confirmed that the fencing would be made of wood.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the community use of the park has been terrific.

Commissioner Marquardt commended Ms. Clayton for her leadership in the Parks Department.

The motion carried 8-0.

7. Consideration Of Alterations (Window Replacement) At 137 4th Ave. N.; Laura DiPasquale, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff Presentation: Elizabeth Bulay. The proposal is to replace the windows on the first floor of the building. Images of the windows have been provided. Staff is not able to determine the age or condition of the windows from the images. However, in comparing the windows to the information in the National Register listing, the windows appear to be the original windows. Additional information is provided within the application about the condition of a few of the windows. The proposed replacement window is an Aluminum Clad Wood Window from the Pella Reserve line. The Guidelines recommend the following for windows:

1. Preserve and maintain historic windows and historic window openings.
2. Design new or replacement windows to have historic profiles and dimensions and a double-hung appearance.
3. Use true divided-light (TDL) or simulated divided-light (SDL) windows rather than snap-in muntins or grids between the glass (GBG) styles.

The information that has been provided for this application does not meet the recommendation of the Guidelines for the replacement of windows as the level of deterioration has not been shown. Rehabilitation of the windows is recommended by the Guidelines instead of replacement.

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

1. Preserve and maintain historic windows and historic window openings.

Should the HZC choose to approve the application, staff recommends conditions outlined in the staff report.

Chair Denton recused himself from discussion and voting on this item. Vice Chair Pearce will take over the chair responsibilities for this item.

Applicant Presentation: Laura DiPasquale. Ms. DiPasquale explained that due to the expense required to repair the windows, the church is unable to make the necessary updates.

Brittany Cochran, Pella Windows. Ms. Cochran explained that Pella Windows, free of charge, would like to replace the windows with historically accurate new windows. After accessing the windows, Ms. Cochran noted the damaged sills and weighted balance system along with mold and rot due to water entering through the windows. The financial expense of repairing the windows is overwhelming for the church and repairing the windows will not meet the building codes. If Pella were to replace the windows, the church would have a lifetime warranty on the windows and be maintenance free.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to approve Alterations (Window Replacement) At 137 4th Avenue North with staff conditions, seconded by commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the applicant photos provided show enough evidence of window deterioration to warrant a request for replacement with historically accurate windows, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Discussion

Commissioner Laster stated that he agrees with staff that these are the original windows. According to the photos, the windows seem to be in sound condition. The exterior windows can be repaired or stabilized with a solvent or liquid wood. Commissioner Laster recommended the windows be taken off site to remove the lead paint safely. The weight and pulley system can be repaired so that the windows are fire code complaint. Also, a complete inventory of the windows along with more investigation is needed to determine the degree of damage for each window. For historical accuracy, it would be best to repair the windows that can be repaired and rebuild the windows with the most damage rather than replace with modern windows.

Commissioner Pearce noted that it appears the building has been covered with aluminum siding trapping the moisture.

Ms. Cochran stated that there are 14 windows total and noted the large front picture window has been replaced previously. Ms. Cochran suggested that the windows in front be maintained/repared and the side and back windows which are the most damaged, be replaced with the Pella historic profile windows.

No further discussion

The motion fails 2-5 (Commissioners Laster, LeMarinel, Pearce, Orr and Worthington voting against).

Commissioner Pearce recommended the applicant attend the next DRC meeting and provide more photos of the windows and views of each side of the building.

Commissioner LeMarinel suggested the applicant provide photos of each facade of the building and more comprehensive information about the damage to each window.

Motion to Defer

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to defer Alterations (Window Replacement) At 137 4th Avenue North to the next voting meeting (July), seconded by Commissioner Laster.

The motion to defer carried 7-0.

8. Consideration Of Alterations And Addition (Principal) At 112 Lewisburg Ave.; Jennifer Lombard, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Staff Presentation: Emily Huffer. The proposal includes the following alterations:

1. Changes to the trim around windows, doors, and the brackets around the front door.
2. Changes to the enclosed porch on the front left elevation.
3. Adding windows on the left elevation (facing the driveway).
4. Adding a roof over the rear deck.

Trim Alterations: During the removal of the aluminum siding of the building, the original trim was found. The intent is to have the trim around the windows, doors, and the front door along with the brackets matching what was found under the siding. The utilization of the design of the trim around the windows and doors and the updated wood brackets is supported by the Guidelines, as it was there historically.

Front Porch Alteration: The removal of the aluminum siding from the building revealed the lack of original siding left on the portion of the building which is the enclosed porch area. This area is located on the left front corner of the building and then wraps to the side of the building facing the driveway. The intent is to mimic the 1987 photo of the building by restoring the porch to read as a porch that has been enclosed. The previous COA approved the restoration of the front of the building by removing the non-historic siding. It is unknown how the front of the building appeared before 1987, but the proposal to have the front porch enclosed is seen within the district. The existing front porch has a single double-hung window on the front facade and two double-hung windows facing the driveway. The proposal will have three double-hung windows on the front elevation and three double-hung windows on the side elevation facing the driveway. While the Guidelines do not support

enclosing porches on the front facade, this porch was previously enclosed currently and based on the photos provided in the application. The utilization of windows and matching window lite patterns is supported by the Guidelines.

Window Additions: The proposal includes the installation of three windows on the left elevation facing the driveway. The windows will have the same a similar window lite pattern to the other windows on the building.

Rear Deck Roof Addition: The COA issued in December 2023 approved an addition that equated to 49.94% of the principal building's historic footprint. With the proposed covering of the rear deck, a roof extension of 210 sq. ft. would equate to an addition of 61.46% of the historic footprint of the building. The

Guidelines recommend the following:

1. Design the size of an addition to be subordinate to that of the historic building.
2. The building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint of the historic portions of the building (portions to remain that are at least 50 years of age).
3. The proposed covering of the rear deck with a roof will add 210 sq. ft. to the building footprint, which exceeds the Design Guidelines recommendation by 11.46%.

Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the porch roof addition on the following grounds:

1. Design the size of an addition to be subordinate to that of the historic building. The building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint of the historic portions of the building (portions to remain that are at least 50 years of age).

Staff recommends approval of the matching of the historic window and door trim, the restoration of the wood brackets flanking the front door, the front left porch alteration, and window alterations with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Because the applicant was not present, staff recommended, and Chair Denton approved allowing time for Ms. Lombard to arrive and to move on to the next item on the agenda.

Applicant Presentation: Jennifer Lombard. Ms. Lombard noted that they took into consideration the feedback from the DRC meeting to make the roof less massive by dropping the back section down so that it's not one massive roof.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner LeMarinel motioned to approve Alterations And Addition (Principal) At 112 Lewisburg Avenue as submitted by the applicant, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that he can support the applicant submittal because of the large lot size and the accessory structure, as approved, follows the historic design guidelines with the square footage being 48 percent of the principal structure footprint.

Ms. Huffer stated that the detached garage is 48 percent of the principal structure footprint, the addition is 49.9 percent of the historic footprint, and, by covering the back porch, the addition is pushed to 61 percent of the historic footprint, adding 210 square feet under roof.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she can support the motion because the improvements, size of the lot, and the front elevation will read as it originally did, historically.

Commissioner Laster noted that the design is more aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Orr stated that because the additional 210 square feet of the porch is not conditioned space, he can support the motion.

The motion carried 8-0.

9. Consideration Of Alterations (Railing) At 104 S. Margin St.; Rick Kwock, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff Presentation: Elizabeth Bulay. The proposal includes the removal of the existing wood railing and the installation of an aluminum railing on the ramp that is located on the front and rear elevations. The ramp and railing are visible from 1st Avenue South as the ramp starts at the front of the building and wraps around to the rear of the building. The age of the ramp and rails is believed to be from the 2000s. The applicant is requesting to replace the rails due to deficiencies that were found during an inspection. The aluminum railing that is proposed will be 36" tall with 1-5/8" cap on the existing concrete ramp. The proposed color for the railing is Quaker Bronze. The material and design of the proposed railing are simple and appropriate and are seen throughout the district. Additionally, the ramp will be screened by plantings, which is encouraged by the Guidelines.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Rick Kwock. Mr. Kwock did not have any additional information to add.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve Alterations (Railing) At 104 South Margin Street with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

Discussion: None

The motion carried 8-0.

10. Consideration Of Partial Demolition and Addition (Accessory Structure) At 231 Myles Manor Ct.; Amanda McCreary, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff Presentation: Elizabeth Bulay. This proposal is for the circa 1940 frame garage located to the left of the principal building that is visible from Myles Manor Court. The proposal to alter the frame garage structure includes partial demolition and addition to the rear and left elevations. The proposal includes demolishing the rear and right supporting walls of the accessory structure to make way for an addition. The proposal is not for the removal of an entire structure. The addition will wrap around the rear and right elevations of the structure. This will leave the left elevation, which is visible from the street, intact. The existing structure is 590 square feet and the addition that is being proposed will be 428 square feet. The new footprint of the garage will measure 1,018 square feet. The addition will be compatible with the historic garage in design and form but will be clearly identifiable through the offset that is proposed. The orientation, form, and size of the addition that is being proposed are appropriate. On the rear elevation, two new windows are proposed for the addition. These new windows will break up the massing of this facade, which was discussed during the DRC meeting. The materials, exterior finishes, and detailing of the addition that is being proposed are appropriate.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the application with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Amanda McCreary. Ms. McCreary explained that the original footprint of the structure is being maintained by the third bay set back in the addition portion. The soffits are being maintained on the left side along with the depth and design throughout the structure. Two windows were added to the rear elevation that provide a better scale. Also, the original garage door openings will not change recognizing the historical structure.

Citizen Comments:

Doug Revere, 108 Mayberry Court. Mr. Revere stated that he is a backdoor neighbor and fully supports approval of the proposed plans and applauds the design.

Motion

Commissioner Worthington motioned to approve Partial Demolition and Addition (Accessory Structure) At 231 Myles Manor Court with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Pearce and Chair Denton collectively complimented the applicant on the design and attention to maintaining as much of the historic structure as possible.

The motion carried 8-0.

11. Consideration Of Site Alterations (Driveway) At 419 Boyd Mill Ave.; Mike Smith, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelter, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff Presentation: Elizabeth Bulay. The proposal is for the replacement of the existing concrete driveway with a cobblestone ribbon driveway and curbing treatment. The proposed material for the driveway is reclaimed rhino granite cobblestone. Within the ribbon drive, the center stipe will utilize planting. The footprint of the driveway will not be altered. At the end of the driveway behind the home, a decorative inlay design is proposed within the cobblestone. The Guidelines recommend the following:

1. Design driveways to follow historic patterns. Ribbon or Hollywood driveways may be appropriate.
2. Use durable materials that were historically typical for driveways, such as gravel, concrete, bricks, and asphalt.

The introduction of a new material that is not typical for driveways in the district and the utilization of a ribbon driveway pattern is not appropriate. The age of the home pre-dates the ribbon driveway, which became popular during the 1920s. The materials and pattern of the proposed driveway are not typical of the Boyd Mill Avenue Historic District.

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

1. Design driveways to follow historic patterns. Ribbon or Hollywood driveways may be appropriate.
2. Use durable materials that were historically typical for driveways such as gravel, concrete, bricks, and asphalt.

If the commission were to approve this application, staff recommends conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Ann Day. Although cobblestones are not historically accurate material for the Boyd Mill home, staff indicated at the DRC meeting that a durable material for a driveway would be accurate. Ms. Day proposes that the Board consider cobblestone as a durable material appropriate for a driveway. The home is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places making it not as critical to be historically accurate. The home has existing stone elements in the foundation and a stone wall making the use of cobblestones a suitable material. Ms. Day explained that the cobblestone curbs would converge into the stone wall at the property line and the driveway dimensions would not change. There are several homes where the use of cobblestones can be found setting a precedent and establishing context for the use of cobblestones in downtown Franklin.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Barrett motioned to approve Site Alterations (Driveway) At 419 Boyd Mill Avenue with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Barrett explained that in historic districts in Franklin and Nashville, cobblestone driveways can be found along with a variety of other driveway materials. Brick, asphalt, pea gravel and aggregate have been used in Historic Franklin, and it's not a stretch to include cobblestone as an appropriate material.

Discussion

Commissioner Pearce stated that initially she had concerns that a cobblestone driveway would call attention to itself. Driving down Fair Street, the cobblestone driveway blends well with the street view. Commissioner Pearce stated that she can

support the motion because of what has been discussed, and the cobblestones will blend well and not call attention or stick out.

Chair Denton noted that he'd never noticed the cobblestone driveway on Fair Street.

Commissioner Barrett added that considering the topography of this property and the positioning of the driveway, one would have to purposefully turn their head to see the cobblestone driveway.

The motion carried 8-0.

12. Consideration Of Alterations (New Construction) At 1835 William Campbell Ct. (Lot 2 Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision); Jennifer Lombard, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Staff Presentation: Elizabeth Bulay. This application proposes alterations to the Queen-Anne inspired house on Lot 2 in the Magnolia Hall Subdivision. The COA for this house was approved and issued in June 2023. This application previously came before the Historic Zoning Commission at the May meeting, where it was deferred to the June HZC meeting. The applicant is refining the designs and elements found on the house. This will be the first lot in the neighborhood and the left elevation will front Boyd Mill Avenue.

Front Elevation: The applicant proposes changes to the front elevation. The proposed changes on the front elevation contribute to the architectural detailing and are in keeping with the Queen Anne style. These proposed alterations complement and do not visually compete with the character of Historic Magnolia Hall.

Left Elevation: The left elevation will front Boyd Mill Avenue and will be highly visible. The Guidelines recommend maintaining the rhythm and spacing of window and door openings of adjacent structures. The applicant has incorporated feedback from the DRC and the previous staff conditions on this elevation. The alterations to the window rhythm and spacing, lite pattern, trim, and detailing are in keeping with the Queen Anne style and are changes supported by the Guidelines, except for the set of double windows on the rear gable, which alters the rhythm and spacing on this elevation.

Rear Elevation: The proposed changes to the rear elevation are simplified and appropriate. These proposed alterations complement and do not visually compete with the character of Historic Magnolia Hall.

Right Elevation: The applicant proposes the following changes to the right elevation. The Guidelines recommend maintaining the rhythm and spacing of window and door openings of adjacent structures. The alterations to the window pattern, trim, and detailing are in keeping with the Queen Anne style and are positive changes.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with conditions outlined in the staff report. Ms. Bulay asked the Board to clarify with the applicant that the double window is on the left elevation.

Applicant Presentation: Jennifer Lombard. Ms. Lombard explained that the double window on the left elevation has a saferoom behind it and could not be split into two windows. However, it could be made into one window.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Worthington motioned to approve Alterations (New Construction) At 1835 William Campbell Court (Lot 2 Historic Magnolia Hall Subdivision) with staff conditions including the option to replace the double windows on the rear left gable on the left elevation with a single window, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Discussion: None

The motion carried 8-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC**13. Administrative COA 122 Harlinsdale Ct. Rear Yard Fencing**

Sponsors:

14. Administrative COA 249 4th Ave. N. Minor Alteration (Rear Non-Historic)

Sponsors:

15. Administrative COA 110 3rd Ave. N. Signage (Reface Post-and-Arm)

Sponsors:

16. Administrative COA 135 2nd Ave. N. Signage (Reface Panel)

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Orr, seconded by Commissioner LeMarinel.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:18 PM.


Chair


Date