



Meeting Minutes

Historic Zoning Commission

Monday, May 11, 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 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 Tyler LeMarinel called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

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

Commissioners Absent: Madalyn Ingram

Staff Present: 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 Tyler LeMarinel asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Comments on agenda items may be made in person 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 Laster motioned to approve the April 13, 2026, HZC Meeting Minutes, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Design Review meeting will be held at 4:00 PM on May 18 at the Eastern Flank Event Facility. The deadline to submit an application is midnight on May 11.

The Proclamation of Preservation Planning Month will be tomorrow evening, 5/12, at the BOMA Meeting at the Williamson County Administrative Complex at 7pm.

Commissioner Pearce noted the theme of this year's Preservation month/week is "All People Created Equal" and suggested the board see the Carothers house that the city recently completed. Ms. Pearce also noted that they are closing in on 264 Natchez and the Veteran's Legion on 11th Street.

APPLICATIONS

2. Consideration Of New Construction, Signage, And Site Alterations (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. A new civic building, signage, and site alterations are proposed on the site and will serve as the Williamson County Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Station. The applicant attended several Design Review Committee meetings, and feedback resulting in design revisions has been incorporated into the proposal. Therefore, staff recommend approval of the application with conditions.

Applicant Speaker: Jeff Earwood. Mr. Earwood stated that he was happy with the finished design through collaboration with HZC, and he appreciates HZC for all the input and feedback during the process.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

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

Commissioner Calhoun stated that the applicant responded well to the feedback from the board and as the project came into better focus with the detailing around the windows and doors, the design is suited for the location and purpose of the building.

Commissioner Laster agreed with Ms. Calhoun and thanked the applicant for their willingness to work with the commission.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she appreciates the seriousness the county took in seeking approval from the HZC for this project when they were not required to do so and it speaks to the cooperative relationship between the business, city of Franklin and Williamson County.

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

3. Consideration Of Ramp Installation At 210 3rd Ave. N.; Brandon Priddy, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer explained that the property at 210 3rd Avenue North is located within the Downtown Franklin National Register. The proposal includes the installation of a ramp at the front of the building. The proposed location of the ramp does not align with the Historic District Guidelines' recommendation for placing modern features in locations that are not readily visible; however, the position of the ramp appears to be the only feasible option for the site. Additional landscaping should be added between the sidewalk and the side of the ramp to help soften and screen the ramp.

Recommendation:

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

Applicant Speaker: Aaron Rogers. Mr. Rogers stated that he appreciates the comments and feedback during the approval process and given the site constraints, the proposed ramp location is the best option.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the Ramp Installation At 210 3rd Ave. N. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun.

Commissioner Laster stated that the ramp may not be in the ideal placement but seems to be the only option that complies with ADA requirements and historic zoning guidelines.

Commissioner Calhoun stated that she agrees with staff regarding landscaping between the ramp and sidewalk to help minimize the location of the ramp.

Chair LeMarinel stated that since handrails are not required, it should look and feel more like a front yard.

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

4. Consideration Of Window Replacement and Alterations At 334 Main St.; Jenna Lee, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the building at 334 Main Street is in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District and is considered a contributing building. The proposal includes the replacement of 12 of the upper-floor windows and the replacement of roofing/flashing materials above the architectural element located above the storefront windows and below the proposed windows that are to be replaced.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Applicant Speaker: Michael Lee. Mr. Lee stated that window replacement and alterations have been needed for a long time, and he's happy to do the replacements.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve Window Replacement and Alterations At 334 Main St with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Calhoun stated that the improvements will be tremendous and it will be exciting to see the window replacements.

Commissioner Laster stated that he appreciates the sketches provided by the applicant.

Chair LeMarinel stated the sketches are great, but he hopes the windows will really look like two sashes and asked if the intent is for the windows to appear this way.

Mr. Lee stated that the windows will be real double hung windows and offered to make the middle sash an inch wide.

Chair LeMarinel stated that if it appears like one rail because one rail is on the back sash and one's on the front.

Mr. Lee offered to submit a photo of the finished product to staff.

Chair LeMarinel noted that he is not concerned enough about it to add a condition or amendment to the motion as he knows it will be completed correctly.

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

5. Consideration Of Principal Building Alterations (Porch Railings) At 157 4th Ave. S. (Dan German Building); Jenna Lee, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 157 4th Avenue South is in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District and is commonly referred to as the Dan German Building. The applicant attended the March 2026 DRC meeting and additional information has been provided for review. The proposal includes a retroactive request for the installation of railings on the front porch and front steps, as well as a new request for the installation of a porch roof railing based on historic photographs.

Retro-Active Request for Front Porch and Step Railing:

The front porch railing, installed between the stone columns, is made of wood and painted a light color. The handrail installed along the front steps is made of steel and painted black. Based on historic imagery, the railing between the stone columns does not appear to have been historically present on the front porch and is not required by Building and Neighborhood Services (BNS). The white wood porch railing is not appropriate. A handrail must be installed for the steps in accordance with building codes. Although the guardrail installed for the front steps matches the guardrail installed for the recently approved ramp, a guardrail is not required by building codes and is not appropriate. The design of this guardrail should be simplified to a minimal handrail, with minimal vertical members, and be pulled back off of the walkway to the minimum required distance from the bottom of the steps, so as not to overwhelm the historic building.

Porch Roof Railing:

The proposal includes a request to install a porch roof railing with the intent of matching historic photographs of the detail present on the building.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend denial of the white wooden porch railing and step railing based on the following Guidelines:

- Avoid installing porch railings on porches where railings were not historically present unless required for safety or access reasons. Required railings should be simple in design with square baluster.

Staff recommend approval of the step railing and porch roof railing with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: David Crouthamel. Mr. Crouthamel stated that his client is concerned about safety for disabled persons or those in wheelchairs so that when walking across there is no chance of falling between the arches. Regarding the steps, Mr. Crouthamel stated that safety/insurance is the issue as they would like people to be able to utilize the area.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION #1 (Porch Roof Balustrade)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve Principal Building Alterations (Porch Roof Balustrade) At 157 4th Ave. S. (Dan German Building) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Laster.

Commissioner Laster stated that he spoke to the artist about this who said he took a photograph of the building and made the sketch from the photograph, so we know it was there at the time in 2002.

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

MOTION #2 (Rails between Arches)

Commissioner Worthington motioned to deny Principal Building Alterations (Rails between Arches) At 157 4th Ave. S. (Dan German Building) based on staff's recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Laster stated that originally the railings were made of cast iron or cast iron piping between the arches for safety and stability as the building was used as a hospital, but the intent was not to have railings between the arches. When the building was faced with stone, they were moving away from the Victorian influence.

Commissioner Orr asked if we know the height from grade of the porch as it looks like it is less than 30".

Jared Carter, BNS Staff, responded that it appeared to be less than 30".

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

MOTION #3 (Front Step Rails)

Commissioner Calhoun motioned to approve Principal Building Alterations (Front Step Rails) At 157 4th Ave. S. (Dan German Building) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Orr commented that the railing must extend a foot past the end of the bottom of the steps but may not require a vertical supporting member and instead, the distance required by codes can be achieved by a return of the handrail.

Jared Carter, BNS staff, responded and stated that if the vertical member is not located a foot past the bottom step, the handrail bar must return back to it with the required distance.

Commissioner Pearce stated that final approval would go before staff.

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

6. **Consideration Of Mechanical Equipment Screening At 230 Franklin Rd. (Building 1 At The Factory); David Click, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that The property located at 230 Franklin Road is home to the Factory at Franklin and is located in the Franklin Road Local Historic District and on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The proposal is to install screening with planting for the mechanical equipment on the roof of the building. While the use of planters with foliage is not recommended per the Guidelines, it may be appropriate to use a metal planter in a matte finish without plantings to screen the equipment, provided the planter is sufficient to fully screen it.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Applicant Speaker: David Click. Mr. Click clarified that the structural limitations previously mentioned do not have to do with the structural capacity of the mechanical platform as the platform has been secured and reinforced. The structural requirement of the screen requires lateral bracing from the frame likely conflicting with the equipment on the platform. Mr. Click provided a photo of the area where the screen has been installed and noted that there is a small gap where the standing seam roof and edge of the screening can be seen. Mr. Click noted that in relationship to the expansive viewshed of the Factory from Franklin Road and Liberty Pike, it is a very small area and is noted on the site plan.

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Worthington motioned to approve Mechanical Equipment Screening At 230 Franklin Rd. (Building 1 At The Factory) with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun.

Commissioner Pearce asked why the screening needed to be built like a metal planter if plants will not be planted in the planter.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the HZC has been reluctant to put plants on the roofs of buildings so it would make sense to install a metal wall, but the applicant is stating that there isn't enough space for the bracing of the wall.

Mr. Click stated that planters will be positioned along the western exposed side.

Chair LeMarinel noted that the planters will be filled with something to keep it balanced and from the vantage point it will look like a metal wall, and it will be bronze matching the rest of the bronze features at the Factory.

Commissioner Pearce noted that it may be better suited to be 3 sided.

Chair LeMarinel stated there are two sides indicated on the plan and a 30 degree angle installed.

Mr. Click explained that the goal is to position the planters along the exposed area with the intent of appearing as an extension of the existing metal roofing.

Commissioner Orr asked if the planters would collect rainwater if they are open at the top.

Mr. Click stated that water drains to the TPO roof below, adding to the landlord's scope of getting the proper building envelope secure.

Commissioner Worthington asked if the metal planters will be permanently mounted to the roof.

Mr. Click explained that most of the planters he has experience with have mounting brackets at the bottom to secure the planter to whatever it is sitting on.

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

7. **Consideration Of Modern Features (Lift Replacement) At 218 3rd Ave. N.; CJ Dickson, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay stated that the property located at 218 3rd Avenue North is located in the Downtown Franklin National Register Historic District. The proposal includes a request for the replacement of an existing lift located off the left side of the front porch with a new lift. The new lift requires a full top glass enclosure and will have a total height of 86". The existing lift location is screened from the front but is visible from side angles. The use of a lift is preferential to a more permanent structure and the replacement of the existing lift in the same location is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Applicant Speaker: CJ Dickson. Ms. Dickson stated that the original lift for wheelchair accessibility is no longer allowed by the state. The new lift has the same height as the existing lift and the landscaping will provide screening from the front.

Citizen Comments: none

MOTION

Commissioner Calhoun motioned to approve Modern Features (Lift Replacement) At 218 3rd Ave. N. with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Barrett.

Chair LeMarinel stated that this is one of the necessities and has been masked well for years and will continue to be masked by the landscaping.

With no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 7-0 (Mr. Laster stepped out for a moment).

8. **Consideration Of Demolition And New Construction (Principal) At 1309 Adams St.; Ben McCreary, Applicant.**

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer, Elizabeth Bulay

Project Leader: Elizabeth Bulay. Ms. Bulay noted that two public comments submitted and are available in the published agenda. The property located at 1309 Adams Street is located in Adams Street National Register Historic District. The site features a ca. 1900 1 ½ story gabled-ell frame residential building. The National Register lists the building as contributing to the district. The proposal includes a request for the demolition of the principal building and reconstruction of the building with alterations and an addition. The Historic Residential Building Guidelines and Additions to Historic Residential Building Guidelines are applied to maintain the standard of the historic residential building during reconstruction.

Demolition:

The proposal includes a request for the demolition of the historic principal building on the property. A structural report by an engineer has been included for review; it details the building's condition and the need to replace

60-70% of the structural elements. A separate report details cost estimates for rehabilitation of \$857,660 and new construction of \$662,460. A report and plans for future action for the reconstruction of the building, with modifications and an addition, are included in the submittal for consideration of demolition.

The Guidelines provide that demolition can only be approved if the Historic Zoning Commission deems one or more of the following conditions to be met:

The condition submitted for this demolition is 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.

The materials included within the application demonstrate a level of structural instability and deterioration of the building that necessitate action in order to make the building habitable. Based on the previous DRC discussions, when the scope of work entailed partial demolition with one wall left to preserve the building, the methodology would constitute demolition if the one remaining wall were relocated or taken apart. The cost evaluation included for review demonstrates that new construction is more feasible. The proposed future action for the site has been detailed, and a reconstruction of the existing historic building with alterations and an addition to the building has been proposed and is supported based on the criteria for time for demolition.

New Construction (Reconstruction of the Historic Residential Building)

The building would be reconstructed in the same location and maintain the existing orientation. The proposed reconstruction would retain the historic form and massing of the original building with alterations to restore a historic front porch outlined on historic Sanborn Maps. A dormer-like element is proposed on the left elevation on the rear of the historic building form. The dormer is located just below the gable ridge and infills the area between the two gables. The dormer is proposed to be 30" from one sidewall and has a slope of 2:12. The Guidelines recommend the following for dormers:

- Size and locate dormers to fit with the historic architectural style and roof shape of the building.
- Dormer roof pitch should be at least 3:12 and no less than half the main roof pitch.

While the dormer-like element is proposed in a location with more limited visibility, the element does not meet the Guidelines for pitch and does not have a traditional location, creating a non-traditional dormer form that is not appropriate.

Addition to Historic Residential Building (Reconstructed)

A one-story addition to the reconstructed historic building form is proposed. The proposed placement and orientation of the addition to the historic building form is located to the rear of the building and is oriented to retain the patterns of development seen on the street. The form of the addition appears to be subordinate to the historic building in height and massing. Minor insets and roof breaks are proposed to differentiate the addition from the historic building form. However, the right elevation does not utilize a break in the massing or roofing to differentiate the historic footprint from the new addition. The proposed footprint of the addition is 1,335 sq. ft. and the historic building footprint is 2,234. The proposed addition is 59.76% of the historic building footprint. The guidelines recommend the building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50% of the historic building footprint. While this does exceed the recommended 50% addition size recommendation, the overall footprint of the building is approximately 9% of the lot coverage and is appropriate for new construction. The reconstruction of the building creates a highly unique situation with the proposed expansion of the reconstruction. The proposed reconstruction of the building is supported and creates a unique application of the Guidelines to ensure a high standard of construction is maintained for replication of the building. However, some minor elements of the reconstruction do not align with the Guidelines. The proposed building meets the requirements for new construction except for a few elements such as the dormer element and new architectural details and ornamentation. However, because the historic residential building guidelines are applied to ensure a higher standard for reconstruction and additions, the size of the new construction that is being reviewed as an addition exceeds the recommended size for an addition to a historic building at 58% of the historic building's footprint.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the demolition of the principal building with the following conditions outlined in the staff report.

Staff recommends denial of the new construction (reconstruction and addition) based on the following Guidelines:

- Preserve and maintain historical architectural details and ornamentation. New architectural features should not be added.
- Size and locate dormers to fit with the historic architectural style and roof shape of the building.
- Dormer roof pitch should be at least 3:12 and no less than half the main roof pitch.
- Dormer sidewalls should be at least 30 inches from the exterior building wall.
- Design additions to be compatible with the historic building yet clearly identifiable through the use of differentiating methods such as roof breaks, wall insets, wall off-sets, material changes, and lower eave lines. A combination of these methods should be considered based on the specific context of the building and the site.
- Design the size of an addition to be subordinate to that of the historic building. The building footprint of an addition should not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint of the historic portions of the building.

If the commission votes to approve the new construction (reconstruction and addition), conditions are recommended and listed in the staff report.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he would like the applicant to speak to the demolition portion of the application, and then he would take a motion for demo.

Applicant Speaker: Ben McCreary. Mr. McCreary stated that staff recommend approval of demolition, and he did not have anything further to add.

Citizen Comments: None

Commissioner Orr questioned if we should save the consideration of demolition until after the consideration of new construction.

Chair LeMarinel responded to Mr. Orr's question by stating that one of the conditions of demolition is that a plan must be approved for what's next for the area. It does not necessarily mean demolition cannot be approved, it means construction cannot take place until a plan has been submitted for what will be built in the location.

MOTION #1 (Demolition)

Commissioner Pearce motioned to approve demolition contingent on the approval of a new COA for new construction At 1309 Adams St, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she does not take demolition of historic buildings lightly, but the house has been empty for years. This house is worse than the Natchez Street building. In the future, Commissioner Pearce stated that she hopes the Historic Guidelines relating to demolition will have language addressing the issue of neglect.

Commissioner Laster stated that demolition is the last resort, but this building has met all criteria for demolition, so it's difficult not to approve the request.

Commissioner Calhoun agreed.

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

Applicant: Ben McCreary. Mr. McCreary stated that through discussions and comments about architectural features that may or may not have been present on the building. Mr. McCreary explained that he took a very plain form and made the design more consistent with the style of the home and the character of the district. A lot of research and walking around looking at other styles of the same period is how the design came about. Mr. McCreary stated that they tried to balance simplicity with visual interest by adding ornate features that would not be considered inappropriate for the home. Regarding the dormer location, Mr. McCreary stated that it has minimal visibility along with its orientation and the vegetation surrounding the location makes it difficult to see.

Looking at the homes to the left and right of the subject building, in relationship to the continuous wall, both homes have continuous walls longer than what is proposed. Mr. McCreary stated that he believes they have maintained a break between the old and new (inset) while being consistent with character of the surrounding homes. Mr. McCreary also noted the large lot size with relationship to the conditioned space of the home even though it is 59% of the historical footprint, it is still on 9% of the lot.

MOTION #2 (Construction of Addition without Gable decorations or Dormer)

Commissioner Laster motioned to approve the construction of the addition without the gable end decorations or dormer for 1309 Adams St with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Pearce.

Commissioner Laster stated that this house is a common Victorian house of the late Victorian period and there are some homes with the gable decoration, but this kind of craftsman look with the proposed decoration is not seen in the district. Also, a precedent has not been set because it is not known if this type of ornamentation was used. In treating this house as though it is a reconstructed historic structure and not a new house, Commissioner Laster stated that he is hesitant to approve the proposed ornamental details. Mr. Laster stated that he has seen the attic vent in the rectangular form in Victorian Franklin homes but typically it is more common as a round shape with a decorative element but is appropriate. Regarding the dormer, it does not fit the traditional style of this home and if it were a new house and being treated as new construction and the dormer was on the back out of sight, it could possibly be considered for approval. The house would be better without the dormer.

Chair LeMarinel stated that regarding the gable details, the existing house has rafter tails out of the rake confirming that Mr. Laster is talking about the timbering material of the gable.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she is ok with going over the recommended square footage of the historic footprint, a little, because of the size of the lot. Also, the dormer does not conform with the historic guidelines and in light of the demolition approval, going over the recommended square footage and then to add elements (gable & dormer) that would not normally be approved, Commissioner Pearce stated she would not approve of those as proposed.

Commissioner Thompson asked if Commissioner Laster's motion included the porch trim detail or just the gable.

Commissioner Laster stated that the motion includes the gable detail, but he has questions about the spandrel. Typically, it is connected to the header of the porch and does not sit below it so that you can see the back wall of the house through the very top of the spandrel.

Mr. McCreary stated that he would be fine if it went up to the top rail of the porch. The design was based on the existing features of the home whether that was accurate or not.

Commissioner Laster noted that he assumed it had been added.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the porch rack is the top rail.

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

9. Consideration Of Signage At 109 3rd Ave. S. (City Hall); City of Franklin, Applicant.

Sponsors: Kelly Dannenfelser, Emily Huffer

Project Leader: Emily Huffer. Ms. Huffer stated that the property located at 109 3rd Avenue South is the location of the City of Franklin's City Hall. The proposal includes the installation of a wall sign above the entrance to the below-grade parking on the rear of the building. The proposal meets the intent of the Guidelines for wall signs for commercial/civic buildings except for the height from grade, which is proposed to be a maximum of 12' and the sign is proposed to be placed 13'4" from grade. The sign is centered above the entrance to the parking area and similar in style to the signage that is seen on the Second Avenue and Fourth Avenue parking garages.

RECOMMENDATION:

Since this is a City project, staff does not make a recommendation, but there are potential conditions should the Historic Zoning Commission approve the proposal outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Speaker: None

Citizen Comments: None

MOTION

Commissioner Orr motioned to approve signage for underground parking at City Hall, located at 109 3rd Avenue South with staff conditions, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the placement of the sign is located at the back of the building with the scale being different for the larger buildings, making the height issue not a huge concern.

Commissioner Pearce asked Chair LeMarinel, as an architect, why 12 feet would be needed for the sign.

Chair LeMarinel stated that he does not know exactly but it could be a structural thing or clearance issue with 12 feet needed for deliveries. Mr. LeMarinel noted it could also be an alignment of the window heads which is an aesthetic thing. Chair LeMarinel stated that he could not speak to the reasoning but noted that the staff report said that the signs are like existing signs in other parking garages downtown.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the sign is great, and she was wondering why it was so tall.

Chair LeMarinel stated that the size has to do with the alignment of the headers of the windows and, structurally speaking, it may have been a lot of weight to hold up if all the structural members are at the floor line.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

RECEIPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COA APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE HZC

10. **Administrative COA For Rear Bollards At 236 Public Sq.; Kristen Swain, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

11. **Administrative COA For Signage At 223 Bridge St.; Evangelina Montelongo, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

12. **Administrative COA For Signage At 347 Main St.; Peter Duncanson, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

13. **Administrative COA For Minor Rear Alteration (Non-historic Window Replacement) At 819 W. Main St.; Candie Westbrook, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

14. **Administrative COA For Rear Yard Fencing (Revision To Approved Plans) At 423 S. Margin St.; Brandon Priddy, Applicant.**

Sponsors:

ADJOURN

Commissioner Orr motioned to adjourn the May 11, 2026, HZC meeting, seconded by Commissioner Calhoun. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 06:02 PM.



Chair



Date

