



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, March 10, 2025

5:00 PM

Eastern Flank Event Facility

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 Laster called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

Commissioners Present: Bob Barrett, Brian Laster, Holly Thompson, Kathy Worthington, Madelyn Ingram, and Lisa Marquardt

Commissioners Absent: Mary Pearce, Michael Orr, and Tyler LeMarinel

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

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 Laster asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Comments on agenda items may be made in person at the meeting 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 Ingram motioned to approve the HZC February 10, 2025, Meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. The motion carried 6-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- The regularly scheduled DRC will be next Monday, March 17th, starting at 4 PM at the Eastern Flank Event Facility.
- The Preservation Plan Community Meeting will be held on March 26th from 6:00-8:00 at the Eastern Flank Event Facility.
- A special DRC has been scheduled on Thursday, March 27th, from 4:00-5:00 PM to meet for a focus group discussion with the Lakota Group for the Preservation Plan Update.
- The annual Historic Zoning Commissioner Training is scheduled for Monday, March 31st, from 8:00 AM – 1:00 PM. Lunch will be provided for the Commissioners.

APPLICATIONS

2. Consideration Of Demolition (Accessory), Alterations (Principal), Site Alterations, And Fencing At 116 Lewisburg Ave.; Amy Adkins, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. 116 Lewisburg Avenue is a circa 1929 Tudor revival that is contributing to the Lewisburg Avenue National Register Historic District. It is a 1 ½-story house that is stone-veneered with a high-pitched side-gabled roof that features stucco on the side gable ends. A large frame addition including the garage extending from the rear of the building was added in 1988. There are several items that are included within this application:

- Demolition of a ca. 1986 Greenhouse (Non-historic accessory structure)
- Alterations to the principal building
- Site alterations
- Rear yard fencing

As proposed, the alterations are appropriate and the replacement of the two rear-facing windows and the reduction of the size of one of the replacements. The windows will remain casement windows, but specifications have not been included within the application and should be consistent with the recommendations of the guidelines. The replacement of the pedestrian door in the rear, the rear deck replacement, the rear deck expansion, the installation of two light fixtures in the rear and front and removal of the front awning are all appropriate and align with the guidelines. Within the application, it is also proposed to paint the previously painted materials such as the siding, trim, and gutters, which were all previously painted. These elements are proposed to be painted in a neutral color. While the HZC does not review paint color selection, the guidelines do recommend using paint colors and schemes typical of the age and style of the building. Neutral hues such as creams, browns, and whites are typical of the Tudor style and are appropriate. Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition of the accessory structure, building alterations, site alterations and fencing with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Citizen Comments: None

Applicant Speaker: Amy Adkins. Ms. Adkins didn't have any other information to add but stated she would be happy to answer any questions.

Motion

Commissioner Worthington motioned to approve with conditions Demolition (Accessory), Alterations (Principal), Site Alterations, and Fencing At 116 Lewisburg Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

Commissioner Worthington stated that last time there was discussion about the lattice screen and asked Ms. Adkins to expand on the lattice details.

Ms. Adkins stated that she proposes not having any lattice work beyond the highest point but to stair-step down and extend the lattice work to the edge of the rock wall.

Commissioner Worthington stated that it reads very well and appreciates Ms. Adkins handiness on the lattice area.

The motion carried 6-0.

3. **Consideration Of Alterations (Principal) And Addition (Accessory) At 1009 Fair St.; Ben McCreary, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. 1009 Fair Street is a circa 1920s craftsman bungalow located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The building has come to DRC, had site visits, and come to the Historic Zoning Commission throughout the duration of the restoration of the building. Most recently, in October 2024, the reconstruction of the accessory structure and the raising of the roof on the principal building were approved. Three items are included within this application:

- Change in materials in the gable ends from lap siding to cedar shake.
- A 64 sq. ft. addition to the accessory structure.
- Driveway Alteration to straighten the driveway to the street.

As proposed, the alterations align with the historic design guidelines and staff recommends approval of the cedar shingle addition to the accessory structure and alteration to the driveway with conditions stated in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Ben McCreary, Chisel Workshop. Mr. McCreary didn't have any other information to add but would be happy to answer any questions.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion

Commissioner Worthington motioned to approve Alterations (Principal) And Addition (Accessory) At 1009 Fair Street with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Vice Chair Laster asked the applicant about the intended use of the building.

Mr. McCreary explained that the owner intended the building to have the flexibility to be either a garage or a dwelling.

The motion carried 6-0.

4. **Consideration Of Signage, Awning, and Lighting Installation At 94 E. Main St.; Aubrey O'Laskey**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. 94 East Main Street is part of a set of combined buildings located in the gateway to the Downtown Franklin Historic District. The facades are composed of a replicated historic gas station, a frame building, and one false front façade building. This application pertains to the middle frame building façade and the right false front building façade. There are three items for consideration included within this application:

- Signage: Wall, Window, and Flag Signs
- Awning Installation
- Light Fixtures

False Front Building Signage: 4 signs are proposed: three separate window signs and a wall sign.

- **Wall Sign:** One wall sign is proposed to be installed on the parapet of the false front building. The proposed sign is 21" by 101", or 14.75 sq. ft. The sign will utilize .25" thick plate letters and project .5" from the building. The signage will be black pin lettering on a white building façade. The height from grade is 16'.
- **Window Signs:** Three window signs are proposed for this building's façade. One on each window flanking the entrance and one window sign grouping area featuring the front entrance and transom.

The proposed signage equates to 15% of the window grouping area coverage. The guidelines recommend using traditional sign placement to enhance architectural elements of the facade. A commercial building should have no more than three signs, unless it has more than one ground floor retail storefront tenant space. While sign size is limited to nine square feet and to be proportionate to the building, facade and other signage, wall sign height from grade has a maximum of 12ft from grade. Window signs must be fully placed within the interior of the building and attached directly to or mounted within 12in of the inside of the business. The proposed quantity of signs exceeds the recommended three signs per commercial building. The proposed wall sign exceeds the recommended sign area maximum and is located at a height more than the recommended 12' from grade. The previous signs for this building have been in this location since 2011. The Zoning Ordinance does permit wall signs to be located on the parapet of a building and to have a sign area maximum of 1 sq. ft. of sign per linear foot of the building's facade. The proposed signage meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance but not the recommendations of the Guidelines.

Frame Middle Building: 3 signs are proposed for the frame building façade: Two window signs and a flag sign.

- **Window Signs:** Two separate window signs are proposed on this building with the window area not provided and cannot be calculated.
- **Flag Sign:** One flag sign is proposed on the front of the frame building to be hung from a post of the porch. The dimensions of the flag sign are unknown. The flag appears to utilize a darker background, but the lettering color is unknown.

The Guidelines recommend the following:

- Window signs must be fully within the interior of the building and attached directly to or mounted within 12 inches of the inside of the business.
- Window sign area maximum is 15% of an individual window or window grouping area.
- Flag signs are not a sign type in the Design Guidelines.

The Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance maintain the same standard for window area coverage so that signage does not exceed 15% of the window or window grouping. This calculation has not been provided at this time. Flags are not a listed sign type in the Guidelines, so the Zoning Ordinance regulates them

Awning: A new shed awning is proposed to be installed on the false front building façade.

- Earlier this year, the previous awning fell during a weather event. The proposed awning will be 39' by 8.5' and fit proportionally over the storefront windows. The awning will maintain a 10'2" clearing to grade. The proposed awning will utilize an aluminum frame, fabric material and acrylic fabric, and steel posts. The proposed awning will be in a green color with cream piping detailing.

The guidelines recommend the following:

- To design awnings to have between a 30- and 50-degree angle, while taking into consideration the height of the storefront and snow and wind load requirements. The awning fabric must cover the front of the awning frame, and to select colors to enhance and complement the building and adjacent buildings. The angle of the proposed awning is unclear. The proposed green should be a muted color that complements the building. A sample of the material in the proposed green color would need to be provided to staff for approval prior to installation. The use of steel posts is not a common feature of awnings in the downtown district; however, due to the failure of the previous awning,

the applicants would like to ensure the safety and stability of the new awning. The proposed size, fit, colors, and design of the awning are appropriate.

Lighting: New light fixtures are proposed to be installed on the false front façade building.

- The replacement of the lighting has been previously approved by the Commission with conditions of approval to submit specifications to staff. The proposed gooseneck lighting and lantern K.1 are appropriate. Staff requested the applicant submit the design of lantern K for review by the commission. The proposed K lanterns are to flank the front entrance and are 21.8" long by 7" wide each. The submitted K.1 Lantern is 12.5" by 7". All the light fixtures will utilize a matte blank finish.

The Guidelines recommend the following:

- Design light fixtures and their placement to be compatible with and subordinate to historic buildings and the surrounding historic context. The proposed K lanterns for the front of the building are simple; however, the scale and design of the fixtures in comparison to historic buildings and what is traditionally seen is inconsistent with what is commonly seen on historic commercial buildings. The use of oblong fixtures is seen nearby on Harpeth Square and on 1st and Main Development. The utilization of the K.1 lantern style aligns with the recommendations of the Guidelines and is appropriate. However, the use of the proposed K lantern is not appropriate.

Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the proposed lighting for the front of the building in the K-Style Lantern based on the following grounds:

- Design light fixtures and their placement to be compatible with and subordinate to historic buildings and the surrounding historic context.
- If new light fixtures are necessary, use concealed lighting or fixtures that are simple in character but compatible with the placement, design, scale, materials, and quality of lighting on adjacent historic buildings.
- Use the smallest possible fixtures hidden underneath cornices and parapets to minimize visual impacts to the extent feasible.
- Orient illumination downward for commercial and civic buildings. Do not design lighting for the sole purpose of attracting attention to building architecture or to building uses.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed signage, awning, and gooseneck and rear lighting with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Aubrey O'Laskey. Ms. O'Laskey stated that she has examples of the awning color (green), one being striped and one being a solid color.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion (Signage)

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve signage at 94 East Main Street with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Vice Chair Laster stated that the proposed signage is 14.75 feet, and the guidelines recommend 9 square feet, and is proposed to be positioned on the parapet.

Commissioner Worthington stated that one of staff's comments stated that only three signs can be present per building. For the false front façade, which one would the applicant like to remove?

Ms. O'Laskey asked the definition of signage considering the gold leaf lettering on the front door.

Ms. Bulay stated that signage is considered any type of wording, shapes or anything that relates to the message of the business.

Ms. O'Laskey explained that all the black lettering indicated in the documents would be in gold leaf. The main priority is the sign above the entrance, in black steel, along with the gold leaf on the front window. The flag would consist of a rabbit waving a French flag, a cream color on the green and is the lowest priority.

Vice Chair Laster stated that the guidelines and the zoning ordinance do not speak to the use of flags.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that there was a flag holder so she assumed a flag sign might be a possibility.

Commissioner Ingram asked staff if the previous sign was larger than the recommended square footage and if the two windows are considered two different signs.

Ms. Bulay explained that she requested a definition from the zoning administrator regarding window grouping areas. The two windows to the side of the entrance shown in the photo are considered individual window signs, so there are two of those. Then, the window, transom, and the main entrance are considered one window sign, as well. There are three window signs and one wall sign for this building. The guidelines recommend a maximum of three signs, but the zoning ordinance does not limit the signs.

Commissioner Worthington asked for clarification of the signs which include one sign above the awning and then three on the pair of windows flanking the entry.

Ms. Bulay stated that two signs flank the entrance and then the small window is considered a sign, as well.

Commissioner Barrett asked if staff was recommending removal of the transom.

Ms. Bulay explained that it would be up to the applicant to decide which sign to remove but the transom is considered part of the grouping of signage of the entrance and would not be sufficient to only remove the single transom. The signage for the false facade proposed are the three window signs and the wall sign above the awning, one of which would need to be removed.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that she would obviously like to keep the wall sign and suggested removing the Perenn on the windows, but the information stating what the business is, a bakery, restaurant and hours of operation would like to be kept, as well.

Ms. Bulay stated that the removal of the two window signs would follow the recommendation of no more than three signs per building.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that if she could keep one window sign, she would like to do so.

Ms. Bulay explained that yes, removal of one window sign would still honor the guideline recommendations.

Vice Chair Laster asked if it would be necessary for an amendment to the motion.

Mr. Harper stated that as of now, the motion on the floor is for approving the signage with staff conditions. "Staff please state the conditions."

Ms. Bulay stated that the conditions of approval for signage. "The proposed signage must be limited to three signs per building façade. For the false front building façade, one sign must be removed. The wall sign on the false front façade building must be reduced to 9 sq. ft. in area and installed no higher than 12' from grade. The window sign area coverage must not exceed 15% of the individual window or determined window grouping area per the Zoning Ordinance. All window signage must be applied fully within the interior of the building."

Vice Chair Laster stated that the conditions within the motion address the signage recommendation and Ms. O'Laskey would choose which sign she would like to have on the building.

The motion for signage carried 6-0.

Motion (Awning)

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to approve the awning, in solid green, as proposed for the building located at 94 East Main Street with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Ingram asked if the piping would be used on the solid green awning.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that yes piping would be used.

Commissioner Worthington asked how far the awning and columns would project from the building.

Ms. O'Laskey explained that after the metal awning fell after a recent snowstorm, Nashville Tent and Awning suggested using columns to support the weight of the awning that will cover the raised patio area.

Vice Chair Laster asked the dimensions of the columns.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that the columns are standard steel posts, but added structure will be used to create a more visually appealing column.

Commissioner Worthington suggested the applicant provide an architectural drawing that would show the dimensions of the awning, placement of the columns, and dimensions of the columns. The drawing would address staff condition number 5, the requirement of the awning having a 30-to-50-degree angle.

Ms. O'Laskey suggested, so that the application can be moved along, making the awning smaller so that columns are not necessary.

Commissioner Worthington stated that it's not just about the columns, but the entirety of the awning structure. The projection and the angle of the awing are critical to see so how much of the building's facade is covered by the awning. This is the first building as one enters downtown Franklin using Franklin Road. It's important to get the design "right." More technical information is needed to determine the appropriateness of the awning.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that the awning would be the exact proportions as the existing awning with the addition of the columns for support.

Vice Chair Laster asked Commissioner Worthington if she would like to motion to defer the awning portion of the application.

Commissioner Worthington stated that if the applicant could provide the drawings to staff, it would not be necessary to defer the awning approval.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the awning would look better without the columns.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that she would be willing to make the awning shorter so that the structural supports/columns would not be needed.

Commissioner Thompson suggested the applicant come up with an option that does not include the column and then provide the architectural drawings for the awning with the column.

Vice Chair Laster stated that the current discussion is more appropriate for a DRC meeting. Having drawings submitted to staff is not deciding on columns or angles.

Commissioner Ingram suggested that it may not be necessary because the new awning will replace the existing awning with the same measurements and angle.

Ms. O'Laskey explained that they would like to continue to have the patio covered and shaded for customers. The columns came into consideration when Nashville Tent & Awning suggested the columns for more structural support. The awning could be shortened to remove the need for the columns.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that the columns are not consistent with the architecture of the building.

Ms. O'Laskey stated that the columns could be removed.

Amendment (Awning)

Commissioner Marquardt amended the motion to state that the awning should be installed without the columns and the awning depth should either be the same as the existing awning or less, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

The motion to amend carried 6-0.

The motion as amended carried 6-0.

Ms. O'Laskey asked for clarification on the size of the K lighting. The existing lighting on the building is 4" larger than the K lighting.

Motion (Lighting)

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to approve the lighting, Style K, as presented in the application for the property located at 94 East Main Street, seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that it appears that the lighting is replacement in kind and is appropriate for the style of the building.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the K version is slightly more modern in shape and the proportions fit well with the building and it is an appropriate choice.

Commissioner Worthington explained that she understood why staff did not support the K Style lighting but, given the narrowness of the location of where the lantern would be, the non-historical K Style is more fitting for the location. The larger lantern would feel massive and overbearing and given the situation, the K Style can be supported.

Vice Chair Laster stated that he understands staff's comments, but the K 1 and K styles are basically the same style other than the K1 is more elongated. The backer plate adds to the light fixture and compliments the historical aspect.

The motion carried 6-0.

5. Consideration Of An Addition (Principal) At 713 Glass Ln.; Jay Sheridan, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The proposal is to add a 484 sq. ft. addition on the rear of the building and will serve as a conservatory/sunporch. The addition is situated so that the addition will not be visible from Glass Lane. The addition will mainly consist of large windows with corner boards that wrap on the corners of the addition and between the window/door panels. It is unclear if the application intends to utilize an accordion window/door configuration on the rear of the building, but it would be appropriate to utilize this element as it is on the rear of a non-historic building. The Guidelines recommend the following:

- Use roof materials compatible with the district, such as asphalt, wood, stone, slate, fiber-glass shingles, or standing-seam metal.
- Design new windows and new window openings to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings.

The proposed rear addition mostly meets the intent of the Guidelines, except for the utilization of a rubber membrane roofing material. However, this roof is tucked behind the main form of the building and will not be seen from Glass Lane. Additionally, the window specifications have not been provided as a part of this application and will need to be provided to the Preservation Staff prior to permitting. The proposed addition is appropriate within the Design Guidelines.

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

Applicant Speaker: Jay Sheridan and Michael Katsaitis. Mr. Sheridan stated that some window specifications had been provided, but he would work with Ms. Huffer on those details.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion:

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve Addition (Principal) At 713 Glass Lane with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Worthington asked the applicant why the rubber membrane roof was chosen.

Mr. Sheridan stated that it was chosen because of the pitch of the roof, which is one over 12.

Mr. Katsaitis explained that with a low-pitched roof, the only options are standing seam metal roofing or rubber membrane roofing (TPO) which is a welded rubber roof.

Vice Chair Laster noted that the roof cannot be seen from the street as the addition is completely at the rear of the building.

The motion carried 6-0.

6. Consideration Of Front Yard Fencing, Alterations And An Addition (Accessory) At 240 4th Ave. S.; Ben McCreary, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The National Register defines the principal building as a one-story, bungalow-influenced dwelling built in the ca. 1920s. The accessory structure is a one-bay garage built in the ca. 1925s with a gable-front roof, weatherboard siding, and original side-hinged double doors made of vertical wood board. Both the principal building and accessory structure contribute to the district. This application previously came before the Design Review Committee during the February 2025 meeting and has incorporated feedback into this design. Within this application there are several proposals:

- Front yard fencing
- Driveway extension
- Relocation of the existing accessory structure
- An addition to the existing accessory structure

Front Yard Fencing:

Three-foot-tall wood picket fencing is proposed around the perimeter of the front yard. The design guidelines recommend:

- Design fences and walls to be compatible with the architectural style of the building.
- Limit height to 3 feet.
- Differentiate gate design, materials, or detailing from the associated fence or wall design.

The proposed front yard fencing meets the intent of the Guidelines, but the proposed design of the gate has not been provided. It will need to be differentiated from the proposed fencing.

Driveway Alteration:

It is proposed to add 808 sq. ft. of new driveway to the existing driveway. The driveway addition is tucked behind the principal building and will not be highly visible from the street. As proposed, the driveway alteration is appropriate.

Relocation of Accessory Structure:

The existing accessory structure is located in the left corner of the property. It is proposed to shift the structure nearly 12' forward, so that the building will be situated closer to the principal building. The Design Guidelines strongly discourage relocation of historic accessory structures. DRC members were supportive of shifting the historic structure, so that it will

remain on the site, and it will be a subtle shift, so that it will appear the same from the street.

Accessory Structure Addition:

The existing wood frame accessory structure is 201.44 sq. ft. It is proposed to add a 456 sq. ft. addition to the structure to equate to a structure that will measure 657.77 sq. ft. The addition will wrap behind the existing structure and to the right of the structure. The addition will utilize a wood or composite lap siding that will match the reveal of the existing accessory structure and the asphalt roofing material to match the existing roofing material. The addition will utilize insets/offsets and a change in roof pitch to define the addition from the existing structure. The front elevation utilizes two carriage-style segmented garage doors with simple lighting above each door. The Design Guidelines recommend the following:

- Preserve and maintain historic accessory structures.
- 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.
- Design the massing, scale, and proportions to be subordinate to the historic building
- The appearance of height should be designed to be minimized from adjacent properties.
- Windows with historic profiles and dimensions with the double-hung appearance should be used.

While the addition does utilize insets, offsets, and roof breaks, and similar roof form elements as the principal building, the height of the addition is not subordinate to the historic accessory building according to the Guidelines. When the application came before the DRC, the DRC members supported the relocation and addition to the accessory structure. Window specifications have not been provided as a part of this application, this will need to be sent to Preservation Planning staff prior to permitting.

Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the relocation and addition of the accessory structure based on the following grounds:

- Maintain the original locations of historic accessory structures.
- 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.

Should the HZC approve the relocation and the addition of the accessory structure, there are several conditions outlined in the staff report that are recommended.

Applicant Speaker: Ben McCreary, Chisel Workshop. Mr. McCreary requested the Commissioner consider approval based on the shape of the site and to consider that the building has been minimized and is much smaller in scale compared to any adjacent structures. The garage subordinate to the primary building and the team has attempted to keep the building compatible with the neighborhood and surrounding properties.

Citizen Comments: None

Motion (Fencing)

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve front yard fencing (gate design to be approved by staff) for the property located at 240 4th Avenue South, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Commissioner Ingram asked if the gate design would need to be approved by the Commissioners.

Ms. Huffer stated that the gate is a minor change and can be approved by staff.

The motion for fencing carried 6-0.

Motion (Accessory Structure)

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve the Accessory Structure at 240 4th Avenue South as proposed, seconded by Commissioner Worthington.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the applicant has done a nice job of creating the accessory structure as a usable building for the property owners, along with the overall scale reduction and the positioning of the accessory structure behind the principal building.

Commissioner Worthington stated that it is a challenging site, and the applicant has done a good job of reducing the scale of the building.

Vice Chair Laster stated that he can support the motion because the applicant has created a design for the accessory building that is usable for the property owners instead of attempting to get rid of the building. Although the accessory building height is taller than the original accessory building, the accessory building is smaller and subordinate to the principal building.

The motion for the accessory structure carried 6-0.

Motion (Driveway Alteration)

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve the Driveway Alterations at 240 4th Avenue South with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Worthington asked the applicant what changes were made to the driveway.

Mr. McCreary explained that a strip of grass was added to reduce the amount of concrete paving. Also, a stone sidewalk replaced the paved sidewalk to have a more natural appearance and to reduce concrete paving.

The motion for the driveway alteration carried 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

7. Administrative COA For A Wall Sign At 220 2nd Ave. S.; Larry Westbrook, Applicant.

Sponsors:

8. Administrative COA For Sign Lighting At 98 E. Main St.; Tyler Ichein, Applicant.

Sponsors:

9. Administrative COA For Flood Vent Installation on Breeding Barn At 279 Franklin Rd.; City of Franklin, Kevin Lindsey, Applicant.

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

Commissioner Worthington motioned to adjourn the March 10, 2025, HZC Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Ingram. The motion carried 6-0.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:07 PM.


Chair

4/14/2025
Date