



## Meeting Minutes

### Historic Zoning Commission

---

Monday, August 11, 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. 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](mailto: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 at the meeting location. Speakers may sit in the meeting location.

#### CALL TO ORDER

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

Commissioners Present: Bob Barrett, Madalyn Ingram, Brian Laster, Tyler LeMarinel, Holly Thompson, Michael Orr

Commissioners Absent: Lisa Marquardt, Mary Pearce, Kathy Worthington

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. Chair LeMarinel stated that the HZC received two public comments regarding items 12 and 13 and those have been published with the agenda packet.

Comments on agenda items may be made in person at the meeting or by emailing [planningintake@franklintn.gov](mailto:planningintake@franklintn.gov) before noon on the day of the meeting. Emailed comments will be provided to the Commission and included in the minutes, but not read aloud in their entirety during the meeting.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### 1. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes

Sponsors:

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the HZC July 14, 2025, Meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

The motion carried 5-0 (Commissioner Madalyn Ingram was not present at the time of the vote).

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Huffer stated that the next DRC Meeting will be held next Monday, August 18, 2025, at 4 pm here at the Eastern Flank Event Facility. Applicants along with anyone invited to DRC should email staff of their intent to attend DRC by midnight, tonight, August 11, 2025, to be added to the agenda.

## APPLICATIONS

### 2. Consideration Of Alterations (Principal) At 802 Fair St.; Bill Clark, Applicant.

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 802 Fair Street is located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The site features a ca. 1924 side-gabled cottage principal building and is considered a contributing building to the historic district. The proposal includes a request to replace all the existing aluminum siding with a new Ply Gem Envoy Aluminum siding intended to match the existing material. The exact material for in-kind replacement is no longer manufactured, and a close match for the material is proposed. The applicant has noted that beneath the existing aluminum siding, there isn't consistent siding found on the house. As the age of the material is not known, replacing the material with what is proposed, like what is existing is appropriate with an in-kind material with similar appearance. The replacement of the material with an in-kind material and similar appearance is appropriate and does not negatively impact the historic significance as the aluminum siding is presently on the building.

Recommendation: Staff recommended approval of the siding replacement with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Bill Clark. Mr. Clark was present but did not have any other information to add.

Citizen Comments: None

### MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve Alterations (Principal) At 802 Fair St with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

The motion carried 6-0.

### 3. Consideration Of Alteration (Principal Roof Material) At 1835 William Campbell Ct. (Magnolia Hall Lot 2); Jennifer Lombard, Applicant.

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 1835 William Campbell Court is located in the Boyd Mill Avenue Historic District, lot 2 at Magnolia Hall. The proposal includes an alteration to the approved plans to change the roof material on the conical porch element from asphalt shingle to standing seam metal. The standing seam metal that is proposed is found on the front façade of the building including already over the box bay window. The use of a standing seam metal roof is an appropriate roof covering material alteration on the front porch.

Recommendation: Staff recommended approval of the roof material alteration on the front porch with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Jennifer Lombard. Ms. Lombard stated that the reason for the change is because the manufacturer would not warranty the shingles on the conical shape. Ms. Lombard also noted that she has material samples for the Commissioners to see.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve Alterations (Principal Roof Material) At 1835 William Campbell Ct. (Magnolia Hall Lot 2) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he likes how the metal material coordinates and stated that originally some metal was proposed. To not draw attention, the shingle would have been toned down, but it makes sense to use the metal material.

The motion carried 6-0.

#### **4. Consideration Of Signage And Lighting At 230 Franklin Rd. (Carousel Building); Raenah Anderson, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 230 Franklin Road is located in the Franklin Road Historic District. The proposal is for the installation of two wall signs on the new carousel building at the Factory. The signs are proposed to be installed above the entrance and windows on the front and rear elevations. The signs will be 19' by 4'6", or 85.5 sq. ft. each and located 17'6" from grade. The Guidelines recommend the following for wall signs:

- A sign area of 9 square feet and proportionate to the building facade
- Maximum height of 12 feet from grade

The proposed size exceeds the recommended size maximum of 9 sq. ft., and the placement exceeds the recommended maximum height of 12' from grade.

Recommendation: Staff recommended denial of the application based on the guidelines for wall sign area and maximum height from grade.

If the commission votes to approve the application, the following conditions outlined in the staff report are recommended.

Applicant Speaker: David Click. Mr. Click stated that the sign dimensions had been reworked so that the total square footage measures 57.5 square feet which aligns with what was already approved. The sign design would be the same other than the overall reduction in size.

Chair LeMarinel asked staff to review what was approved and asked if the mural would have been in the same position as the sign (in the gable area).

Ms. Bulay stated the mural was approved with a modification of standards for placement. The mural itself was never reviewed or proposed, instead the applicant is proposing a wall sign. The proposed location of the sign is the same location as what was approved through the MOS. The MOS was approved prior to alterations (windows being pushed higher on the building) being made to the building, changing the location slightly.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Thompson motioned to deny Signage And Lighting At 230 Franklin Rd. (Carousel Building) and stated that the sign did not have enough of a historical design to go against the guidelines. The sign should be more historically significant if the sign is going to be larger.

The motion fails for a lack of a second.

Commissioner Orr asked staff if the revised sign dimensions mentioned by the applicant would meet the zoning ordinance requirements for a wall sign.

Ms. Bulay stated that the revised sign would meet the zoning requirements for a wall sign in the same location and placement.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the revised sign would meet the zoning requirements, but the wall sign still goes against two of the guidelines for height and square footage. Because a MOS was previously approved, the revised sign dimensions would be acceptable.

Ms. Bulay noted that the revised sign would meet the general intent of the zoning ordinance.

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Signage And Lighting At 230 Franklin Rd. (Carousel Building) with staff conditions and not to exceed 57.5 feet, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Ingram noted that the wall sign photo in the application documents is shown before the size revision.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the photo is the supersized version prior to the reduction in height and width. Chair LeMarinel asked the applicant what percentage the reduction of the overall sign size is. It appears to be about a 46% reduction in size.

Mr. Click stated that the width is reduced from 19 feet to 15.7 feet and the height is reduced from 4.5 feet to 3.8 feet. Essentially the wall sign is in alignment with the windows but may extend 2-3 inches in width on each side.

Commissioner Laster stated that if the sign can fit within the scope of the windows, the sign would be aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Laster noted that this is a reasonable request.

Commissioner Thompson stated that if the sign fits within the same dimensions as the windows, the proposal can be supported and asked about the sign photo in the application documents relating to size.

Mr. Click stated the sign would have the same color scheme and same font as seen in the photo, but the dimensions have been reduced.

Commissioner Thompson stated that if the sign is smaller, it will look fine. Considering the huge version of the sign, it would need to look different.

Ms. Dannenfelsler stated that the staff's condition is based on square footage so if the Commission would like the signage to stay within the dimensions of the windows, that needs to be stated.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he is comfortable either way.

The motion carried 6-0.

#### **5. Consideration Of Awning (Principal) At 900 Fair St.; Stephen Scott, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelsler, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 900 Fair Street is located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The site features a ca. 1895 one-story building, which contributes to the district. The applicants attended the June and July DRC meetings, and feedback has been incorporated into the application. The proposal includes the removal of the existing green, arched fabric awning and installation of a copper awning with brackets over the entrance to the front porch. The proposed awning style utilizes a Juliet design. The bracket design is proposed to be metal and use a scroll design. The Guidelines recommend the following:

- Use duck canvas or cotton and polyester blends with or without acrylic treatment. Avoid vinyl awnings.
- New architectural features should not be added.

The use of a copper material for an awning is not supported by the Guidelines and the proposed bracket adds an ornamental detail that is not seen elsewhere on the front facade of the historic building.

Recommendation: Staff Recommends denial of the application based on the following Guidelines:

- Use duck canvas or cotton and polyester blends with or without acrylic treatment. Avoid vinyl awnings.
- New architectural features should not be added.

If the commission votes to approve the application, conditions of approval are recommended and outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Stephen Scott. Mr. Scott stated that he understands that copper is not a recommended material in a historic district, but copper material has been approved by the HZC in some situations. Mr. Scott referenced application photos showing the use of copper as the material in the historic districts. Mr. Scott noted that copper was chosen because copper will patina over time, matching the existing material on the house. The fabricator highly recommended against use of a standing seam metal as this type of awning would not be the intended “look” we’re going for – making it look like a cheapened version. The goal is to remove the rounded green awning as it is not aesthetically pleasing. As far as the brackets go, this is not a deal breaker as the objective is to remove what is there now. Based on the feedback from the DRC meeting, Mr. Scott explained that he thought he had chosen a bracket that would be appropriate.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve with staff conditions an Awning (Principal) At 900 Fair St, seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

Commissioner Ingram stated/asked if the Board approves with staff conditions, will canvas be used or could metal be used.

Ms. Bulay explained that the only condition staff had was if the application were being approved against staff’s original recommendation, so in this case the Board’s motion is for approval meaning the copper material would be approved.

Commissioner Ingram asked the applicant if the drawings were to scale as they appear slightly shorter than last time.

Mr. Scott noted that the drawings were generated by AI and are as close to scale as possible and yes, there would be a increase in size. The size is very close to the application drawing.

Commissioner Orr stated you can count the brick and see, but the size is very close.

Commissioner Barrett asked if the Board is also approving the brackets in the motion.

Chair LeMarinel stated that a drawing is included in the application, so they are part of the approval. Looking at the drawing it could be frilly, but a side profile is shown and not the actual picture. For a Tudor style home, the bracket design is not too busy and considering the ironwork on the gate, the bracket design blends with existing elements of the building.

Commissioner Ingram stated that the brackets selected by the applicant look good and seem appropriate for the home.

Commissioner Orr noted that the brackets are not massive and do not overwhelm the doorway.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the canopies in the photos are larger than the canopy under consideration. The canopy should hold a lot of weight on top making the brackets seem smaller.

The motion carried 6-0.

## **6. Consideration Of Site Alterations At 1002 Fair St.; Jeff Fleishour, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 1002 Fair Street is located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The site features a ca. 1885 one story Queen Anne style house that has elaborate detailing and a ca. 1950 concrete block garage, both of which are contributing to the National Register District. The proposal includes a request for two site alterations including:

- Installation of a covered pergola walkway
- Installation of a pea gravel rain garden

The first request is to install a pergola-covered walkway from the rear of the building to the side of the accessory structure and the second request is for the installation of a pea gravel rain garden in the rear yard. The Guidelines recommend the following for other site and setting alterations.

- Generally, site and setting alterations should be considered as appropriate when they are undertaken in locations that are not visible from public view, do not involve the removal of historic features, and do not detract from or overwhelm the context of the historic districts.

The pea gravel rain garden will not be visible from public view, does not involve the removal of historic features, and does not detract or overwhelm the context of the historic districts. The design of a flat-top-covered pergola walkway will be visible from public view and a pitched pergola design is not seen in the historic districts and may overwhelm the context of the district.

Recommendation: Staff recommend denial of the pergola walkway cover based on the following Guideline:

- Generally, site and setting alterations should be considered as appropriate when they are undertaken in locations that are not visible from public view.

Recommendation: Staff recommend approval of the pea gravel rain garden with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Jeff Fleishour, contractor. Mr. Fleishour stated that the purpose of the covered pergola walkway is simply to provide protection when walking from the garage to the house. The pergola adjacent to that would be coming off the house at 10 feet. Both pergolas are well behind the house and out of view. Visually, one would have to really try to see either pergola. Originally, an exterior kitchen extended out to the east and after a conversation with staff, the area was truncated off and placed behind the house to stay within the guidelines.

Chair LeMarinel asked the applicant if the walkway is being proposed to be an open air or covered.

Mr. Fleishour stated that the request is for a covered walkway.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the open-air pergola covers the dining area and the outdoor kitchen. Chair LeMarinel asked if that was the staff's understanding of the application.

Ms. Bulay stated that staff understood that the entire walkway was going to be covered with a pergola and it would be open air and not a fully covered walkway.

Chair LeMarinel stated that staff is recommending denial based on the visibility of the pergola.

Ms. Bulay stated that a pergola is reviewed under site and setting alterations following the recommendations of the Guidelines. The walkway was not evaluated as a covered connector from the house to the garage because the request was not understood. Denial was recommended for the open-air covered walkway based on the guidelines.

Randy Thompson, homeowner. Mr. Thompson thanked the Board for their work and service to the city. Mr. Thompson

explained that he has three adult children with a genetic disorder requiring each to use a motorized wheelchair to move around. All three children are successful adults with careers. The entire project is intended to create an environment so that they can move around the property as easily as possible when they come home to visit. For people who use wheelchairs, everything is an obstacle. The goal of the project is to make a space where wheelchairs can go from the house to the cottage without getting wet.

Chair LeMarinel asked staff if the pathway is completely covered if it would be considered differently.

Ms. Bulay stated that it would change the guidelines it is reviewed under. For awning, canopies and breezeways there are different guidelines to consider for visibility. One is to choose a path that lessens the length and expanse of the walkway.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Thompson motioned to defer the item to the September 8, 2025, HZC meeting so that the covered walkway can be considered under the correct guidelines, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Ingram invited the applicant to attend the DRC meeting to discuss further.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the images were helpful but did not reflect the exact configuration. It would be helpful for the applicant to request a covered walkway which may be in better alignment with the guidelines and room for interpretation based on those guidelines.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the discussion was helpful, and staff would reach out to the applicant about attending the next meeting.

The motion to defer carried 6-0.

### **7. Consideration Of Alterations At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory Hotel); Benton Smothers, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property at 230 Franklin Road is the site of The Factory of Franklin. The Factory Campus is located in the Franklin Road Local Historic District, and the site is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The application packet includes

- Metal roofing, gutters, and downspouts on the hotel building,
- Screening of the mechanical equipment on the hotel building,
- The change of a portion of the facade, that involves windows

The preservation staff only reviewed these items even though there are other items that are not addressed that have changed from the previous submittals. Regarding metal roofing, the applicant proposes using a galvalume 5V metal roof on the building which appears to meet the guidelines. Silver galvalume gutters and downspouts are also proposed on the building and meet the guidelines. Galvalume 5V metal roofing and dark colored gutters and downspouts can be found on the Factory campus. The proposed material for the mechanical equipment screening is proposed to be the same material as the roof, a 5V galvalume material. The proposed exhaust fan screening color appears to blend with the roofing material that was supported by DRC members during the August meeting. Lastly, the proposed change of right façade that faces the parking lot and railroad line is proposed to be altered. The previous design utilized dark metal siding to the ground of the building and three large windows on each floor of the building. The proposed change of design will have four ground-floor windows surrounded by brick and then the dark metal siding will begin above the windows. The guidelines recommend designing new windows to be compatible with the size, placement, rhythm, and relationship of solids to voids of those on nearby historic buildings. It is unknown what the size of the new windows are proposed to be and if they relate to the existing sizes of the windows of the buildings on the Factory.

Recommendation: Staff recommends deferring the change of the facade based on the following grounds.

- Design new windows to be compatible with the size, placement, rhythm, and relationship of solids to voids of those on nearby historic buildings.

Recommendation: Staff recommend the approval of the galvalume 5V metal roofing, galvalume gutters, galvalume downspouts, and galvalume metal screening for the new exhaust fans with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Read Talley. Mr. Talley explained that the goal of this proposal is to address the roofing material so that the COA can be granted and a site plan submitted. Mr. Talley stated that he doesn't want the other items to get in the way of that as the team is working toward submitting construction documents. During the process adjustments will be made requiring the team to bring the items before the Board. Regarding the three items proposed for this submittal, the team feels confident about and believe they are appropriate and ready to discuss. The team continues to work on the other items and once those are complete will be brought before DRC and then the HZC for discussion and approval. Regarding the windows, the teams is proposing additional windows of the same grid pattern (as seen throughout the Factory) for the fitness room to allow more natural light.

Chair LeMarinel asked for a clarification of the roof, gutters, and downspout material. The application indicated galvalume gutters and downspouts but then referred to them as silver metal.

Mr. Talley confirmed that the material for the roof, gutters, and downspouts will be galvalume or galvanized material. Mr. Tally provided brick samples showing one brick sample brand new straight out of the package and the other brick showing how the brick would weather/age over time.

Citizen Comments: None

Chair LeMarinel stated that he would like to address the all the metal elements (roof, gutters, downspouts and screening) in one motion and a second motion to address the windows.

## **MOTION**

Commissioner Barrett motioned to approve the galvalume material for the roof, gutters, downspouts and screening for the Factory Hotel at 230 Franklin Road with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Ingram thanked the applicant for bringing the brick samples and asked the applicant to estimate the timeframe before the aging process would occur.

Mr. Talley stated that the aging process depends on the weather conditions, but he would estimate 5-7 years.

The motion carried 6-0.

## **MOTION**

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the window alterations to the September 8, 2025, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Laster asked the applicant if the window alterations were presented at the DRC meeting.

Mr. Talley stated that the alterations were discussed.

Chair LeMarinel noted that he remembered the discussion and stated that he would like to see the facade finalized so that the Commission can see the proposal all at once.

Commissioner Ingram agreed with Chair LeMarinel.

The motion to defer carried 6-0.

## 8. Consideration Of Alterations (Principal) At 319 N. Margin St.; Wilson Stevenson, Applicant.

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Ms. Bulay stated The property located at 319 North Margin Street is located in the Downtown Franklin Historic District with a ca. 1900 one-story frame duplex. A Certificate of Appropriateness was granted in 2021 for building alterations include raising the building one-foot, new wood siding on three facades, new cementitious siding on the rear, select window replacement, and deck expansion on the rear. The proposal includes continuing with the exact same approved plans with two alterations, which include the use of smooth cementitious siding on all facades of the building and replacement of all windows on the building. The proposed smooth cementitious siding will utilize the approved 5" reveal for the entirety of the building. The second alteration to the approved plans includes replacing the two original windows which were to be preserved as a condition of approval on the approved COA. The windows could not be preserved due to the termite damage and deterioration from damages from flooding. The proposed window will match the approved window profile of the windows which were approved in the original COA. The Guidelines recommend the following:

- Replace deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding.
- To use Smooth cement board siding may be appropriate for replacement of deteriorated wood siding on rear facades.

This request is to install a smooth cementitious siding on all facades of the building and is not appropriate. The request to replace the two identified original windows on the building with the window profile which was previously approved for the remaining windows is appropriate.

Recommendation: Staff recommend denial of the request for the installation of smooth cementitious siding on all facades based on the following Guidelines:

- Replace deteriorated siding with siding that matches the original siding. Do not install vinyl or other synthetic siding. Smooth cement board siding may be appropriate for replacement of deteriorated wood siding on rear facades.

Recommendation: Staff recommend approval of the window replacement with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Wilson Stevenson. Mr. Stevenson stated that this house has been vacant since the early 1990's with multiple exterior materials used over the years including wood, asphalt, vinyl siding, and using inferior materials that have the same appearance does not make sense. Mr. Stevenson explained that \$70,000 has been spent to redevelop and improve the building and lot and it has been extremely difficult. Lastly, Mr. Stevenson stated that he feels that the proposed material would be best for the home.

Chair LeMarinel asked staff to pull up the photos of the property and asked if the photos were taken before the home was lifted.

Mr. Stevenson explained that the home could not be lifted as there was no foundation coupled with termite damage and the fact the home had burned twice. Two other developers have attempted and failed to bring the house up to standards. Mr. Stevenson said he was ready to get started and finish restoring and redeveloping the home.

Citizen Comments: None

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve Alterations (Principal) At 319 N. Margin St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Chair LeMarinel asked if the motion includes both elements, window replacement and siding.

Commissioner Thompson stated yes and asked if staff recommended the use of actual wood and is that the only option other

than replacing the vinyl.

Ms. Bulay stated that it was originally approved to utilize wood siding on all three facades and to use cementitious siding only on the rear for historic residential buildings.

Commissioner Thompson stated that if the cementitious siding is approved for the rear, it looks basically the same, is long lasting and does not change the look, it would be acceptable. Replacing three of the facades with vinyl seems to be the least desirable choice.

Commissioner Laster stated that he can support use of cementitious siding because the historic home that existed in 2021 does not exist today as shown by the photographs. The original intent was to repair the siding of the home but according to the photos there isn't any siding to be replaced. Cementitious siding would be approved for new construction which is basically what the home will be.

Chair LeMarinel stated that according to the photos, the home will basically be new. So, then the Commission looks to the guidelines for a recommendation for siding for a new home and asked if cementitious siding be appropriate for infill.

Commissioner Orr asked if there was a request for demolition.

Ms. Bulay stated that there was not a request for demolition as the walls were moved off site and deterioration occurred during the ownership change.

Commissioner Orr suggested that this situation could set a precedent that if a historic home gets demolished, a new home can be built.

Chair LeMarinel stated that it appears the applicant is basically going to replicate the duplex that existed previously, but it will be a new building. At this point it is disingenuous to the intent of the guidelines to attempt to replicate the historic structure.

Commissioner Ingram asked if the motion includes the siding to remain a similar width and does the motion include the windows.

Chair LeMarinel stated that if Commissioner Ingram is referring to the reveal, yes it would be the same width, and the windows were clarified and were recommended for approval by staff. Historically, all the windows but two were approved to be replaced.

Commissioner Laster noted that there were only two original windows left.

Commissioner Ingram asked what the guidelines say regarding the grid pattern on the windows versus what is being proposed. The front windows are different from the rest of the windows.

Chair LeMarinel stated that as Mr. Laster noted there are only two original windows with a grid pattern of four over four. The Commission may need to weigh in on the windows if the original COA is not active.

Ms. Bulay explained that the current application is a proposal for the two windows as the other windows were approved previously. Permits have been pulled and work started on the previously approved windows.

Commissioner Laster asked if it was part of the conditions of approval that the replacement windows match the original window profile.

Ms. Bulay stated yes, the conditions of approval were that the windows match the original window profile.

The motion carried 6-0.

9. **Consideration Of New Construction At 1845 William Campbell Ct. (Lot 7) At Magnolia Hall; Jennifer Lombard, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The application has been to several Design Review Committee meetings to discuss the overall architectural style of the proposed building. The proposal includes the construction of a two-story, cross-gabled residence with Colonial Revival architectural style features. The placement, scale, massing, height architecture, and materials all appear to be appropriate per the design guidelines. Regarding materials, the foundation level of brick buildings should be delineated through some type of belt course, such as soldier or sailor coursing, and should have a height of at least one foot above the grade on the primary elevation. The guidelines recommend using wood or composite material and the windows have the appearance of wood which is appropriate for windows, stops, jambs and trim. While the window specifications have not been provided as part of this application, they should align with the Guidelines. Several elements, such as the lighting and the hardscaping materials, have not been provided. The Guidelines recommend using simple fixtures that are appropriate to the scale of the house and constructed of historically prevalent materials and avoiding ornate carriage lights or fixtures reflective of the 18th century and using durable materials that were historically typical for driveways, such as gravel, concrete, bricks, and asphalt.

Recommendation: Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Jennifer Lombard. Ms. Lombard was present but did not have any additional information to add.

Citizen Comments: None

**MOTION**

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve new construction At 1845 William Campbell Ct. (Lot 7) At Magnolia Hall with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Ingram noted that the adjustments that were made, make a huge difference and the design looks great.

Commissioner Laster agreed with Commissioner Ingram and stated the application has come a long way.

Chair LeMarinel acknowledged Ms. Lombard's efforts in adjusting the scale to suit the site. The scale is vastly improved.

The motion carried 6-0.

10. **Consideration Of In-Kind Repairs and Alterations (Colt Barn and Hayes House Equipment Barn) At 331 Franklin Rd. (Harlinsdale Farm); Lisa Clayton, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the Park at Harlinsdale Farm is located within the Franklin Road Historic District and is also on the National Register of Historic Places. The proposal includes the following:

- In-kind repair and replacement of exterior elements on the Colt barn,
- Installation of doors on the Hayes House Equipment barn.

**Colt Barn**

The barn is located behind the Hayes House and is closest to the pond. The application notes that within 2024 and 2025, severe storms compromised the structural stability of the barn, and therefore, emergency actions were taken to ensure the integrity of the barn. The proposal is seeking a retroactive COA for the emergency repair work that has already been completed and to complete the repair and restoration of the exterior of the barn. The repair of the barn is supported by the Guidelines. It is recommended to try to preserve as much wood material as possible on the site and replace it when restoration is not feasible. Ms. Huffer referred to photos showing siding replacement on the barn along with the remaining

areas where the siding is proposed to be replaced (45' Length).

#### Hayes House Equipment Shed

This barn is located beside the Hayes House and is proposed to recreate doors on the east and south elevations. Ms. Huffer referred to historic photos where the doors can be seen. Two doors are proposed to be recreated on the southern elevation and on the eastern side of the barn, facing the Hayes house, a man door is proposed. Recreation of the doors is supported by the guidelines which recommend the reuse of existing wood in good condition. This is a city project, staff do not make a recommendation but there are potential conditions should the Commission approve the application.

Applicant Speakers: Kevin Lindsey and Trevor Finch. Mr. Lindsey stated that the only additional information to discuss is painting the equipment barn white if the Commission approves installation of doors. Doors are being proposed to keep the public from climbing the stairs that are just inside the barn door. Friends of Franklin Parks use the area for storage. The doors will help to secure the site when staff are not present.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve In-Kind Repairs and Alterations (Colt Barn and Hayes House Equipment Barn) At 331 Franklin Rd. (Harlinsdale Farm) and painting the equipment building white with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Laster stated that the city has done an excellent job of researching the site and a great job of using original materials.

Ms. Huffer asked if Commissioner Laster wanted to include painting the barn white as part of his motion.

Commissioner Laster stated that that was the intent of the motion.

Mr. Lindsey stated that the intent of painting the equipment barn white is to be consistent throughout the farm.

Chair LeMarinel noted that in the original photos the doors are dog eared with one door missing a dog ear and it would make him happy if it could be put back.

Mr. Lindsey stated that the dog ear will be put back and noted that the doors are 11' high, making it a task to create operable doors. The doors will be built in a way that anyone can open and close them.

The motion carried 6-0.

### **11. Consideration of an Addition And Alterations (Principal) At 305 3rd Ave. S.; Brandon Priddy, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property at 305 3rd Avenue South is located in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District. The proposal includes the following items:

- A retroactive approval of the installation of copper downspouts on the building,
- Changing the roofing material of the rear addition (previously a detached garage),
- An addition to the building will include the 1990s minor accessory structure.

A retroactive COA is proposed for the installation of copper downspouts on the building and while it is unknown if the downspouts that were removed were original to the building, the new copper downspouts are appropriate for the age of the building. Regarding the roof change, the applicant proposes to change the existing roofing on the rear portion of the building which was previously a circa 1950s detached garage. The Guidelines recommend preserving historic roof forms and materials and if partial or wholesale replacement is needed, use material whose composition and appearance match the historic materials. As requested, replacement of the roofing on the rear portion of the building does not align with the Guidelines. An

836 square foot addition is proposed on the right side of the building. The construction of the addition including form, placement and sizing is appropriate per the guidelines. However, the lack of solids to voids on the building addition does not meet the design guidelines. It is recommended designing new windows to be compatible with the size, detailing, placement, rhythm, and relationship of solids to voids for historic buildings. By not having windows on the addition, it does not align with the guidelines and does not have a similar solid to void ratio on the building. Additionally, future lighting and hardscapes were not included as part of the application and staff will need more information on these items if they are offered. It was not proposed to utilize downspouts and gutter on the addition, but it would be appropriate to utilize the same design that is seen on the building.

Recommendation: Staff recommend denial of the change in roofing material from asphalt shingle to metal roofing and the construction of the addition based on the following grounds:

- Preserve historic roof forms and materials. Roofing sections on main and other visible facades should remain unaltered.
- If localized damage occurs, replace the damaged materials only. If partial or wholesale replacement is needed; use materials whose composition and appearance match the historic materials.
- Design new windows to be compatible with the size, detailing, placement, rhythm, and relationship of solids to voids of those on the historic building.

Recommendation: Staff recommend approval of the retroactive installation of the downspouts with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Should the HZC approve of the roofing material change and construction of the addition, there are additional conditions recommended and are listed in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Mike Hathaway, 906 Studio Architects. Mr. Hathaway thanked the Commission for their insights and discussions on this project. Regarding the proposed roofing changes, the team is proposing use of a metal roof to provide continuity throughout the property. The garage is the only area where an asphalt roof is utilized and the team request consideration from this point of view. Mr. Hathaway addressed the voids in the facade by stating that someone suggested using a Smokehouse concept for the addition. Conceptionally a Smokehouse would have simple detailing with very few openings and a simple fenestration. The designs presented to HZC have not shown much detailing as the team is following through with the Smokehouse concept. The goal is not to make it look like it is a formal outbuilding or garden structure. Mr. Hathaway asked the Board to consider the addition from the Smokehouse perspective when contemplating a decision on the application.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Laster motioned to deny the garage roofing replacement and the new addition with conditions at 305 3rd Ave. S., seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Laster explained that part of the historical appreciation is seeing changes in the building over time. Seeing the changes over time makes an impression, rather than trying to match the rest of the house.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the guidelines are clear and state that if the roof is asphalt, the roof should remain asphalt, barring some compelling argument, the HZC tries to follow the recommended guidelines. Regarding the new addition, Chair LeMarinel stated that the form is an improvement from what was seen at the DRC meeting. The building has the Smokehouse feel with exaggerated dimensions. The building is twice as long as a Smokehouse would be with long expansive walls and even though there is a brick wall in front, that brick wall may not be there forever. The openings may not need to be windows but there needs to be some kind of rhythm of openings that meet the guidelines.

Commissioner Laster stated that he suggested the concept of a Smokehouse but typically a Smokehouse is 120 square feet and conflicts with the Greek Revival style with the addition proposed along the side. Commissioner Laster invited the applicant to attend the DRC meeting.

Commissioner Barrett noted his concerns about the viewshed from 3rd Avenue even though there is brick fencing there. The

addition would still be visible.

The motion to deny carried 6-0.

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Barrett motioned to approve the copper downspouts at 305 3rd Ave. S., seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

The motion to approve the downspouts carried 6-0.

## **12. Consideration Of Demolition (Principal And Accessory) At 119 Church St.; John Ligon, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property at 119 Church Street is located in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District. The National Register lists the building at 119 Church Street as non-contributing and being constructed circa 1920. The National Register does not list the accessory structure as being on the site. The proposal is for the demolition of the principal building and the accessory structure. The information provided on the accessory structure was that it is an 8'x10' small metal shed that appeared to be of a 1980s construction. Based on the documentation provided, the removal of the metal accessory structure appears to not adversely impact the site. The Guidelines recommend conducting routine maintenance and major repairs on historic structures to ensure their preservation. Demolition is not permitted unless there are extraordinary circumstances. The Guidelines provide that demolition can only be approved if the Historic Zoning Commission deems one or more of the following conditions met:

1. If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character.
2. If the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant, as determined by the HZC.
3. If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition and construction of a comparable structure. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

Within this submittal, new cost estimates were provided for both the rehabilitation of the existing structure and the complete reconstruction of a new one. The estimated cost to rehabilitate the building is \$975,000, and to build a new structure will be \$590,000. A contractor who builds new custom houses provided these numbers on behalf of the applicant. It is unclear whether the contractor has experience working with historic buildings, as their website states that they handle any new construction need. While photos have been provided showing the deterioration of the building and the cost estimates have also been provided as well, the cost estimates have been provided by a contractor that does not have experience with historic buildings.

Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the demolition of the principal building based on the following ground:

- If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect with demonstrated experience working with historic structures. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for rehabilitation versus demolition and construction of a comparable structure. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the circa 1980 metal accessory structure with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: John Ligon and Matt Ligon. Mr. Matt Ligon stated that this is the third time before HZC and hoped that

they have been responsive to every request from staff and the Commission. Documentation from two engineers, a house mover, and two contractors that have all stipulated that there are safety concerns with the structural integrity of the building. Mr. Ligon stated that he believes they have provided enough documentation to support all three of the conditions that must be met for demolition approval. Mr. Ligon noted that Mike Lee had the opportunity to inspect the building and agreed that it would not be feasible to restore the building. Mr. Lee had planned to attend and speak but was unable to make it.

**Citizen Comments:**

Mike Miersma, 203 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. Mr. Miersma stated that he recently finished restoring his home that has a view of this property. Mr. Miersma noted that the building doesn't have any aesthetic value, and he would like to see it demolished. Walking through the building with a contractor and civil engineer you could see the floor joist was rotten and not much worth saving. Mr. Miersma agreed with Matt and John Ligon regarding demolition and stated that it is a tremendous eyesore for the Brownstones across the way.

Ms. Huffer stated that a written public comment was received and was published with the application documents.

**MOTION**

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve demolition of the accessory structure at 119 Church Street, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

The motion carried 6-0.

**MOTION**

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve demolition of the principal structure at 119 Church Street, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Orr stated that based on the photos and discussion regarding this property there doesn't appear that there is much to be saved.

Commissioner Laster stated that this is one of the tough decisions the HZC is confronted with as most may see the building as a shack, but it still has some historical significance to the city of Franklin. If the building had been under roof for the last couple of years, Commissioner Laster stated his opinion might be different. Mr. Laster explained that in his experience, rehabilitation of historic homes even under the best conditions may have dry rot, wet rot, termites, and post-beetles. In this situation, a tree fell on the roof causing exposure to the elements leaving very little to be saved. To save the building means basically replacing everything, making it no longer an old house. The guidelines provide direction in these tough situations by providing criteria that must be met to justify demolition. The engineers report along with the contractor's report both meet the criteria provided by the guidelines. It could also be said that due to the alterations made to the building over the years, it no longer has historical significance. The building is a non-contributing historical structure. In this situation, Commissioner Laster stated that demolition is appropriate for the principal building. Commissioner Laster noted that this is only the second time in his history, as a member of the HZC, that he's voted in favor of demolition and these are tough decisions.

Commissioner Ingram stated that she has a question about how the numbers were determined.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the guidelines require estimates from an architect or a contractor with construction experience with historic homes and are provided by the applicant. Staff nor the Commission would be involved in providing the estimates.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he agrees with Commissioner Laster regarding tough decisions. When these types of houses were built, they were not built to be architectural statements, but they are still contextual and are important. Chair LeMarinel stated that the community is made up of all different types of architecture and they all contribute in some way. Some structures more than others, some more ornate and some more plain but each one is part of who we are as a community. In this circumstance, as Mr. Laster stated, the home is in bad enough shape and with the supporting documents from professionals, Chair LeMarinel stated that he feels comfortable with the motion.

Commissioner Ingram asked what happens after the demolition, is the applicant required to rebuild.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the third criteria states that if the structure is to be demolished, a separate report should be submitted detailing future actions of the site. Chair LeMarinel stated that the applicant mentioned green space, but he was not sure if the final determination had been made.

Mr. Huffer also noted that the first condition for the demolition of the accessory structure is that any new proposed development on the lot should obtain a COA from the Historic Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Laster noted that there may be salvageable elements of the historic structure such as a mantel, doors or sashes and may be usable.

Commissioner Barrett stated that even though the Commission is leaning toward demolition approval, it is important to remember the historical aspects of this side of town. During the Civil War this was a nice part of town and over the years the area has gone down and is now back up with a vengeance. Remembering how this area of Franklin is now is not how it was even 50 years ago.

The motion carried 6-0.

**Recess:**

Commissioner Laster motioned to take a recess, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. The motion carried 6-0.

**13. Consideration Of An Addition (Principal) And Alterations And An Addition (Accessory) At 1008 Fair St.; Jacob Layne, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that The property located at 1008 Fair Street is in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The site features a ca. 1889 one-story Federal-style house. The proposal includes a request for an addition to the principal building and for alterations and an addition to the accessory structure. This proposal was previously submitted for a DRC review, but staff recommended to the applicant there should be significant redesign prior to attending a DRC meeting and that application was withdrawn. This proposal was subsequently submitted for a formal HZC review.

**Principal Building Addition:**

A two-story, 164 sq. ft. addition is proposed on the rear of the principal building. The height of the historic building is 18' and the height of the proposed addition is 20'10" and utilizes a "popup" "camelback" form. The proposed "pop-up" form is highly inappropriate per the Guidelines, and the proposed two-story addition is not subordinate to the one-story historic building and compromises the scale relationship between the historic building and the addition. Because significant redesign and additional information are necessary, an analysis of the windows, entrances, deck, materials and exterior finishes, details and ornamentation, and decks was not conducted as they will need to be redesigned as well to accommodate an appropriate form for the addition.

**Accessory Structure Alterations and Addition:**

The proposal includes alterations and an addition to the existing accessory structure. The National Register lists the building as a ca. 2000 structure. Historic Sanborn maps indicate that, historically, there may have been a structure in the same area as the existing structure. With the information currently available, the structure is reviewed as a non-historic accessory structure. Proposed alterations to the existing structure include the addition of a dormer on the rear façade and the addition of a front-facing gable. The roof pitches for the roof forms have not been included. Neither information nor specifications for the materials, details, windows, or garage doors have been called out or included in the application. A 420 sq. ft. addition is proposed to the existing accessory structure, as well. The proposed alterations and additions do not increase the compatibility of the structure and appropriateness of the structure within the district. The proposed alterations and additions create mass that is not consistent with the massing and scale of the surrounding historic accessory structures. A more thorough review of the proposal cannot be completed as information or specifications for the materials, details, windows, garage doors, or lighting have not been called out or included in the application for review.

Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the addition to the principal building and alterations and addition to the

accessory structure based on the Guidelines listed in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Jacob Layne. Mr. Layne stated he would like to clarify that the roof pitches and dormers follow the codes with a 3/12 for the dormer and reiterated that the front façade will not be touched or altered in any way. Mr. Layne also noted that the historical character of the home is important and would like to carry that character through to the back.

Citizen Comments: None

Ms. Bulay noted that one public comment was received electronically and is published with the application documents.

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Orr motioned to deny An Addition (Principal) And Alterations And An Addition (Accessory) At 1008 Fair St. based on all staff comments and conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Laster invited the applicant to attend a DRC meeting to discuss the design. Chair LeMarinel stated that he agrees with the motion to deny. The massing of the building is not even close to what would be allowable or recommended in the guidelines. A lot of work needs to be done to get the project within compliance so that the Commission can consider it for approval. Chair LeMarinel also invited the applicant to the DRC meeting to discuss and get feedback from staff and the Commissioners.

Commissioner Laster stated that it would be a good idea to spend time with staff so that they can provide directions on the project.

Chair LeMarinel reminded the applicant about the DRC meeting and if they plan on attending, please let staff know by midnight.

The motion to deny carried 6-0.

#### **14. Consideration Of Alterations At 109 3rd Ave. S. (City Hall And City Hall Park); Anna Ruth Kimbrough, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfels, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The property at 109 3rd Avenue South is the site of the previously approved demolition and construction of the City of Franklin's new City Hall. The site is in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District. The proposal includes the following items:

- Rooftop mechanical screening
- Roofing materials
- Gates and railing
- Windows and doors specifications
- Lighting for the building, site, and park
- Park elements
- Hardscaping

Ms. Huffer explained that all the items proposed appear to be appropriate and follow the design guidelines. Since this is a city project, staff do not make a recommendation. However, there are potential conditions should the HZC approve the proposal. These potential conditions are listed in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Anna Ruth Kimbro, Studio Eight Design, design representative for the new City Hall project. Ms. Kimbro stated that there are several items she will cover that were conditions of approval for the previous COA. It was suggested in the HZC meeting that the steps on the plaza on the corner should be squared off instead of rounded. Ms. Kimbro noted this change in the renderings on page A3.0 in the submittal documents. Also, the brick planters that run along 3rd Avenue and the ADA ramp have been lowered in height. Ms. Kimbro moved on to the new items to be considered in this proposal. Ms.

Kimbro noted a material sample she provided for the mechanical screening that will be in an antique bronze to match the windows and other detailing on the building and will be a combination of louvers and solid panels. The enclosed rooftop penthouse will have clad and thin bricks to match the brick of the city hall building. Ms. Kimbro noted that the mechanical rooftop screening cannot be seen from the square or from Main Street. Other material samples provided by Ms. Kimbro include the roofing material for the pediments as shown in the top left rendering on page A3.0. It is a soft gray material which complements the limestone pediments on the main city hall building. On page A3.3 of the application documents, Ms. Kimbro referred to the brick color choices for the various areas throughout the city hall campus. Regarding the gates and railing designs, Ms. Kimbro explained that the team considered existing gates and railing around Public Square and at the Harpeth Square development along with historic examples in the residential areas close to the site. Page A3.7 shows the proposed railing and gate design shapes that were chosen because they are unique and reflect historic examples seen around the city. Moving onto the windows, Ms. Kimbro explained that they ran into issues with the commercial hardware working on clad wood doors. Commercial hardware provides the electrified card readers and panic bars that are not typically installed on wood clad doors. After researching historic examples of aluminum doors, the Boyd company can accommodate custom design that will have the same profile as the Marvin design and be as close as possible to a wood clad window (Pgs. A.3.10-11).

The team compared the exterior lighting of public square, the courthouse and throughout downtown to determine exterior lighting for the new city hall. Ms. Kimbro explained that they are proposing keeping the pediments lighted to maintain the scale and form of the building. Coach lights were added on each side of the main entrance with the remainder of the lighting proposed as downlighting to light the pathway to the parking garage and plaza area for safety. The lighting system will be adjustable so that the right amount of lighting can be chosen with warm light around 2700 to 3000 Kelvin which is an incandescent warm light. Ms. Kimbro provided examples of the light fixtures to be used throughout the City Hall buildings, parking garage and the park on Pages. AL1.2-AL2.3.

Three fountains are proposed on the site that include a central main fountain, a courtyard fountain and a wall fountain (Pg. AF1.0). Ms. Kimbro touched on the vertical elements proposed for the park (L1.1-L1.2). There are three locations proposed for trellises. The rendering shows how the proposed columns will have a brick base with the wood portions of the trellis in white. Ms. Kimbro noted that the column design comes from the kind of architecture seen on residential porches around the site with brick bases, white columns and white pergola members. Swings are also proposed in the Franklin green color and will tie in with the Franklin benches. Next, Ms. Kimbro referred to the paving materials proposed for the park as seen on page L1.3 of the submittal documents and noted that fixed aggregate will be used in some places instead of loose aggregate as some were concerned about. The next page, L1.5, Ms. Kimbro referred to the wider planters for the front entry from the square and the taller planter will be utilized at the arcade connector to the courtyard. The furnishings proposed for the park and throughout the site are indicated on page L1.4.

Citizen Comments: None

#### **MOTION**

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Alterations At 109 3rd Ave. S. (City Hall And City Hall Park), seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Laster stated that for the window elements the thinner muntin pattern seems more appropriate and asked Ms. Kimbro about the Boyd vs. Marvin window style relating to the double hung appearance of the Marvin window. Mr. Laster stated that it looks like a single meeting rail, but you would usually have the shadow line. Looking at the Boyd style window it almost looks flat, and it appears to have two meeting rails.

Ms. Kimbro explained and confirmed that the Boyd window profile has a double hung appearance because of the offset. Ms. Kimbro referenced page A3.10 in the application documents.

Commissioner Laster asked Ms. Kimbro if the coach lights for the main entrance will be attached to the wall with a gooseneck attachment.

Ms. Kimbro confirmed that a gooseneck would attach the coach lights to the wall.

Commissioner Orr stated that he is concerned about the benches not having a bar to keep people from using the bench as a place to sleep.

Ms. Kimbro explained that their security consultant had mentioned it but based on Franklin's current crime rate and Franklin's projected crime rate for the future, they didn't feel like it was necessary. The team has made a good effort to try to keep the lighting subtle on the park but provide enough light for the security cameras to operate at night.

Commissioner Ingram expressed her concern about the style of the railings and not having a historic look. Looking at the Brownstones in the photos along with other examples, Commissioner Ingram stated that the railings seem more contemporary to her.

Commissioner Barrett noted that it was mentioned at the DRC meeting that the width of the railings would be thicker than shown on the application documents.

Ms. Kimbro stated that the railings will be thicker like what is seen on steel or wrought iron railing. The thickness will measure ½" with the circular and arched pieces measuring 3/8." The reason a different style was chosen for City Hall was to create something unique and appealing for a lifetime but also giving a nod to the history and context of its surroundings. Commissioner Ingram recognized how hard the design team has worked to create a unique building fitting for downtown Franklin but reiterated her point about the style of the railings and stated that the style does not seem to fit the context of the building, in her opinion.

Chair LeMarinel stated that after the last discussion on the railings, he went back and studied railings and noted that he doesn't mind the circle shape and arch of the design. The whole point of ironwork is to be slender and Chair LeMarinel noted that the proposed railings may look like a traditional iron panel was taken and set into the large newel posts. The iron work in front of the Harpeth Hotel is aluminum and is designed to be thicker so that it will hold up better. Lastly, Chair LeMarinel stated that the newels seem a bit heavy as they appear to be 4"-6" square but also noted that he is ok with the understated design given everything else going on with the building.

Chair Laster stated that he agrees with Ms. Ingram and Chair LeMarinel and stated that the design seems a little lackluster. However, there are benefits of simplicity too. Mr. Laster suggested seeing a material sample.

Commissioner Ingram agreed that seeing a material sample could make a difference.

Ms. Kimbro noted that one of the conditions of approval is to provide a material sample, wrought iron, steel, or aluminum, which has not been decided yet.

The motion to approve carried 6-0.

## 15. **Consideration Of HPO Rezoning Recommendation Request for 171 Hillhaven Ln. And Parcel ID 063---02101; City of Franklin, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelsler, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The City undertakes annual Zoning Ordinance updates and two nominations into the HPO for the property on Mack Hatcher Parkway (by Harlinsdale Farm) noted as Parcel ID 063---02101, and land located by Roper's Knob, located at 171 Hillhaven Lane. Due to the location of the property in relation to Harlinsdale Farm and to Roper's Knob, the property owners of these two properties, the City of Franklin, and Franklin's Charge have worked with the city staff and requested that the property be rezoned and placed within the HPO. The City-owned property that fronts Mack Hatcher Parkway and Aldersgate Way and is adjacent to Harlinsdale Farm to the south and the property is approximately 54 acres. The property at 171 Hillhaven Lane is positioned so that the property will connect to the city-owned portion of Roper's Knob. The fortifications at Roper's Knob were entered on the National Register as part of the Civil War Historic and Historic Archeological Resources in Tennessee Multiple Property Submission.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the HZC recommend approval to the FMPC and the BOMA for the proposed HPO district rezoning. The FMPC and the BOMA are both slated to consider the proposed rezoning at their respective meetings in the coming months.

Citizen Comments: None

**MOTION**

Chair Laster motioned to recommend approval of HPO Rezoning Recommendation Request for 171 Hillhaven Ln. And Parcel ID 063---02101 to the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Laster stated that he has been to the parcel that will connect to Roper's Knob and stated that Franklin's Charge has done a great job in making this available to the city. It is also great to see properties join the historic zoning overlay.

The motion to recommend approval carried 6-0.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Huffer reminded the Board that there will be a special DRC meeting on Thursday, August 21, 2025, at 3 pm to discuss the Harpeth Village Mixed Use development plan and a review of the modification of standards. The special meeting will be held at 324 Liberty Pike, suite 150, Jamison Station.

**RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC**

16. **Admin COA For Lighting at 129 2nd Ave. N.; Marla Albert, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

17. **Admin COA For Signage (Reface) At 232 5th Ave. N.; Jason Collins, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

18. **Admin COA For Signage (Projecting, Sandwich Board, And Window) At 430 Main St.; Cathey Jo Elwood, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

**ADJOURN**

Commissioner Orr motioned to adjourn the August 11, 2025, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Ingram. The motion carried 6-0.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:23 PM

  
Chair

  
Date