



City of Franklin

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

Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, May 12, 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

Chair LeMarinel called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Commissioners Present: Tyler LeMarinel, Chair; Brian Laster, Vice Chair; Michael Orr; Holly Thompson; Lisa Marquardt; Bob Barrett; and Mary Pearce.

Staff: 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 LeMarinel 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 Pearce motioned to approve the HZC April 14, 2025, Meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

The motion carried 7-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Regularly scheduled DRC will be next Monday, May 19th starting at 4 PM at the Eastern Flank Event Facility and the deadline to apply is midnight tonight, 5/12.
- Tomorrow, May 13th at 7:00 PM a proclamation will be made by the Mayor for Preservation Month, and all are welcome to attend and take a photograph for our proclamation reading!
- Preservation Mailers have been created and sent to residents of the HPO. A copy of the postcard can be found at your spot.

APPLICATIONS**2. Consideration Of In-Kind Replacement Of Elements And Roofing At 305 Public Sq. (Williamson County Historic Courthouse); Jenna Lee, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The property at 305 Public Square is located within the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District and the National Register of Historic Places. The courthouse is a two-story brick Greek Revival-style building with a stone foundation and a gable metal roof. The proposal includes a series of in-kind repairs and work to preserve the building. The proposal came before the Design Review Committee in March 2025 to discuss the proposed alterations to the building. As proposed, the application meets the intent of the Guidelines, and the work will further preserve the historic building for many years into the future.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the in-kind replacement and repair of elements with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant: No applicant present

MOTION: Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the item to the June 9, 2025, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Pearce noted that typically a Williamson County representative attends as a courtesy but is not required to attend.

Mr. Harper stated that he will research to confirm if a county representative is required to attend the meeting for a vote to occur.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

3. Consideration Of Alterations (Accessory) At 234 4th Ave. N.; Brandon Priddy, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Emily Bulay. The property located at 234 4th Avenue North is in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District and features a ca. 1935 one-story, veneered building with Tudor-revival influences. The site also features a circa 1970 concrete-block accessory building that was deemed non-contributing in the 2018 National Register update. The proposal came before the April Design Review Committee, and feedback has been incorporated into the COA application. The proposal includes replacing a retrofitted French door with a steel overhead garage door with a paneled design and 16-lite window pattern. The proposed garage door is seen elsewhere in the district and maintains a similar appearance to garage doors on nearby historic buildings along the street. The proposed garage door is appropriate in light of the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the garage door with the following conditions detailed in the staff report.

Applicant: Aaron Rogers. Mr. Rogers did not have any additional information to add but was present for questions.

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Alterations (Accessory) At 234 4th Ave. N. with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Citizen Comments: None

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

4. Consideration Of Site Alterations (Driveway) At 803 Fair St.; Samuel Whitson, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. The property located at 803 Fair Street is in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The site features a ca. 1930 one-and-a-half-story, Tudor revival house and a ca. 1930s front gable garage. The proposal includes replacing the existing asphalt driveway material. The driveway path will not be altered or expanded. The driveway material will be replaced with a chip and seal blend material with a concrete border. The proposed alteration is in keeping with the recommendations of the Guidelines as the materials are consistent with those recommended and are materials that are seen in the district.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the driveway alteration with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant: Samuel Whitson. Mr. Whitson stated that he would like to replace the driveway with a similar design used in other parts of the historic district using the same contractor.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve Site Alterations (Driveway) At 803 Fair St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

5. Consideration Of New Construction (Principal) At 115 Winslow Rd.; Michael Katsaitis, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. The property located at 115 Winslow Road is a vacant lot in the Franklin Road Historic District. A 1 ½-story principal structure with an attached garage in a neo-classical French revival style is proposed. Feedback from the April Design Review Committee meetings has been incorporated into the application. This item was most recently deferred during the April 14th Historic Zoning Commission meeting. The placement, orientation, form, size, height, foundation, roof, gutters, downspouts, site and setting are all unchanged from the last meeting and are appropriate and within the design guidelines.

Porches, Stoops, Decks, and Porte Cochere: A partial-width front porch is proposed at the front of the building. The porch is 9' deep and will be 13'6" wide. The porch will feature sets of simple, double columns, which are proposed to be approximately 12" in diameter. The material for the columns is not known but should be consistent with the guidelines. Materials and Exterior Finishes: The proposed building will be clad in lap siding. The lap siding will have a 4.5" reveal and is proposed to be in a neutral color that is in keeping with the traditional colors of a neo-classical building. The specifications of the material were not included in the application but should follow the design guidelines. The proposed materials and exterior finishes are consistent with the recommendations of the Guidelines.

Entrances: A ¾ lite door is proposed for the front entrance with flanking panels and sidelights. The front entrance is approximately 8' tall. The design of the doors is appropriate. Feedback has been incorporated into the design and scale of the front entrance and is now more compatible with those seen on historic buildings on the street. The materials were not specified but should be consistent with the design guidelines.

Windows: A variety of window patterns are seen on the building. The proposed windows appear to be appropriate. While a surround is proposed for the windows on the building, the surround should be raised.

Shutters: Shutters are proposed on the front of the building. The use of shutters is appropriate to the proposed architectural style. The material and size specifications must be consistent with the Guidelines.

Dormers: Three gable dormers are proposed on the front of the building. The dormers on the front façade will have a pitch of 9:12. The recessed dormers on the garage will have a pitch of 1:12. Feedback from the Design Review Committee meeting has been incorporated the size of the dormers on the garage have been reduced to assist in the massing of this portion of the building. The pitch of the dormers on the garage does not meet the recommended minimum pitch for dormers. However, the rear and less visible facades may offer additional flexibility.

Chimneys: A stone chimney is proposed at the front right corner of the building. A smaller chimney of the same design is proposed at the rear of the building at the covered porch. The proposed chimney appears to be compatible with the existing chimneys on neighboring historic buildings. The material of the chimney cap is not specified currently.

Modern Features: Mechanical equipment is proposed to be located along the right elevation. Landscaping is proposed to screen the equipment. The mechanical equipment must be screened from street view with landscaping, fencing, or walls.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the new construction with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant: Michael Katsaitis. Mr. Katsaitis stated that he would characterize the architecture as Greek revival. Mr. Katsaitis also added that the columns would be made of wood with doric caps and attic bases. The window casing measurements are 5/4 by 6 and would extend out in front of the siding. The chimney caps would either be clay pot or a decorative spark arrester.

Citizen Comments:

Stacy Ligon. Ms. Ligon stated that the home has evolved into a very appropriate style and size for the street and thanked the Commissioners and the applicant for their work in helping to create a great home for the neighborhood.

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve New Construction (Principal) At 115 Winslow Rd with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Pearce complimented the success of the project as it has come a long way. Ms. Pearce noted her concerns about the size and scale of the front right chimney and stated that it seems to draw too much attention. The chimney is too large in context with the house and needs some reworking so that the chimney is not the focal point. Commissioner Pearce recommended the use of brick for this style of home.

Commissioner Laster stated that the chimney was not part of the discussion at the last DRC meeting and noted that the chimney form is traditional, but the placement is non-traditional.

Commissioner Marquardt stated that her only concern was the larger chimney and asked staff if the chimney was consistent with existing homes along Winslow Road.

Ms. Bulay stated that several homes of varying styles along Winslow Road have front facing wide chimneys. Staff determined the chimney was consistent in height of the other homes in the area.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the house looks great, but the chimney needs to be reworked.

Commissioner Orr noted a neighboring home with a large front facing chimney.

Commissioner Laster stated that a front facing chimney is more representative of a Tudor style revival.

Commissioner Pearce explained that she believes that the non-traditional placement of the chimney may look odd in the context of the neighborhood because the chimney appears to be on the front elevation. Ms. Pearce also noted that she could not find a photo of stone chimney on a Colonial revival style home.

Commissioner Barrett stated that although he likes the style of the chimney, the proximity of the chimney to the front of the home is problematic.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the chimney looks odd for this style of home. Stylistically in scale and proportion the chimney doesn't fit the home, although Chair LeMarinel stated that he is very supportive of everything about the home other than the chimney.

Commissioner Laster suggested removing the chimney portion from the application so that the applicant can move forward with the next steps of the project.

Commissioner Pearce and Chair LeMarinel agreed with the removal of the chimney from the application.

Amendment (front corner chimney)

Commissioner Laster amended the motion to remove the front corner chimney from the application, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the applicant could come back to DRC with a separate plan for the chimney but would be able to move to the next step of the project.

Vote: 7-0

Amendment Passes

Amendment (window specifications approved by staff)

Commissioner Pearce amended the motion to include staff review and approval of window specifications, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Vote: 7-0

Amendment Passes

Vote (Main Motion as Amended Twice): 7-0

Motion Passes.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the application is amazing.

6. Consideration Of Site Alterations, Fencing, and Principal Building Alterations At 228 Franklin Rd.; Yates Bateman, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The property at 228 Franklin Road is located within the Franklin Road Local Historic District and is on the National Register for Historic Places. The building is a two-story frame Greek Revival-influenced residence constructed ca. 1846. The application has a series of work that is proposed:

- Reinstalling a front walkway and steps from the sidewalk of Franklin Road to the building.
- Replacing the existing concrete front steps with limestone steps.
- Installing stone columns at the street and stone columns with a vehicular gate.
- Constructing a ramp at the rear of the building.

- Installing a sports court and lighting at the rear of the property.
- Additional hardscaping will be installed at the rear of the building.
- Installation of 4-board horse fencing.

The guidelines recommend a max height of 4.5 feet for the 4-board horse fencing.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the application with conditions stated in the staff report.

Applicant: Yates Bateman. Mr. Bateman stated that he agrees with staff conditions and thanked staff and Commissioners for their efforts.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve Site Alterations, Fencing, and Principal Building Alterations At 228 Franklin Rd with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Laster stated that the alterations are for the Truett house and was the first nursery in Franklin. The architect did a tremendous job maintaining the traditional look of the home.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

7. Consideration Of Alterations (Window Replacement) At 438 Main St.; Viktoriia Bahliuk, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. The property located at 438 Main Street is in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District. The building is part of Five Points Place, a 1923 two-story commercial building clad in glazed bricks. The proposal includes the replacement of sixteen windows on the second floor of the building. The existing windows are one-over-one sash wood windows and utilize a storm window as well. The proposed replacement windows include thirteen single-hung full wood windows and three simulated hung wood windows. The existing condition of several of the windows has been submitted for review. Based on the images provided of the windows, the interior trim and window stool on the interior of the building appear to be deteriorated and may need repair. The applicant has noted that the windows are leaking. The windows on the rear of the building are historic wood windows that maintain segments of wavy glass. The windows on the front of the building, which are proposed to be replaced, do not have wavy glass. Additionally, surrounding the glass within the wood frame of the windows, which are proposed to be replaced, there is an aluminum trim piece that is not seen on the historic windows on the rear of the building. The Guidelines recommend the following:

- Preserve and maintain historic windows and historic window openings.

Based on the images provided, the windows do not appear to be in a state of disrepair for which replacement would be recommended. The existing conditions demonstrate a need to replace the interior trim work and window stools on the interior of the building, which does not require HZC approval to make the interior repairs.

Additional treatment on the exterior may be needed to prevent the windows from leaking from the exterior. However, additional information is needed to further understand the condition of the windows and if other repair alternatives are available, rather than replacement. A definitive age for the windows is not known, and as the Guidelines recommend preserving and maintaining historic windows, the application does not meet the recommendations of the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends denial of the window replacement based on the following grounds:

- Preserve and maintain historic windows and historic window openings.

If the HZC votes to approve the application, staff recommends a series of conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant: Viktoriia Bahliuk (Pella Representative). Ms. Bahliuk stated that the windows are leaking and recommends replacement with the Pella Reserve window which is a replica of the historic window. Pella will prepare the masonry opening, install the new window maintaining the same brick molding, and finish all the work inside and outside the window. From the

Pella Window Company standpoint, the windows cannot be replaced.

Julie Davis, Property Manager. Ms. Davis stated Ms. Cochran's intent is to replace the windows with historic replica windows and removed the storm windows. The front windows have sustained more damage than the rear windows. The interior window damage is significant.

Karen Cochran, Property Owner. Ms. Cochran stated that during the replacement of the glazed brick and mortar, a tremendous amount of water damage was discovered mostly on the inside but also on the outside of the windows. Ms. Cochran stated that Pella Windows were chosen because of their ability to complete the brick molding and replace the windows with historic replicas.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION (defer)

Commissioner Marquardt motioned to defer Alterations (Window Replacement) At 438 Main St to the next meeting because more information is needed about the outside damage to the windows.

Motion dies for lack of a second.

MOTION (to deny)

Commissioner Laster motioned to deny Alterations (Window Replacement) At 438 Main St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Laster stated that originally the building was known as the Samuel White Building and understands the applicant's intent is to do the right thing for the building. The guidelines recommend repairing historic windows and not replacing them. Looking at the photos, the deterioration appears to be on the trim and stool of the window and not the sashes. Commissioner Laster recommended investigating where the moisture is getting in through the brick causing the moisture issue. The Tennessee Historical Commission would be a resource that could provide guidance and possibly recommend contractors who do repairs for sensitive historic situations.

Commissioner Pearce agreed that a discussion on repairing and preserving the windows is necessary as this building is one of the stars on Main Street. Commissioner Pearce recommended taking a deeper look to understand the damage to the window and the source of the moisture.

Commissioner Orr noted that recently an applicant had the same issue and was able to find people who specialize in historic window repairs.

Chair LeMarinel noted that the glass appears to be insulated with an aluminum spacer which is a more modern construct which doesn't mean the windows are not old, but the guidelines are clear about repairing historical windows instead of replacing them.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

Chair LeMarinel stated that staff may be able to provide resources for window repairs.

Commissioner Pearce invited the applicant to attend the DRC meeting for more information and discussion.

8. Consideration Of New Construction (Parking Structure) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory); Benton Smothers, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The development plan for The Factory's proposed new buildings received a favorable Preliminary HZC Recommendation in January 2025 and the development plan and rezoning was approved by the Board of Mayor and Alderman in April 2025. The next step in the process is to obtain a COA, followed by Site Plan approval by the Planning Commission. The proposal was before the DRC in January, February, March, and April 2025 in preparation for the formal COA review. This part of the proposal includes constructing a new parking structure between the existing buildings numbered 3 and 5 on The Factory's Campus. This new building will face the Harpeth Industrial Court buildings. The development is proposed at 230 Franklin Road at The Factory of Franklin. The Factory Campus is in the Franklin Road Local Historic District and the site is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Within this application, a new parking structure is proposed.

Placement & Orientation

The new parking structure is proposed to be between the existing buildings 3 and 5 on the Factory Campus. These buildings will face the Harpeth Industrial Court. The National Register lists Buildings 3 and 5 as contributing buildings to the Factory site. The new parking structure will be tucked in behind the existing buildings on the site and is appropriately placed per the Guidelines.

Building Form

Feedback from previous DRC meetings has been incorporated into the form of the proposed building. The form of the surrounding buildings historically served the site as industrial buildings. Therefore, the building forms are not ornate, and they are simply designed to provide a space for the work that was needed at the time of their construction. The building form of the proposed structure is generally consistent with the surrounding buildings. The Guidelines recommend aligning the architectural features of the new building with the existing buildings. The size of the window and door openings, floor-to-ceiling heights, cornice alignment, and foundations of the new building have not been provided within the application to understand if the proposed building aligns with the existing surrounding buildings. Additionally, it is a Zoning Ordinance requirement for a new Commercial/Mixed-Use Building to vertically orient materials, design elements, and architectural details to emphasize the proportion of height to width. As proposed, the horizontal banding across the entire building emphasizes the building's horizontal appearance.

Building Height

The height of the building varies from 38'-6" on the main parts of the building to 47" at the tallest on one of the stair towers. The Preliminary HZC Recommendation noted that the average height of the buildings on the Factory Campus is 39'-1/2" in height; and ten percent above the average height is 42'-11". The submitted plans are noted to have a maximum height of 44'-2", which is different from the Preliminary Recommendation. Most of the building is underneath the Guidelines recommendation for height except for the stair towers, which will be 47' and 43'-8".

Materials & Exterior Finishes

Within the application, there are two options proposed for the main material of the building. Both options will be composed of a brick in the color "English Pub". However, the option lies in choosing between a traditional brick and a thin set brick panel with a series of concrete banding. The application indicates that if the traditional brick is utilized, then the concrete banding is not attainable. Feedback from several DRC meetings supported the use of a traditional brick over the brick panels. For the traditional brick option, only one elevation is provided, and additional information is needed for the other three sides of the building if banding was not utilized. There is a note that for the traditional brick option, the banding will be replaced with soldier and stacked brick. Additionally, there are two options for the metal paneling at the top of the building. The Zoning Ordinance regulates that accent materials can have up to 25% of each facade. These materials should be architectural metals, authentic stucco, or scored precast concrete. The Zoning Ordinance further prohibits corrugated metal for Commercial/Mixed-Use Buildings. The use of a traditional brick meets the Guidelines recommendation as that is what is seen on the Factory Campus. It is noted that the mortar color and mortar joint will be like Building 2. The provided materials of the silver corrugated metal is appropriate on the roofs of buildings as that is what is currently there and what could have been there previously. However, the utilization of a roofing material as a material on the side of a building does not meet the intent of the Guidelines. A sample of these materials have not been provided to staff to determine if these materials would meet the requirements of the Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance. More information is needed to understand what the building will look like if the banding is not utilized.

Roofs

The roof of the parking structure will be utilized as a parking floor. Several of the surrounding buildings do utilize a flat roof. The parapets of the parking structure will mostly screen smaller vehicles from the viewshed of Franklin Road.

Details & Ornamentation

The detailing of the cement banding and the use of brick on the proposed new building are like what is seen on the adjacent Building 2. The application notes that the proposed building will have 18" wide horizontal banding and 12" wide vertical banding. Information has not been included on the measurements of the width of the banding on Building 2, or if there are other buildings that utilize banding. The amount and design of the heavy horizontal banding along the length of the building emphasizes the horizontal, when coupled with the rest of the architectural details. As such, it does not meet the Zoning Ordinance requirement for vertical articulation. There is a note for an option that for the traditional brick option, the banding will be replaced with soldier and stacked brick and not utilize concrete banding. For the thin set brick panel option, the cement banding is utilized. Renderings have not been provided to show how the building would appear with the use of bricks in the space of concrete banding. Additionally, there are two options for the metal paneling at the top of the building. The design of the first option (inset brick) does not meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements for vertical articulation. Additional information is needed to determine if the second option meets the Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance.

Signs

Proposed signs are noted on the entrance to the parking structure, but additional information is needed to review and approve the proposed signs.

Entrances & Windows

On the lowest level of the garage, architectural metal frames will be in the window spaces. This was a suggestion during a DRC meeting to better blend the new construction with the existing buildings by utilizing metal framing members that appear as window frames. Information on the window sizes was not included within the application to fully understand if the window openings are compatible with the surrounding openings. While the windows are vertically proportioned, more detailed information is needed for the architectural metal window frames and the sizing of the window openings.

Connector Piece and Alterations

To comply with the Fire Department's requirements, the new building must be attached to the historic building. It is proposed that a 6" expansion joint will connect Buildings 3 and 5, with finished black metal flashing and framing will be attached to the new building. Additionally, several of the rear doors are proposed to be replaced with fire-rated doors.

Lighting

The renderings show existing lighting that is seen on the existing Building 11 entry. However, the lighting that was discussed at the DRC meeting was the lighting that will be on top of the garage and its visibility and light pollution that could be seen from Franklin Road. The proposed lights are appropriate to the site, but the entire lighting plan should be provided to understand if it meets the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends deferral of the application based on the lack of information on the following:

- Three elevations for the second option with traditional brick.
- Align the architectural features of the new building with those of nearby historic buildings, including floor-to-ceiling heights, cornice alignment, window and door heights, and foundations.
- Reinforce the appearance and rhythm of historic vertical divisions to maintain consistent facade widths.
- Use brick or masonry materials that are compatible in size, profile, and detailing with historic materials.
- Use decorative details in a manner that is compatible to those on nearby historic buildings while avoiding direct replication.
- Design new windows to be compatible with the size, placement, rhythm, and relationship of solids to voids of those on nearby historic buildings.
- Maintain vertically proportioned windows with traditional spacing patterns and alignment created by the upper-story windows of nearby historic buildings.

Applicant: Benton Smothers. Mr. Smothers explained that there would be no change in the height of the building. The use of metal panels is consistent with the approved metal panels of Building II. Mr. Smothers stated that he didn't provide a material example since the metal panels are the same for Building II and have been previously approved. As part of the DRC process, the banding was added to the building, but the original design could be used instead. As far as the banding, the widths could be shifted to 12" for the vertical bands and 18" for the horizontal bands solving the problem without changing the general design. Regarding the request to use thin brick, it provides safety, cleanliness and durability for use in the tight operating spaces around the historical buildings. This brick is actual brick than meets the zoning ordinance and the design

guidelines recommendations. Mr. Smothers asked for approval with conditions with the final materials approval by staff including brick mortar color, final metal color on the roof, size of banding (change to meeting the zoning ordinance) and lighting. The window design (shop drawings to be provided) would follow suit as all the other windows on the Factory site that have met the historical requirements for pane sizing.

Gina Emmanuel. Ms. Emmanuel stated that originally, she preferred the conventional brick but after many meetings with the garage manufacturer and seeing completed projects across the area and in other historic districts, the thin brick provides another option. The thin brick is actual brick that is more durable over time with less joint visibility whereas joints are regularly visible when using conventional brick.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Pearce motioned to defer, based on staff comments, New Construction (Parking Structure) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory) to the next voting meeting, June 9, 2025, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Pearce stated that if the project isn't in compliance with the zoning ordinance, that needs to be addressed first. Also, it sounds like the applicant is rethinking the banding around the building. Looking at other buildings with concrete banding, the banding gets dirty overtime and has the appearance that the building is unkept. Lastly, Commissioner Pearce, noted that the one of the goals of the parking garage is for all cars to be out of view from Franklin Road, not just small cars, as the applicant stated.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

Chair LeMarinel invited the applicant to the DRC meeting for more discussion as the parking structure is headed in the right direction, but more information and discussion is needed.

9. **Consideration Of Partial Demolition Of Buildings 9 & 10, New Construction (Hotel), And Construction of Refuse Locations At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory); Benton Smothers, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfels, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. This part of the proposal includes demolition of the farmer's market pavilion, demolition of Building 9, partial demolition of Building 10, construction of new refuse locations, and the construction of a new hotel building. These alterations will mostly be situated to the east of the existing buildings and will face Liberty Pike.

Farmer's Market Demolition

The pavilion is proposed to be demolished as part of this application. The application states the pavilion is a circa 2006 structure on the site. The demolition of the existing Farmer's Market pavilion is appropriate.

Building 9 and 10 Demolition

Part of the proposal includes partial demolition of Building 9 and incorporating Building 10 (which is a stand-alone building on the site) to have the non-historic additions to be removed and to be partly enclosed into the proposed new hotel building. The footprint of the new hotel building will include demolishing approximately fifty percent of Building 9 and then converting the remaining portion of the building into an open air, mostly roofless structure. Buildings 9 and 10 are contributing historical buildings. A building is deemed contributing due to its significance to the site and if its absence would lead to a negative impact on the site. For a building to remain contributing, it should visually read and retain its features like it did during the period of significance.

As shown in the plans, removing approximately fifty percent of the footprint of the building and removing a large part of the roof to be an open-air structure would not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards nor the Design Guidelines, as it would not retain the features of the building that are considered important to the structure.

Building 9

In previous meetings, it was stated that approximately fifty percent of the building is proposed to be demolished to accommodate the new hotel on the Factory's Campus. However, the submitted application indicates that all the remaining elements of the building facade that will face Liberty Pike will utilize the existing materials or will be replaced in-kind. The remaining portion of the building will be demolished. It appears that only one facade will remain on the building with wholesale replacement of the remainder. For a building to remain contributing, its historic features must be retained. As proposed, the building will not have a roofing system as it does today. The proposal does not meet the Guidelines for demolition. Additional information is needed on the final material selections and colors.

Building 10

Demolition of non-historic additions is proposed to building 10. The non-historic additions are appropriate to be removed as they were added circa 2015. They were reviewed by the Historic Zoning Commission at the time.

New Refuse Locations

Two new refuse locations are proposed on the Factory Campus. The design of the refuse enclosures appears to match the previously approved refuse design for materials, except for the sliding doors. The rendering appears to utilize brick and metal sliding doors. Additional information is needed for the measurements of these structures. Location 1 will be located beside the proposed parking structure. Location 2 will be located on the right side of the rear wing of the proposed hotel building. Location 1 will not be visible from the ROW, but Location 2 will be visible from Liberty Pike.

New Hotel Building

Placement & Orientation

The building is proposed to be situated at the end of the existing buildings and will partially encompass Buildings 9 and 10 into the footprint of the hotel. The placement of the building could block the viewshed of the historic buildings when coming from Liberty Pike to Franklin Road. The DRC has previously given feedback in recent meetings that the placement is appropriate to the site.

Building Form

The long-extended form of the building with a pitched roof is seen on several historic buildings on the site. While the overall form of the building appears to meet the Guidelines, additional detail about projection of the vertical brick pilasters is needed. In addition, the Guideline referring to aligning the architectural features of a building to other historic buildings that include the including floor-to-ceiling heights, cornice alignment, some window and door heights, and foundations have not been provided or have been partially provided.

Building Height

The Design Guidelines recommend making the height of new buildings consistent with the height of all historic buildings on the same block face by designing buildings to be within ten percent above or below the average height of the historic buildings on the same block face. The average height of the buildings on the Factory Campus is 39'-1/2" in height; with the recommendation of the 10 percent height addition, the height recommended would equate to 42'-11". The proposed height of the three-story building meets the Design Guidelines recommendation and is proposed to be 42'-7". The Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum 13' ground floor height but can be reduced in the HPO for compatibility to surrounding buildings. Additional information is needed to review the ground floor height compared to other historic buildings on the campus.

Materials & Exterior Finishes

It appears that the building is proposed to be constructed out of red brick with gray mortar, with black metal accents, and a gray metal roof. Final material selections have not been provided as a part of the application. Additional information is needed to determine the appropriateness of the materials as it relates to the surrounding historic materials.

Details & Ornamentation

On the proposed building, there are some elements that have been incorporated into the design that are seen elsewhere on the Factory Campus. These elements include the black metal paneling and the ribbon windows. These elements that have been incorporated help the building blend with the existing historic buildings on the site.

Signs

Signs have not been included as a part of this application. The Guidelines recommend considering signage placement as part of the overall building design.

Entrances & Windows

Within the application is a window study with some of the measurements of the existing windows compared to the proposed windows on the new hotel. While some of the windows on the new building are smaller than the existing buildings' windows, other windows on the new building exceed what is on the historic buildings, such as the ribbon windows on the new building are larger than the historic ribbon windows. Additionally, the "cube" portion of the hotel does not relate to any window opening existing on the Factory Campus but does relate to X-shaped cabling seen on the campus. Window and door samples have not been provided as part of this application.

Awnings & Canopies

There are several awnings/canopies that are proposed on the hotel building. Within the application they are noted as a "marquee". The most prominent canopy is visible on the South and East elevations, which will face Liberty Pike. Facing Liberty Pike, the canopy will project 18' and on the East side facing the railroad tracks, the projection will be 10'. The canopy material is noted to be "metal roofing to match the appearance of the existing". A material sample has not been provided for the canopy or the brackets. On the North elevation facing the Harpeth Industrial Court, a smaller metal canopy is also proposed. Additional information is needed on the material selections of the canopies.

Mechanical Equipment

The mechanical equipment in two locations are proposed to be 4' taller than the parapet. Per the Design Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance, rooftop equipment must be screened from street view.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the Farmer's Market Pavilion and demolition of the circa 2015 addition to Building 10 with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Staff recommends deferral on the demolition of Building 9, the new refuse locations, and the new hotel based on the following grounds:

- Overall material selections
- Measurements of the refuse areas
- Align the architectural features of the new building with those of nearby historic buildings, including floor-to-ceiling heights, cornice alignment, window and door heights, and foundations.
- Final window and door selections

Applicant: Read Tally. Mr. Tally stated that over the last few months discussions at the DRC meetings have been productive and the application reflects the progress. There are a handful of items touched on that could be appropriate for conditional approval. Building 9, the team feels this has been discussed thoroughly. The building has lost its structural integrity as illustrated in the architectural and structural engineering report. The plan is to keep the first bay and use original materials if possible. If this is not possible due to deterioration or rot, the use of in-kind materials is proposed. As much as possible, the hotel materials will match the other parts of the Factory from the brick, mortar, roof, windows and colors. The same architectural metal, previously approved, used throughout the Factory is proposed for the hotel building. The team would like to get into the construction documents and specs stage to provide more fully vetted materials and feels that is premature to do so now. The windows and doors are proposed to be historic replicas with narrow mutton profiles, as seen on other parts of the Factory. Regarding ceiling height, there are not any standardized ceiling heights at the Factory as the team made an honest attempt to align the window elevations by size and height. The front elevation of the hotel resembles the front façade of the Factory. If the ceiling height is pushed to 13 feet, that will push the other issues out of sync with what the team been trying to accomplish over the past five months. Moving from north to south, the building height is consistent but there is a 4-foot rise in elevation. The lowest elevations are at the front where public space is (exposed ceilings) and at the back where the 4-foot rise occurs, private spaces such as offices and guest rooms will be housed, appropriate for lower ceilings. The mechanical equipment is conservatively sized and as the project moves forward, more specific equipment will be determined. The manufacturer has confirmed that the equipment can be painted to match the parapet and is somewhat self-shielding as the metal is smooth without coils and not obviously mechanical. Mr. Tally stated that to provide screening for the equipment, it will require offsets for clearance requirements making it pop up and be more visible. The team is proposing to move forward with the condition to add the screening later if the mechanical equipment isn't screened enough. The refuse enclosures are proposed to have two bays with only one visible from the street. The visible one is next to the hotel and has been pushed back as far as possible from Liberty Pike with the opening to the north, away from primary views. Again, the intention is to match the material as much as possible and would submit the materials for approval if they are different than what was proposed.

Citizen Comments:

James Blair, Nashville, TN. Mr. Blair noted his special interest in the future of the Factory as grandson of Dortch Stove Works owner. Mr. Blair supports construction of the hotel and as the design of the hotel has been reviewed by the HZC, it continues to get better and better. Regarding demolition of buildings 9 and 10, although demolition is the last resort, the buildings have lost their structural integrity and Mr. Blair noted that he is thankful for what is being preserved. Overall, Mr. Blair stated his support for the hotel and hoped the HZC will approve the hotel so it can move to the next stage.

MOTION (Farmers Market & Building 10, 2015 Addition Demolition)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve demolition of Farmers Market & Building 10, 2015 Addition At 230 Franklin Rd with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

MOTION (Refuse Locations)

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve the Refuse location and materials as shown at 230 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Laster asked why the applicant chose sliding doors for the refuse locations instead of swinging doors previously used at the Factory.

Mr. Smothers stated that it is an operational choice. The swinging doors can be problematic and interact with the trucks when entering and exiting.

Chair LeMarinel noted that most of the Commissioners felt comfortable with placement of the refuse, it was the logistical issue that official documents with dimensions for the public record were not provided. If the same materials used in other places at the Factory are going to be used, the applicant should indicate that with the information pertaining to the material specifications.

MOTION to Defer (Refuse Locations)

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the Refuse Locations to the June 9, 2025, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Pearce stated that specific dimensions and material specifications are needed along with staff's recommendation to defer.

Chair LeMarinel stated that not enough information is provided to decide comfortably.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

MOTION (Building 9 Partial Demolition)

Commissioner Orr asked staff for their reasoning against demolition of Building 9 and stated that he felt like previous lengthy discussions determined that a section could come down and the front elevation facing Liberty Pike would be rebuilt to look like it did historically.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the Commission had given feedback stating that partial demolition could be acceptable, but staff's position has always been against demolition of Building 9.

Commissioner Pearce explained that demolition goes against the guidelines but several of the Commissioners had given feedback stating that they were comfortable with partial demolition.

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve partial demolition of Building 9 as proposed at 230 Franklin Road, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Orr stated that the rationale for going against staff recommendations is because the Commissioners agreed that partial demolition of Building 9 was acceptable, and the applicant was given that direction and moved forward with the project.

Commissioner Pearce explained that as a rule, one would not demolish a historic building under any circumstances, but given the context of this large, extraordinary project, bending the guidelines, a bit, is appropriate.

Commissioner Laster alternatively noted that he wasn't sure if this decision would be considered going against the guidelines. The guidelines provide criteria and one of those is that if the building has lost its historical integrity. Given the additions to the building, the replacement of posts, the fact the building was a lumber shed and then enclosed for many years, one might say it lost its historical integrity and structural integrity.

Commissioner Pearce added that if this single building existed in another location and in a different context, her opinion would be to save the building.

Ms. Huffer noted that if the building will be partially demolished there are no specifications regarding material other than to be replaced in kind. There are no specific call outs for materials or replacement of the same color and profile. Staff would like clarification.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the application says the preserved part will be maintained unless rot is encountered and will be replaced with wood. An amendment could be offered to say that any in kind replacements must return to the preservation staff for approval.

Amendment to (Building 9 Partial Demolition)

Commissioner Laster amended the motion to include that any in kind replacements must return to the preservation staff for approval, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Pearce added that the amendment provides a solution to the concern.

Vote: 6-1 (Commissioner Marquardt voting against)
Amendment Passes

Vote (Building 9 Partial Demolition as Amended): 7-0
Motion Passes

MOTION (New Hotel Construction)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to defer New Hotel Construction at 230 Franklin Road to the June 9, 2025, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Marquardt.

Commissioner Laster stated that for the first time the Commission is seeing renderings with color that show how the hotel building begins to merge and become part of the Factory. It would be nice to see more of that at the next DRC meeting.

Commissioner Pearce stated that as much as she tries to stay away from public comments or discussions about pending projects, the community considers this a large significant building, and the Commission needs to see all the details and know as much as possible before approving.

Chair LeMarinel noted the project is headed in the right directions, but another layer of detail is needed including material samples and window specification with photos. Regarding the mechanical equipment, screening must be provided per the zoning ordinance so the Commission needs to know the exact dimensions and if the units will be visible or not. If so, what type of screening is proposed.

Commissioner Laster also suggested that discussions at the DRC meeting should focus on staff concerns only and not the full application.

Commissioner Pearce asked if the applicant will be presenting a Lighting package.

Ms. Huffer stated that, as this point, a lighting package has not been presented.

Commissioner Marquardt suggested seeing more information relating to the "cube" comment made by staff.

Vote: 7-0

Motion Passes

OTHER BUSINESS

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

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

10. **Administrative COA For Signage (Reface) At 138 3rd Ave. N.; Emily Rawls, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

11. **Administrative COA For Signage (Reface) At 109 1st Ave. N.; Emily Rawls, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

12. **Administrative COA For Sandwich Board Sign At 339 Main St.; Forrest Moodie, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

Commissioner Orr motioned to Adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Laster. The motion carried 7-0. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:59 PM.

Orin Laster
June 9, 2025

