



## Meeting Minutes

### Historic Zoning Commission

---

Monday, February 9, 2026

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@franklinton.gov](mailto:planningintake@franklinton.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 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Tyler LeMarinel; Chair, Brian Laster, Angela Calhoun, Bob Barrett, Madalyn Ingram, Mary Pearce, Holly Thompson, Michael Orr, Kathy Worthington

Commissioners Absent: none

Staff Present: Kelly Dannenfels, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay, Bill Squires, Jared Carter

**CITIZEN COMMENTS (Open for citizens to be heard on any issue or concern, including those related to items on the agenda. Please submit a Speaker Card at the beginning of the meeting if you would like to address the Commission. If you would like to speak on an agenda item, the Chair will hold your comment until the public comment period associated with the item. As provided by law, the Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments for items not on the agenda, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director/Staff for administrative consideration, or to a schedule the matter for consideration at a later date. Those addressing the Commission are requested to come to the microphone and identify themselves by name and address for the official record. The Chair may restrict the period for public comment, including the length of the public comment period, the number of individuals who can speak and the length of time each individual may speak. When time allows, the standard individual public comment time is two minutes.)**

Chair LeMarinel asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Comments on agenda items may be made in person 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:

A motion was made by Commissioner Laster, seconded by Commissioner Orr to approve the minutes from the January 12, 2026 meeting. The motion carried 9-0.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Emily Huffer: Regular DRC meeting will be Meeting will be on Tuesday, February 17, 2026. The training with the Law Department has been rescheduled.

**APPLICATIONS****2. Consideration Of Signage (Convenience) At 118 4th Ave. N.; Michael Evans, Applicant.**

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

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 118 4th Avenue North features a ca. 1910 frame pyramidal residential building and a rear parking lot accessible by alleyway. Four convenience signs are proposed at the entry and exit points to the commercial parking lot and are proposed to be 18' x 24', or 3 sq. ft in sign size. The signs are proposed to be mounted to post with the top of the signs to be 71" from grade.

The Guidelines recommend the following for convenience signage:

- Maximum size of 4.5 sq. ft. per side
- Maximum height of 4 feet
- Where not visible from the right-of-way, convenience signs used for parking spaces may be up to 1.5 square feet and up to 6.5 feet tall

While the proposed sign height and size do not meet the Guidelines, State laws were recently passed that regulate commercial signage for parking lots. In consultation with the Law Department, it is determined that new law requires the signs to be installed and requires a higher level of visibility for the signage messaging. The proposed signs meet the new State laws.

Applicant Speaker: Michael Evans. Mr. Evans stated that the application was submitted prior to the final discussion at the last meeting, but the recommended final has been ordered.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:** None

**MOTION**

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve Signage (Convenience) At 118 4th Ave. N. with staff conditions including the previously discussed final, seconded by Commissioner Ingram. The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

**3. Consideration Of Window Alterations At 305 3rd Ave. S.; Kevin Coffey, 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 replacement of two windows on the right elevation. The replacement of the one-over-one window does not appear to have enough information for staff to provide a recommendation. However, the replacement of the existing pair of double-hung eight-over-eight windows with a larger pair of eight-over-eight windows does align with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommend deferral of the replacement of the one-over-one window due to a lack of information. Staff recommend approval of the window replacement of the eight-over-eight pair of windows with conditions listed in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Kevin Coffee. Mr. Coffee referenced the plan elevations from the application documents and stated that the elevation in the middle shows the desired window modifications. Those modifications include a change from a one over one window in the breakfast area to an eight over eight which is in keeping with the rest of the home. A modification of the kitchen window from a smaller to a larger double hung window that utilizes the original header height is proposed. Mr. Coffee explained that he came across an old appraisal that references photos confirming the use of taller windows originally and stated that he proposes using the original window opening with a slightly smaller window. Mr. Coffee explained that he said the windows have limestone headers and sills but instead they are made of wood and are proposed to be replaced in kind. Lastly, Mr. Coffee stated that he proposes keeping the same window profile and would have a vintage mill work make the windows.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:** None

**MOTION (Window Replacement 8/8 Light Pattern)**

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve window replacement (eight over eight) at 305 3rd Ave. S. with staff

conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Laster stated that the applicant has done a nice job of presenting the existing conditions of the home/windows to the Commission along with proposing window replacement with what was originally present on the home.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he likes hearing that the applicant proposes to use the original window openings, bringing the home back to how it appeared historically.

With no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

**MOTION (Window Replacement of a 1/1 light pattern with an 8/8 light pattern)**

Commissioner Thompson motioned to approve window replacement of a 1/1 light pattern with an 8/8 light pattern at 305 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. S. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Chair LeMarinel confirmed that the window in question, on the right elevation, is to the left of the windows from the previously approved motion and the window is about a foot longer.

Commissioner Laster stated that he would like to have more information about the window as part of the 1908 addition. It would be nice for the applicant to answer questions such as "Was the window replaced? Was there a weight pocket or evidence of a weight pocket? Were the weight pulleys present?" This information tells the story of the home and provides evidence of whether the windows were replaced over the years, all of which helps the Commission make decisions.

Commissioner Worthington stated that it would be nice to know the jam thickness.

Commissioner Laster stated that the appraisal shows 3/1 windows showing window replacement over time.

**MOTION (Deferral)**

Commissioner Pearce motioned to defer the 1/1 window replacement until the March 9, 2026, HZC Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

Chair LeMarinel suggested the applicant provide photos of the existing windows so that the Commission can make a better judgement.

**4. 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 by the Historic Zoning Commission in June 2025. This proposal is for alterations to the form, size, and location of the structure. The new parking structure is proposed between the existing buildings 3 and 5 on the Factory Campus. The new parking structure will be tucked in behind the existing buildings on the site and is appropriately placed per the Guidelines. Since the December HZC meeting, the applicant has worked with the Building and Neighborhood Services Department to ensure the placement complies with the International Building Code (IBC).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Applicant Speaker: Read Talley. Mr. Talley stated that since the last meeting, the code issues have been resolved along with adjustments to the openings in the garage.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner Laster commended the leaders of the Factory team for continuing to make their case resulting in an appropriate redevelopment for the historic district.

Commissioner Barrett agreed with Commissioner Laster and stated the plan has come a long way and is more suitable for the Factory District.

With no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

5. **Consideration Of A Preliminary Historic Zoning Commission Recommendation For A Final Plat At 208 E. Main St., 206 E. Main St., and 119 2nd Ave. N.; Daniel Wolterman, Applicant.**

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

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the buildings located at 206 and 208 East Main Street and 119 2nd Avenue North are located in the Downtown Franklin Historic District. A Preliminary Historic Zoning Commission recommendation is required for Preliminary Plats and Final Plats that create new lots. The request is for a recommendation to the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission for the subdivision of the existing two lots into three lots to create a new lot around the existing building located at 119 2nd Avenue North. Lot 68 currently features both of the buildings at 208 East Main Street and 119 2nd Avenue North. Lot 56 currently features the existing building at 206 East Main Street. The proposed subdivision of Lot 68 will create a new lot, 56A, which will encompass the existing building at 119 2nd Avenue North. No new buildable lots are being proposed with this request. The request is appropriate in light of the Guidelines and does not appear to have an impact on the existing historic resources.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommend that the HZC make a positive preliminary recommendation for approval to the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission for the creation of new lots as proposed by Preliminary Plat and or Final Plat. Ms. Bulay noted that at this preliminary stage, the HZC is providing an initial recommendation to FMPC on whether this conceptual proposal, as presented today, meets the intent of the Guidelines. The HZC will further review any future proposals for consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chair LeMarinel noted that lots 119 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North and 208 E. Main Street are non-contributing buildings and 206 E. Main Street is considered contributing to the historical district.

Applicant: Daniel Wolterman. Mr. Wolterman stated that the intent is to create a new lot with the 119 building. Staff recommended splitting into two parts for future planning. Additional parking would be added to 206 E. Main Street and create a separate lot with 119 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:** None

**MOTION**

Commissioner Orr motioned to recommend a preliminary approval to FMPC for A Final Plat At 208 E. Main St., 206 E. Main St., and 119 2nd Ave. N., seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Orr stated his concerns about the lot line around lot 56, between lot 56 and lot 68. The lot line is closer to lot 56 which is the building that contributes to the historical district needing protection, opposed to the commercial building on the other side. Commissioner Orr stated that he would like to see a ten-foot offset from the building on lot 56 to allow more protection from anything that might happen in the future on lot 68.

***Amendment***

Commissioner Orr amended the motion to include a 10-foot setback to the property line at 206 E. Main Street between lot 56 and 58, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Ingram asked for clarity regarding lot 56 A and lot 68 and asked what the goal for the property is.

Chair LeMarinel stated that lot 56A and 56 are one parcel.

Ms. Bulay stated that lot 56 A and 68 are all one lot currently and explained that the applicant is proposing to add a lot line around the building at 119 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and revise the boundaries for lot 56 on the corner.

Chair LeMarinel stated that it appears there is a reduction of 10 feet where it says maintenance easement, basically where the amendment stipulations would be.

Commissioner Worthington stated that lot 56, the corner lot, would add the easement into its proposed new lot line.

Chair LeMarinel stated that building could not occur anyway but it's not a bad idea to monumentalize to be sure, as easements change over time.

The motion to amend carried by a vote of 9-0.

With no further discussion, the original motion, as amended, carried by a vote of 9-0.

## 6. Consideration Of Alterations (Principal Building) and Site Alterations At 234 4th Ave. N.; Daniel Kiedis, Applicant.

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

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 234 4th Avenue North is located in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District and features a ca. 1935 one-story, minimal traditional style building with Tudor-revival influences. The proposal includes a request for a series of alterations to the principal building, alterations to the site, and modern features.

### *Principal Building Alterations*

The alterations proposed to the principal building include the construction of a rear dormer, alterations to the rear entrance, rear stoop alterations, new lighting, and minor alterations to install new mechanical openings on the rear and less visible facades.

#### Rear Entrance

Two lite patterns were included within the application submittal. The design in the colored renderings with the proposed 9-lite pattern is appropriate for the age and style of the building. It is recommended to save the existing door for future use if possible.

#### Deck

The proposed material is appropriate for the deck and railing. However, the horizontal railing design is not a traditional or common railing design. The front porches utilize a simple metal railing with vertical balusters. The design of the horizontal railing is not appropriate. The use of metal would also be appropriate for the railing, as it is seen on the site.

#### Lighting

New light fixtures are proposed in the covered porch and at the rear of the building. A specification has not been included at this time but must be submitted for review to ensure the fixture is compatible with what is existing.

### *Modern Features and Site Alterations*

The proposal includes a series of modern features and site alterations including the installation of a ramp on the rear of the building, an accessible walkway, and mechanical equipment and screening.

#### Mechanical Equipment

While located within 20' of the front façade, the intent of the Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance is to fully screen equipment from off-site, and the proposed opacity is appropriate to meet the requirements of screening. The proposed horizontal board design is not appropriate. The use of an opaque fence within the front yard is not recommended by the Guidelines and is not commonly seen within the defined front yards of residential buildings. Alternative screening such as landscaping would meet the requirements for screening and better align with the Guidelines.

#### Ramp

The proposed location, material, and design of the ramp minimize the impact of this feature on the historic building.

### RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the building alterations, site alterations, and modern features with conditions outlined in the

staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Sam Green. Mr. Green stated that originally, he was made aware of the need for a COA because of the potential occupancy change from residential. To meet the need for a rear entry, a subtle re-grading adding a 5% slope is proposed reducing the need for an additional landing. The wood walkway would have a walnut stain. Mr. Green stated that he hoped the Commissioners would consider the horizontal slats for the guardrail, but the design could be changed if necessary. Mr. Green explained that the windows were proposed to be casement windows with the same light pattern and portions as the rest of the building. Based on the last DRC meeting discussion, the lap siding exposure has been reduced. Mr. Green asked the Commission for input if additional parking is necessary. Lastly, Mr. Green stated that he brought examples of proposed lighting fixtures.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None

**(Withdrawn) MOTION (Dormer, Ramp, Rear Door Modifications)**

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve dormer, back ramp and rear door modifications with staff conditions at 234 4th Ave. N., seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Ingram stated that staff recommended keeping the same grid pattern on the door.

Chair LeMarinel stated that staff noted that the door should be kept.

Ms. Bulay stated that staff recommended the light pattern that you see in the proposed rendering as opposed to the elevation drawings.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the motion could be approval with staff conditions for screening and railing. The applicant would then build a version that adheres to staff recommendations. An amendment to the motion could be made that changes the wording, if someone chooses to do so. Staff's conditions address the rails allowing options for the applicant.

Commissioner Pearce withdrew her motion **(Dormer, Ramp, Rear Door Modifications)**.

**MOTION**

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve Alterations (Principal Building) and Site Alterations at 234 4th Ave. N. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Ingram questioned the durability of a wooden ramp.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the ramp would be at the back of the building and the building is a house and not a commercial building. The wooden ramp meets the guideline recommendations and since the ramp is in the back, it is not as much of a concern.

Commissioner Laster noted that the steps should be preserved and stated that many ramps approved by the HZC have been wood ramps.

Commissioner Worthington stated that the ADA requirements may not be met if the building is zoned as commercial as curbing and handrailing may be required.

Chair LeMarinel stated ADA requirements had been discussed with comments from Mr. Carter.

Mr. Carter stated that most of the details are being worked out by staff.

Commissioner Laster asked what the current zoning is for the property.

Ms. Huffer stated that the property is currently zoned office residential.

Commissioner Laster noted that in the future the property could revert to residential.

With no further discussion, the motion carried 9-0.

**7. Consideration of Alterations (Principal Building) At 1010 Fair St.; Amanda McCreary, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property at 1010 Fair Street is located in the Hincheyville National Register Historic District. The proposal includes the following:

- Infilling the side porch on the left elevation,
- Constructing a dormer on the left elevation,
- Alterations to the rear of the building, and
- Altering the attached "garden shed" addition on the rear

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Applicant Speaker: Amanda McCreary. Ms. McCreary stated that changes were made to the light patterns based on DRC feedback.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:** None

**MOTION**

Commissioner Worthington motioned to approve Alterations (Principal Building) At 1010 Fair St. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun.

Chair LeMarinel asked the applicant if the shed in the back has a foundation as it appears the sides do not meet the floor.

Ms. McCreary stated that the shed is in good shape and the angle of the photo misrepresents the shed making it appear not to have a foundation. Ms. McCreary explained that she would like to add the same detailing to the shed as the principal building and change the roofline so that it is more in keeping with the home.

With no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

**8. Consideration Of Demolition (Accessory Non-Historic), New Construction (Accessory), And Site Alterations At 217 5th Ave. S.; Ben McCreary, Applicant.**

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

Commissioner Thompson recused herself from this item.

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 217 5th Avenue South is located in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District. The proposal includes a request for the demolition of the non-historic accessory structure, construction of a new accessory structure, and site alterations.

**Accessory Structure Demolition**

The proposal includes a request to demolish the ca. 1990 frame shed located behind the principal building. The structure is not historic and is listed as non-contributing to the national register historic district. The structure has been photographed and documented. The removal of the structure is appropriate and will not negatively impact the site or district. The proposal includes a request to construct a new 1 ½ story accessory structure. The proposal includes a request for site alterations to alter the material of the driveway at the accessory structure to create a parking pad and to install a new walkway from the structure to the principal building and is appropriate. A picket fence is proposed in the rear yard with height and placements still needed and may be eligible for administrative review by staff.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommend approval of the accessory structure demolition, new construction accessory structure, and site alterations with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: Ben McCreary. Mr. McCreary stated that since the last DRC meeting, the dormers have been

removed, and specifications of the garage have been added.

Chair LeMarinel asked the applicant about the height of the existing accessory structure next to where the new accessory structure will be.

Mr. McCreary stated that he did not know for sure, but the eaves should be equal at 13 or 14 feet.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

Gail Haddock, 213 Lewisburg Avenue. Ms. Haddock explained the complicated and unresolved flooding issues that occur in this area when significant rainfall occurs. A new accessory building footprint along with additional paving will take away ground that would absorb water during substantial rainfall. Ms. Haddock explained that she owns property on the corner of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South & Church Street which receives stormwater run-off from the subject property along with runoff from other properties along the street. The city planned to install a new drainage system in this area which would require residents to sign off on an easement to accommodate the system, and this hasn't been completed. Ms. Haddock stated that one property owner has decided not to sign off on the easement further complicating the process. Lastly, Ms. Haddock stated that she wanted to make the HZC aware of the flooding and drainage issues in the area along with her concern about the impact on her property.

**MOTION (Deferral)**

Commissioner Pearce motioned to defer the application for Demolition (Accessory Non-Historic), New Construction (Accessory), And Site Alterations At 217 5th Ave. S. to the next HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Ingram.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the HZC should understand the significance of the stormwater runoff and the detail of any elevation changes to the topography.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the job of the HZC is to judge the application against the Historic Design Guidelines which includes site alterations. Mr. LeMarinel stated that he does not see any significant changes to the grading of the site but explained that he does not fully understand the requirements relating to stormwater issue beyond the realm of the HZC. There is some form of engineering the application would pass through.

Ms. Bulay explained that engineering details are not included at the time of the COA application but once the building permits are applied for, the stormwater regulations along with other building codes will be reviewed and taken into consideration.

Commissioner Orr stated that William Banks is working on gathering the easements so that the city can install additional drainage. The construction of the accessory structure and the impervious surface is an increase and could affect direct drainage for the subject property but would not directly impact the overall drainage issue significantly.

Chair LeMarinel stated that when considering an application, the HZC does not consider neighboring backyards but if the Commission does not feel like enough information has been supplied to make a judgement with the guidelines in mind, a deferral is the best course of action.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she made the deferral based on the conditions that exist in the area and would like to withdraw the motion.

Commissioner Ingram stated that if the flooding issues do not get reviewed it could cause a domino effect adding to the ongoing flooding issue. Commissioner Ingram agreed with withdrawing the motion as the person who seconded the motion.

**MOTION (Approval)**

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve the application for Demolition (Accessory Non-Historic), New Construction (Accessory), And Site Alterations At 217 5th Ave. S. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the windows read as separate windows and some of the windows show transoms and some windows don't show transoms looking at the perspective of the garage.

Chair LeMarinel stated that it may be the graphic representation in the application documents.

Mr. McCreary stated that the dormers are proposed to be all trim and do not have any siding. Regarding the transoms, it is proposed to have one quarter and then a three quarter glass in the top.

Commissioner Pearce stated that it would be her recommendation not to use transoms because of the simplicity of the building.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the doors Commissioner Pearce is referring to are the garage doors. This would mean no glass in the garage door and making the door a solid panel. The HZC has reviewed several garage doors with glass.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she didn't realize the transoms were on the garage and stated the transoms appear odd proportionally.

Commissioner Pearce and Chair LeMarinel agreed that the garage door was closer to historic size than several garage doors that had come before the Commission.

Commissioner Laster asked for clarification about the horizontal lines seen on the garage door.

Mr. McCreary stated that the lines show that they are segmented doors and not true carriage style doors.

With no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

## 9. **Consideration Of New Construction, Signage, And Refuse (Williamson County EMS) At 110 Aldersgate Way, John Gore, Applicant.**

**Sponsors:** Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property at 110 Aldersgate Way is located within the Franklin Road Historic District. The property is on the edge of the Historic Preservation Overlay (HPO) and is considered to front the roundabout coming from Mack Hatcher Memorial Parkway. Shared on the property are the Franklin First United Methodist Church and a collection of other buildings, ranging from agricultural to residential uses. A new civic building, refuse area, and signage are proposed on the site and will serve as the Williamson County Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Station. The applicant attended the December 2025 Design Review Committee meeting, where feedback was incorporated into the proposal. The proposed placement and orientation, building form, height, materials, details and ornamentation, entrances, gutters and downspouts generally meet the Guidelines. While the proposed fiberglass windows do not exactly align with the Guidelines regarding materials; they are similar to those on the adjacent FFUMC building. The proposed lighting aligns with the Guidelines for appearance but shall utilize a warm white light to align with the Guidelines and be altered to only be illuminated downward. It is proposed to construct a refuse enclosure to serve the needs of the new building. The refuse area meets the Guidelines; the applicant shall make sure that the refuse enclosure door meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance by utilizing self-closing doors or another way that is listed in the staff report. If a change is proposed, an updated COA may be required if it affects the structure's appearance.

### Signage

It is proposed to construct a brick and limestone monument sign in front of the building. It is proposed to be 4'-8" in height and 7'-4" in length. The sign is proposed to utilize black metal pin lettering in an unknown finish. External illumination is proposed, but it appears that the fixture has not been included within the application. Within the Guidelines, monument signs are not specifically noted as an appropriate sign type within the HPO. However, the Guidelines provide these general sign recommendations:

- Design signs to respect and respond to the character of the property on which they are being placed and of the overall district.
- Select locations, sizes, and placement of signs to complement the building and other buildings within the district

While a monument sign is not a sign type that is recommended within the Guidelines, this site and setting has unique characteristics. It is on the edge of the HPO, and its context is along Mack Hatcher and not visible from Franklin Road. The monument sign appears to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, so the HZC can ultimately decide if a monument sign is appropriate in this context. Should the HZC deem the monument sign appropriate, the sign is recommended to utilize a dark metal in a matte finish for the lettering. External illumination is recommended to be limited to soft landscape uplighting with incandescent and warm-colored lighting when possible. Should the sign be approved by the HZC, a sign permit shall be submitted and meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommend denial of the monument sign based on the following grounds:

1. The proposed sign type is considered an inappropriate sign type within the Design Guidelines.

Staff recommend approval of the construction of the building and refuse enclosure with the following conditions outlined in the staff report. If the HZC were to approve the monument sign, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. The sign shall utilize a matte metal finish for the sign lettering.
2. The sign lighting shall align with the Guidelines to utilize soft landscape uplighting with incandescent and warm-colored lighting when possible.
3. A sign permit must be issued prior to installation and meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Applicant: Lacey Fuller, TMP Architecture. Ms. Fuller stated that she tried to incorporate as many of the suggestions as possible from staff regarding materials. Ms. Fuller noted that when the Commission considers the approval of the sign to remember the purpose of the facility and the importance of being able to identify where the building is quickly.

Citizen Comments: None

**MOTION (Building)**

Commissioner Ingram motioned to approve New Construction, Signage, And Refuse (Williamson County EMS) At 110 Aldersgate Way with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Commissioner Laster stated that the building will be located about 2000 feet away from the church and explained that he doesn't see the relationship to the church building but does see how the building could relate agriculturally. It would have been nice to see a building that reflects the rural character of the area.

Commissioners Ingram and Pearce agreed with Mr. Laster.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the closest building is the barn but beyond that it is one of the oldest homes in Williamson County. Chair LeMarinel also pointed out that since the church owns the property, there may have been suggestions or requirements regarding the design of the new building, by the church. It would be nice if there was a way to satisfy the requests of the church along with allowing the design to be more rural. As the design stands now, the building looks like a church and not like the rest of the property. Chair LeMarinel stated that when the church purchased the property they knew there were historical buildings on the property and that certain considerations would be necessary in the future.

Commissioner Ingram suggested that if the gothic arches were adjusted, the design may look less like the church.

Commissioner Laster noted that the arches reflect the church and stated that he is hesitant to get into designing as it would be ideal if the applicant came to the DRC meeting so that the application can be discussed.

Chair LeMarinel stated that there are several details of the proposed building that read more like a church or civic building.

Commissioner Calhoun stated that she agrees with Commissioner Laster's assessment of the design of the building and when people drive by this area with the open fields with horses it feels very rural. Ms. Calhoun stated that a more historical design that relates better to the surroundings should be strongly considered.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the design process for the building appears to have begun focusing on the church. The Commission is asking for the building to reflect more agrarian, focusing on the surroundings. The proper approach might be to start with an agrarian approach and then turn the design toward the church.

Commissioner Barrett suggested that considering the height of the proposed building, a building design leaning toward a barn type structure may be more appropriate.

Commissioner Ingram stated that regarding identifying the building, a building that looks notably different than the church may be more desirable.

**MOTION (Deferral)**

Commissioner Laster motioned to defer the application, New Construction, Signage, And Refuse (Williamson County EMS) At 110 Aldersgate Way, to the next HZC meeting, March 9, 2026, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun.

Commissioner Orr asked how much leverage the HZC does have, considering this is a Williamson County project.

Commissioner LeMarinel stated that the project would be evaluated against the historic design guidelines.

(*\*\*\*Microphone was off*) Commissioner Pearce stated that generally, Williamson County's historic position is that the design guidelines are followed other than a small detail here and there.

Commissioner Worthington stated that it would be a missed opportunity if the building does not reflect the rural farming character of this corridor of Franklin.

Commissioner Ingram stated that she would like to make sure the applicant understands the design that the Commission is looking for.

Chair LeMarinel stated that similar feedback was given to the applicant during the DRC meeting, in which the applicant did consider and implement several recommendations from DRC.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the Farmers Market and The Giving Garden are part of the church mission.

With no further discussion, the motion to defer carried by a vote of 9-0.

Chair LeMarinel invited the applicant to attend the next DRC meeting and noted that staff would need to know if the applicant is planning to attend.

Commissioner Worthington noted that it would be helpful if the applicant provided more information regarding the monument sign, relating to height, massing, and location.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC****10. Administrative COA For Signage (Sandwich Board) At 203 3rd Ave. S.; Dan Fielder, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

**11. Administrative COA For Signage (Reface Convenience) At 103 1st Ave. N.; Michael Evans, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

**12. Administrative COA For Signage (Canopy, Small Hanging/Projecting, and Convenience) At 320 Main St.; Marianne DeMeyers, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

**ADJOURN**

There being no further business, Commissioner Calhoun motioned to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. The meeting adjourned at 06:14 p.m.

  
Chair

  
Date