



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, December 8, 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 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: Tyler LeMarinel; Chair, Brian Laster; Vice Chair, Bob Barrett, Mary Pearce, Michael Orr, Madalyn Ingram

Commissioners Absent: Kathy Worthington, Holly Thompson, Lisa Marquardt

Staff Present: Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay, Kelly Dannenfelser, Shauna Billingsly, Randall Tosh

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 Tyler 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 November 10, 2025, HZC Meeting Minutes, seconded by Commissioner Laster. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

BYLAWS UPDATE

2. Consideration Of The Bylaws Update.

Sponsors:

Project Leader: Ms. Huffer stated that the update includes corrections to clerical errors along with a change in the HZC meeting start time to 4 pm to be consistent with the Design Review meeting start time.

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the Bylaws update, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Amendment

Commissioner Laster amended the motion to keep the HZC Meeting time at 5 pm in the Bylaws section 8.1.1., Meeting Time, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Laster explained that the success of a good public meeting is consistent meeting time along with a convenient time for the working public. Most people work until 5 pm and although one may need to arrange his or her work schedule for the 5 pm meeting, a 4 pm meeting would require an earlier leave from work. Also, Commissioner Laster stated that feedback from residents who live in the Historic Districts would prefer the meeting time to remain at 5 pm.

The amendment carried by a vote of 6-0.

The main motion, as amended carried by a vote of 6-0.

2026 MEETING CALENDAR**3. Consideration Of The 2026 HZC & DRC Meeting Calendar.****Sponsors:**

Project Leader: Ms. Huffer explained that 2026 meeting dates and deadlines include a 4 pm start time for the HZC meetings. The meeting dates can be voted on with the stipulation the HZC meeting will continue to start at 5 pm.

MOTION

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve the 2026 Meeting Dates and Deadlines including the HZC Meeting start time at 5 pm, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Citizen Comments: None

The motion carried by a vote of 6-0

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Huffer stated that the next DRC Meeting will be held at the Eastern Flank Event Facility, December 15, 2025, at 4 pm. Applicants who plan or are invited to attend, as a result actions taken tonight, should email staff by midnight tonight.

APPLICATIONS**4. Consideration Of Site and Building Alterations At 713 Glass Ln.; Linda Childs, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property at 713 Glass Lane is a non-historic building that is located within the Boyd Mill Historic District. The proposal includes the replacement of the porch floor, front steps, and walkway.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the replacement of the porch flooring, front steps, and walkway with conditions listed in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Ernie Reynolds. (microphone was not on). Mr. Reynolds provided a stone sample for the

Commissioners to view.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve site and building alterations at 713 Glass Lane with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Pearce stated that alterations will be a nice upgrade from the aggregate concrete and the upgrade will enhance the closely located Boyd Mill Historic District.

The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

5. Consideration of An Alteration (Principal) At 717 Glass Ln.; Will Forte, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

6. Consideration Of Alterations (Accessory) At 720 W. Main St.; Mary Gardner, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 720 West Main Street is located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The proposal includes a request to replace the garage doors and light fixture on the accessory structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Brett and Mary Gardner. Mr. Gardner stated that a third hinge would be added to the garage door as previously discussed.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Alterations (Accessory) At 720 W. Main St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Chair LeMarinel asked the Commissioner if the third hinge on the garage door should be discussed.

Amendment

Commissioner Laster amended the motion to include the third hinge on the garage door, seconded by Commissioner Ingram. The motion to amend carried by a vote of 6-0.

The main motion, as amended carried by a vote of 6-0.

7. Consideration Of Alterations to A Previously Approved COA (Accessory) At 1008 Fair St.; Jacob Layne, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay stated that the property located at 1008 Fair Street is located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. A COA was reviewed and issued at the November 2025 HZC Meeting for alterations and an addition to the accessory structure. The proposal includes a request to alter the previously approved plans for an addition and alterations to the accessory structure. The proposed alterations to the approved plans for alterations and an addition to the structure are appropriate as the alterations create a more subordinate form and read as additions over time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the alterations and addition to the accessory structure with conditions listed in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Jacob Layne. Mr. Layne stated that after meeting with staff, he redesigned the addition by decreasing the front facade by four feet to avoid disrupting the tree's root system that could potentially create onsite engineering concerns. The total square footage will be reduced by 70 feet. Because there were onsite engineering concerns, Mr. Layne explained that he further simplified the design by making it cleaner without changing the character of the structure.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve Alterations to A Previously Approved COA (Accessory) At 1008 Fair St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Chair LeMarinel noted that he liked the smaller footprint of the addition but also noted that the side facing gable made the addition appear as a 2 car addition rather than a large 3 car garage.

Commissioner Pearce asked about the measurements of roof ridge line of the addition, once completed.

Mr. Layne stated that the addition roof ridge line would be 18" lower than the principal building.

The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

8. Consideration Of New Construction (Accessory) And Lighting At 230 Franklin Rd. Bldg. 1; John Brown, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that The property located at 230 Franklin Road features Building 1 on the Factory campus and is located in the Franklin Road Historic District. The proposal includes a request for the installation of a new accessory structure and installation of lighting. The applicant has incorporated suggestions from past DRC meetings and discussions with staff.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the application with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: John Brown. Mr. Brown stated that the final pieces of the application for building 1 include an accessory structure that will have the same finish as the building and two light fixtures, a post light and string light. Details about each of the items are detailed in the staff application documents.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve New Construction (Accessory) And Lighting At 230 Franklin Rd. Bldg. 1 with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Pearce asked staff if the city had changed its position on permanent string lighting.

Ms. Bulay explained that as discussed in the DRC meeting, string lighting is permitted at the Factory, in this situation.

The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

9. Consideration of Signage At 103 1st Ave. N.; Michael Evans, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

This item was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

10. Consideration Of Signage At 434 Main St.; Holly Hayes, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property located at 434 Main Street is located within the Downtown Franklin Historic District. The building is the Five Points Place or locally known as the White Building. 434 Main Street is single retail storefront. The Guidelines recommend that a commercial building should have no more than three signs, unless it has more than one ground-floor retail storefront/tenant space. The applicant is proposing 8 different signs. The dimensions of the signs, the windows, the awnings, the materials, how the signs have been applied, and other information has not all been provided in the application to provide a recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend deferral of the application due to a lack of information within the application.

Applicant Speaker: Ian Bristo. Mr. Bristo stated that he is Holly Hayes husband and apologized for not providing the information required for the sign application. Mr. Bristo explained that there are two businesses in the building that operate independently of each other, Sanctuary (jewelry and clothing store) and Awaken (Apothecary and Sleep store). The sign application was submitted under 432 Main Street and 434 Main Street and somehow the application was merged into 434 Main Street. In the application, Mr. Bristo explained that they propose two awnings, one for each store. Mr. Bristo went on to say he and his wife would be happy to provide whatever information is needed as well as be educated on the application process and the proper procedures to get the sign approved.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Ingram motioned to defer the application to the January 12, 2026, HZC Meeting to allow time for the applicant to provide additional information, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Chair LeMarinel explained that discussion about a deferral is limited to the reasons for the deferral.

Commissioner Orr noted that the application was not clearly outlined with details about proposed locations for each sign.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he would like to see the applicant and staff get together so that everyone is on the same page. Also, Chair LeMarinel suggested the applicant attend the next DRC meeting where the discussion is less formal with time allotted for questions with staff and commissioners.

Commissioner Ingram stated that she would not be comfortable voting on the application with the limited amount of information provided by the applicant.

The motion to defer carried by a vote of 6-0.

11. Consideration Of Exterior Alteration At 115 Winslow Rd.; Michael Katsaitis, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property located at 115 Winslow Road is a vacant lot in the Franklin Road Historic District. A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for the construction of a new principal building and attached accessory structure in May 2025. The applicant is proposing to change the siding of the principal building to painted brick from all lap siding.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the exterior siding change with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Michael Katsaitis. Mr. Katsaitis explained that after the last DRC meeting it was decided to

keep the lap siding on the garage/carriage house and painted brick for the principal building.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to deny Exterior Alterations (Painted Brick) At 115 Winslow Rd., seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Laster stated that the Historic Design Guidelines clearly state that masonry or brick should not be painted unless previously painted. Regarding new construction materials, the guidelines recommend use of materials that would have been historically used and in this situation, natural brick would be recommended. Seven of the eight homes on Winslow Road are constructed with natural brick with one home painted masonry/brick. Commissioner Laster stated that to his knowledge the HZC has not approved painting masonry or brick and if this application is approved a precedent would be set for the future. To approve painted brick along Winslow Road would not be in keeping with the guidelines.

Commissioner Ingram asked if something else changed in the application because the garage was proposed to be lap siding.

Chair LeMarinel stated that originally the entire building was proposed to be lap siding. At the DRC meeting, the applicant proposed that the entire structure be all brick. Comments and suggestions were made about whether the garage section of the home should maintain use of lap siding to have the appearance of a detached structure and to illustrate the garage is subservient to the main house.

Commissioner Ingram stated that it appears the lower part of the home is stone and asked how the Commission feels about the applicant using stone.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the guidelines mention use of stone and brick and explained that Commissioner Laster is calling into question the applicant's proposal to paint the brick. Natural brick would be acceptable. Chair LeMarinel noted that the application is approved for use of lap siding on the house and the garage.

Commissioner Laster reiterated that painted brick would not be in keeping with the guidelines and would set a precedent for future requests in Franklin's Historic Districts.

Commissioner Pearce stated that it is confusing or sends an inconsistent message to allow infill brick homes in the historic district to be painted and in another situation, recommend paint be removed from a painted masonry/brick church. Also, Commissioner Pearce noted that she does not see a compelling reason to paint the brick of the subject building and added that stone could be approved but new stone construction can be complicated. However, Ms. Pearce noted that the homes on either side of the subject property are stone homes which leave little room for variation.

Chair LeMarinel explained that considering the form of this house, in Franklin, stone would not have been used. One would be more likely to see this style of home constructed using brick or siding.

The motion to deny carried by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Katsaitis asked about changing the proposal to the use of a light colored brick.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the motion had been voted on and he should submit a new application for use of the new material.

12. Consideration Of Alterations (Principal) At 121 Myles Manor Ct.; Noel Jones, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 121 Myles Manor Court is located in the Franklin Road Historic District. The proposal includes a request to replace the doors at the front and side entrances and a retro-active request for the replacement of the asphalt shingle roof with a cedar shake roof.

Door Replacement

The proposal includes a request to replace the door on the front porch and side porch with a ½ lite door that

features a shelf and paneling. While the existing $\frac{3}{4}$ lite doors on the front porch and side porch are not original or historic, the proposed replacement door style is not appropriate for the Tudor Revival architectural style of the house as it relates more to the Victorian and Queen Anne architectural styles.

Roof

During the November 2025 COA application review, staff noted that the roofing material and flashing had been changed from asphalt shingle to cedar shake and copper flashing without review or issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The application was deferred during the November Historic Zoning Commission for additional research and information to be submitted for review. The applicants were unable to find historic images of the building to determine what the original roofing material was. Images of the Tudor-revival architectural style with cedar shake roofs and local examples of historic buildings with cedar shake roofs have been included within the application for review. Information or evidence has not been provided that the original and historic roofing material was cedar shake. Based on the lack of evidence of an alternative roofing material having been present, asphalt shingle is likely the historic material for the roofing. The roofing material alteration is not supported by the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the door replacement and the retroactive roofing alteration based on the following Guidelines:

- Use designs appropriate for the style and age of the building.
- Preserve historic roof forms and materials.
- If partial or wholesale replacement is needed, use materials whose composition and appearance match the historic materials.

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

Owner: Scott Cash. Mr. Cash explained his misunderstanding of the meaning of a home being a historical compliant structure. Mr. Cash stated that he did not realize that the time period in which the home was built and style of the home should be considered when determining historically correct materials. Mr. Cash further explained that he would not have purposefully installed a shake style roof if he would have known the material would be inappropriate for the home and apologized for the mistake. Much research was completed to determine if the home ever had a cedar shake roof, but Mr. Cash stated it was unsuccessful.

Applicant Speaker: Noel Jones. Mr. Jones noted that other than seeing the use of 1 by 6 purlins at the top of the rafters, which is indicative of a shake roof, no other evidence was found that would indicate there could have been a shake roof on the house in the past.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION (Door Replacement)

Commissioner Laster motioned to deny the proposed door replacement for 121 Myles Manor Court, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Laster stated that the reason for his motion to deny the door replacement is based on staff's comments.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he understood that staff did not have any issue with replacement of the doors, but the doors should match the style of the home which is Tudor Revival.

The motion to deny carried by a vote of 6-0.

Chair LeMarinel asked staff a general question regarding approval of door replacement and if staff can approve without input from the Board.

Ms. Bulay stated that staff does not approve door replacements for the front of a structure but has approved door replacements for the rear of buildings.

MOTION (Roof)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to deny the cedar shake roofing material for 121 Myles Manor Court, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Pearce expressed her concern about the unfortunate situation the HZC is put in by needing to

retroactively approve or deny the roofing material. It's very difficult.

Commissioner Laster stated that wood is not a prohibited material for roofing as stated in the Historic Guidelines. The home was built in 1936-1938 and at that time, according to newspaper articles, redwood California shake roofs were used as roofing material in Franklin. Mr. Laster stated that we do not know if redwood shake roofing was used for this house. Given this information, Mr. Laster stated that it causes him to pause and consider that a wood shake may have been used as roofing material, but it cannot be confirmed. If a terra cotta roof was installed, the retroactive request for approval would be a definite denial and had the applicant proposed a cedar shake roof prior to installation there is a chance the Commission would have approved the request.

Chair LeMarinel also noted that the design guidelines also recommend maintaining the elements of the home as they exist currently. If starting from scratch, a wood shake roof could be approved.

Commissioner Pearce noted that she has not seen a house of this age that utilized a cedar shake roof other than an odd outlier. One would typically see a shake roof on homes built during the generation prior to this home built in the 1930's.

Commissioner Barrett noted that his neighbors had hail damage to the roof of their historic home and ended up removing five roofs that had been added over the years and the last roof removed was cedar shake roof.

Commissioner Pearce noted that after talking to people who are well acquainted with this home, no one can remember a cedar shake roof on the house. Although the roof, as it is now with cedar shake material, does not stand out or cause the eyes to immediately see the roof. Commissioner Pearce explained that the Board is put in an uncomfortable position of having to retroactively approve or deny.

Commissioner Laster noted that wood shake roofs are a maintenance headache and most people, if given the choice, would not replace the cedar shake roof with cedar shake roofing material because of the upkeep required.

Commissioner Orr noted the precedent that will be set if the HZC approves the shake roof and asked the Board if the applicant had requested an asphalt roof that more closely mimics a cedar shake roof, would the HZC be faced with retroactive approval.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the whole idea of asphalt roofing material is that it is designed to mimic a shake roof by appearing thicker and providing depth. Every asphalt shingle, for the most part, is designed to imitate slate, shake, or flat tile by adding shadow lines to the profile of the shingle. Chair LeMarinel stated that this situation is tough because we do not want people to replace their roof without getting approval and then use the rationale that other people have done the same thing in the past.

Commissioner Orr stated that if the Commission approves this application, a precedent will be set for all future applications regarding roofing material.

The motion to deny carried by a vote of 4-2 with Commissioner LeMarinel and Commissioner Laster voting against.

13. **Consideration Of Alterations to A Previously Approved Building (Parking Structure) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory); Read Talley, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property located at 230 Franklin Rd. is home to the Factory at Franklin and is located in the Franklin Road Local Historic District. The proposal to construct a new parking structure was approved at the June 2025, HZC Meeting. This proposal is for alterations to the form, size, and location of the parking structure. The applicant attended the November DRC meeting. Staff commented, at the meeting, that the applicant should meet with the Building and Neighborhood Services (BNS) Department to confirm placement of the structure will meet building codes. Ms. Huffer noted that the applicant had not consulted with BNS yet. It is unclear if the proposed parking structure can be constructed per the proposed placement. Mr. Randall Tosh is present to answer questions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Huffer stated that other than the meeting with BNS, staff recommend approval of the application for Alterations to A Previously Approved Building (Parking Structure) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory) with conditions outlined on the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Read Talley. Mr. Talley stated that he met with BNS prior to this meeting to discuss building code requirements. Mr. Talley stated that as part of the process the team is consulting a third party reviewer to work through the details and nuances to meet all the requirements. The north and east façade of the parking structure would remain the same other than how much space (setback) would be between the buildings. Mr. Talley explained that questions such as defining what constitutes a detached versus not detached building will determine changes to the structure. The team is asking for approval with a condition that all codes will be met as required and if physical changes to the structure occur, the proposal would come back to HZC for approval.

Citizen Comments: James Blair, 533 Plantation Court, Nashville, TN. Mr. Blair thanked the Commission, staff, and Holladay Properties for the work on the Factory Project over the last two years. Overall, the design looks great, but Mr. Blair suggested bricking the west elevation wall of the parking garage like in the previous version of the garage. From the historical standpoint, the new version of the parking garage, levels 3 and below, allows parked cars to be seen. The parapet on the top level blocks the view of cars. Mr. Blair finished by stating that all the hard work is paying off as the Factory is a beautifully designed project.

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve Alterations to A Previously Approved Building (Parking Structure) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Pearce asked the Board to comment on the openings on the north elevation, making the cars more visible.

Chair LeMarinel noted that in the new design, headlights may be visible at night. Given everything going on around the building along with the nuances of the structure design, the cars may not be visible.

Mr. Talley explained that the ridge line on level three comes up higher with the goal of allowing as much airflow as possible to filter out exhaust.

Commissioner Pearce noted her main concern is the openings on north elevation on levels 2 and 3 and how much car visibility there will be.

Chair LeMarinel and Commissioner Pearce agreed that the south elevation is not as concerning because of the business entrances and the activity on that side of the Factory.

Mr. Talley stated he would be glad to look at reducing the visibility on the north elevation.

Chair LeMarinel stated that specifically Ms. Pearce is referring to the first two horizontal bays on the north elevation and what alternatives could be proposed to reduce visibility whether it is bricking in the openings or installing louvers, although louvers may or may not be a typical feature seen in a Franklin Historic district.

Commissioner Orr suggested that visibility of the garage from the north elevation, from Franklin Road, may be minimal or not visible at all.

Commissioner Pearce stated that if the headlights cannot be seen, she is not as concerned about the openings.

Chair LeMarinel stated that who knows what may happen in the future to the property north of the Factory, not in the historic district. One must consider future development further blocking the visibility of the parking garage.

Commissioner Ingram noted that to Ms. Pearce's point looking at page six of the application documents, coming from downtown Franklin, car activity in the garage will be visible for the 2nd and 3rd levels.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he was not convinced this would be an issue and stated regardless of what the final determination is regarding the openings, the recessed areas keep the building from being plain and flat.

Mr. Talley explained that attention was given to window placement on the parking structure so that it does not align exactly with adjacent buildings.

Chair LeMarinel noted that flashes of headlights will be visible as cars circles through the garage looking for a parking slot but visibility from the south, driving north from downtown is a larger viewshed considering the other activities going on at the Factory and will be a wider wash.

Mr. Talley stated that he liked the louver possibility as a covering over the openings of the garage as it would appear intentional and would address visibility issues.

Commissioner Ingram noted that on page 5 of the application documents, the elevation shows how that the ramp is visible through the openings of the garage.

Commissioner Pearce stated that if the applicant works with Building and Neighborhood Services to address the code requirements and the applicant can provide examples of alternative ways to address the structure openings and garage visibility, then she is fine with the motion.

Mr. LeMarinel noted that there will be plenty of discussion regarding the codes for this building.

Mr. Tosh stated that the applicant provided a code report for the parking garage to be considered as a separate building. The code book identifies the space as a covered mall and covered malls are required to have 60 feet of open space between the parking structure and the mall. An attachment to the code report was added because the applicant would like the parking structure to be part of the covered mall. Mr. Tosh explained that extensive research was done as well as ICC contacted to address the situation. It was concluded that the parking structure would be considered as a separate building and 60 feet between the covered mall and the parking garage would be necessary to meet the code requirements. Mr. Talley was notified this afternoon that the structure cannot be approved.

Chair LeMarinel asked if the age of the Factory buildings make it difficult to accommodate fire codes requirements.

Mr. Tosh stated that before the fire codes can be addressed the placement/spacing requirement must be approved first. The covered mall requirements for distance to the parking structure must be met first.

Chair LeMarinel restated that the covered mall requirements is the reason the garage project is being held up not the garage. Mr. LeMarinel commented that he's not sure why the HZC is considering the parking garage if the basic codes have not been met.

MOTION (To Defer)

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the application to the January 12, 2026, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Pearce noted that a deferral is the best course of action so that the applicant can address the concerns stated by Mr. Tosh.

Chair LeMarinel noted that sometimes the Commission will review a project even though there are minor conditions or codes that still need to be met. It is an understanding that the minor issues will be met by the applicant but the situation with the Factory parking garage placement is not the same type of situation and is on a much larger scale. Until the placement of the garage is approved, the HZC should wait to approve the final details of the parking structure.

The motion to defer passed by a vote of 6-0.

14. Consideration Of Alterations to A Previously Approved Building (Hotel) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory); Read Talley, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. The property located at 230 Franklin Rd. is home to the Factory at Franklin and is located in the Franklin Road Local Historic District. The proposal is for alterations to the building and the adjacent buildings it will touch.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the proposal with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Mr. Talley stated that there are only a few issues outside of what was discussed at the DRC meeting to address. Mr. Talley also noted that the feedback from the DRC meeting was incorporated into the final designs for this application. Regarding the clear story at building 10, the intent is to fill in the historic opening. When the contemporary roofing is removed, the opening will be filled in. Mr. Talley stated that Mr. LeMarinel's recommendation regarding the door design worked out well as the doors will have the same mullion pattern as the windows. The preferred choice for the awnings is the corrugated metal to blend in with the other awnings on the Factory campus.

Chair LeMarinel asked Mr. Talley for more details about mounting materials that will be used for the awning.

Mr. Talley explained that the intent is to keep the mounting material simple and as understated as possible.

Commissioner Laster asked Mr. Talley if the brackets for the corrugated metal awning will be like brackets shown with the standing seam metal awning in the application documents.

Mr. Talley stated that the photo of the brackets Mr. Laster is referring to seem to be thicker and heavier, but the intent is to select mounting brackets that are not overbearing but simple and that match and are appropriate for the feel of the Factory.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve Alterations to A Previously Approved Building (Hotel) At 230 Franklin Rd. (The Factory) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the proposed work is successful.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he prefers the corrugated metal awning instead of introducing a new awning to the campus as the corrugated metal awning will blend with existing awnings. Also, Chair LeMarinel noted that he likes historic windows more than aluminum windows.

Commissioner Barrett asked if the change to the corrugated metal awning creates a "fixed" or stationary awning.

Chair LeMarinel stated that corrugated metal awning would be fixed and not moveable. Mr. LeMarinel asked to Board if anyone had comments on the mechanical bull pen.

Commissioner Laster stated that it is a huge improvement and a better solution than trying to hide the mechanicals behind a parapet on the roof.

The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Huffer asked if anyone would like a copy of the Bylaws to please let her know. Also, as a thank you to the Commissioners hard work and commitment to the HZC there will be Merridee's cookies and tea after the meeting.

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

15. Administrative COA For Rear Yard Fencing At 206 E. Main St.; Jill Pittman, Applicant.

Sponsors:

16. Administrative COA For Minor Alteration (Rear Entrance) At 234 4th Ave. N.; Kiley Darde, Applicant.

Sponsors:

17. **Administrative COA For Window Signage At 342 Main St.; Matt Christensen, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

18. **Administrative COA For Mechanical Equipment Installation At 197 Splendor Ridge Dr.; Aquilla Cartwright, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Commissioner Orr motioned to adjourn the December 8, 2025, HZC Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 06:20p.m.



Chair



Date