



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park
3000 Granny White Pike
Nashville, Tennessee 37204
Telephone: (615) 862-7970
Fax: (615) 862-7974

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES June 19, 2013

Commissioners Present: Hunter Gee, Acting Chair; Menié Bell, *Rose Cantrell, Samuel Champion, Richard Fletcher, Aaron Kaalberg, Ben Mosley

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Robin Zeigler (Historic Zoning Administrator), Susan T. Jones (City Attorney)

Applicants: Michael Ward, Ronee Swafford and Daniel Long, Preston Quirk, Rich McCoy, James Lowen, Andrew Pulliam, Ryan Taylor

Public:

In the absence of the chair and vice-chair, Commissioner Gee led the meeting. He called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and read aloud the processes for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission.

MINUTES:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the May 15, 2013 minutes without changes. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

DESIGNATION:

Recommendation of Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay for 305 Kent Road, Hall-Harding-McCampbell House and adoption of Historic Landmark Design Guidelines for this property:

Denise Gallagher, intern, presented the case for 305 Kent Road.

There were no requests to speak to the case by the applicant or the public. Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve based on staff recommendation. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the project passed unanimously.

Acting Chairperson Gee read aloud the process for the Consent Agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1733 4TH AVE N

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925102

3605 MEADOWBROOK AVE

Application: New Construction-addition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1925270

1814 BEECHWOOD AVE

Application: New Construction-outbuildings
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1925272

109 EVANDER ST

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: BRAD BAUMGARTNER
Permit ID #: 1925199

314 GREENWAY AVE

Application: New Construction-outbuilding
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1925304

1306 EDGEWOOD PL

Application: New Construction - outbuilding
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1925330

1716 SWEETBRIAR AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: FRED ZAHN
Permit ID #: 1925277

1812 BEECHWOOD AVE

Application: Setback reduction
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: FRED ZAHN
Permit ID #: 1925285

1817 4TH AVE N

Application: New construction-addition and Setback reduction
Council District: 19
Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1925115

315 SOUTH 11TH ST

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: FRED ZAHN
Permit ID #: 1925273

3713 RICHLAND AVE

Application: New construction--addition; Setback reduction
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1925201

1624 16TH AVE S

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1925221

2002 20TH AVE S

Application: New Construction--addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1925228

1505 ELMWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1925485

906 MANILA AVE

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1925206

1812 BOSCOBEL ST

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1925278

1814 BOSCOBEL ST

Application: New Construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1925284

1630 DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New Construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1925265

614 SHELBY AVE

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #:1919909

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the cases for consent and explained that 1306 Edgewood was removed from consent at the request of the applicant.

There were no requests from the public to remove any additional items from the consent agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the consent agenda items with their applicable staff recommended conditions. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion was passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1306 EDGEWOOD PL

Application: New Construction - outbuilding
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1925330

**Commissioner Cantrell joined the meeting at 2:10 p.m.*

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for 1306 Edgewood Place.

1306 Edgewood Place is a one and one-half story frame house, constructed circa 1910. With a mix of Craftsman and Victorian architectural features, and because of the early date of construction, it is considered to be contributing to the historic character of the neighborhood

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing non-contributing outbuilding and construct a new outbuilding.

The existing outbuilding does not contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood. Demolition of the structure meets guideline IV.B.2.b.

The new outbuilding will be a one and one-half story, two car garage in the rear-left corner of the property, replacing a non-contributing garage.

The roof of the new building will be a side-oriented gable with a ridge height of twenty-four feet, with eaves at eleven feet.

The footprint will be six hundred, sixty-five square feet in area, with the primary front wall being twenty-five feet wide. With the height being shorter than the house by at least four feet, and the footprint only about 1/3 that of the house, the outbuilding will be subordinate to the house. It will meet the guidelines for height, scale, and setbacks.

The materials will include: cement-fiber siding, asphalt shingle roof, and wood windows and trim. These materials are appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed new outbuilding with a condition that the double-door on the front of the garage is changed to two doors. Having met that condition staff finds that the application would meet the applicable sections on the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Acting Chair Gee asked about the 18' opening that appears to go to the edge of the building where the elevation shows a smaller opening. Mr. Alexander explained how the openings would work.

Preston Quirk, applicant, handed out two pages of three photographs to show existing conditions. He explained that the house is deep and 23' from the existing garage so there is concern about being able to access the second bay if the two bays are separated. He pointed out that all that will be seen from the street is half the garage.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if the rear façade needed to have two separate doors too and Mr. Alexander stated that because the rear façade would not be seen from the street, staff was not as concerned about the rear design.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if the issue could be solved with some type of delineation and Mr. Quirk agreed to a door design that looks like two doors.

Acting Chair Gee asked for clarification of the design guidelines requirement of two doors which was explained by Mr. Alexander.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked if the garage could be moved back closer to the alley and Mr. Quirk explained that if it were closer there may be issues with making the turn from the narrow alley.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the condition that the one door should utilize a design that aesthetically reads as two doors. Commissioner Cantrell seconded. Commissioner Mosley moved to amend the motion to include the clarification that the two door requirement is not necessary in this case because of the close proximity of the existing structure that the applicant is honoring, to the existing house. Cantrell seconded the amendment. The amendment passed with vote in opposition from Commissioner Champion. The amended motion passed with four votes in favor and Commissioner Champion voting in opposition.

1906 HOLLY ST

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1925212

Staff member Baldock presented the case for an addition at 1906 Holly Street. She stated that the dwelling at 1906 Holly is a one-story house with a gabled-ell form constructed c. 1920. The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story addition to this one-story house. The new addition will be taller than the historic structure and requires the removal of portions of the existing house, roof, and a chimney. Staff is recommending disapproval of the project, finding that the height, scale, roof shape, and proportion and rhythm of openings do not meet Section II.B. of the Design Guidelines. Historic and current

photos of the house were present. Two photos show that on the left side of the house, behind the gable, is a one-story addition that is not original to the house. It does not appear in its current form in the 1986 photo. In addition, the foundation material for this portion of the house does not match the rest of the house's foundation material. The other photos show that on the right, behind the side bay is the back part of the gabled L. It is believed that this portion of the house was reconstructed after a fire in 2003. It is not known how much of this portion of the house is original and how much was reconstructed. The foundation matches the foundation of the rest of the historic house, but the roof framing is new.

The applicant proposes to construct an addition on top of the existing back portion of the house and to increase the footprint of the house by about twenty-four feet. As the roof plan shows, the proposed addition will necessitate the removal of significant portions of the original roof form, particularly on the right side of the house. The proposed addition will stack on top of several feet of the front-facing gable and on the roof of the right bay. These portions of the historic roof should be preserved, and any new structure should be constructed behind these roof forms. On the left side, because the addition will not step in the recommended two feet (2') from the back slope of the gable roof form, the historic roof form will be negatively impacted. The addition will have a three-sided hipped roof. While hip roofs are recommended when an addition is proposed to be taller than the historic structure in order to minimize its visibility, in this instance, the location of the addition so close to the front of the house makes the roof form inappropriate.

The proposed addition is designed to be four feet taller than the historic structure. The portion of the roof that faces the front and the sides will be hipped. The roof will stack on top of the roof of the right side bay. The design guidelines states that an addition can be up to four feet taller than the historic structure when the taller portion of the addition is at least forty feet (40') behind the front of the house and the taller portion of the addition steps in appropriately. The addition ties into the back slope of the house at a point just below the ridge. The addition is four feet taller than the house at a point that is just 21' feet from the front façade, which is significantly less than the 40' feet the guidelines ask for. The addition also does not step in from the side walls of the house. Typically, the Commission has required that two-story additions step in two feet (2') from the roof and the side walls of the house. The addition will be constructed on top of the existing non-historic rear portion of the house. Also on this façade, staff finds that windows that meet the historic proportions of being generally twice as tall as they are wide are needed towards the front of the addition. In addition, this façade should have a window opening of at least four square feet every eight to ten feet (8'-10').

On the right elevation, the proposed second story addition stacks on top of the side bay and on top of the mid and back portion of the gabled ell. The addition does not step in from the right side walls of the house. The rear elevation will have a gabled roof form. This elevation shows that the roof of the addition will have side slopes with a 3/12 pitch. The design guidelines states that roof pitches should generally be a minimum of 6/12 in order to match the historic context.

The applicant submitted a drawing to show that the taller portion of the addition will not be visible when standing directly across the street. However, staff notes that the addition will be highly visible and will have a visibly negative impact on the historic structure when viewed from the street, at an angle from the house.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the proposed two-story addition. The proposal will alter the original form of the house and does not meet the stated objectives of the design guidelines to be "compatible in scale," not be "visually jarring or contrasting," and "not disturb public facades." Because the addition is four feet (4') taller than the historic house at a point only approximately twenty-one feet (21') behind the front wall of the house, and because it does not step in from the house's sidewalls and roofs but rather stacks on top of the house's walls, staff finds that the proposed addition does not meet Sections II.B.1., II.B.2., and II.B.10 of the design guidelines. Because the addition removes a significant portion of the historic house's roof form; and the slope of the addition's roof is less than 6/12, staff finds that the roof form does not meet Sections II.B.5. and II.B.10 of the design guidelines. The windows on the left façade do not meet the historic proportion and rhythm of openings, therefore staff finds that the fenestration pattern does not meet Sections II.B.7. and II.B.10. of the *Design guidelines*.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked what type of guidance was provided to the applicant. Ms. Baldock explained that there have been several meetings for at least a couple of weeks and that the applicant had been provided examples of approved additions that are taller than the existing house.

Applicants Ronee Swafford and Daniel Long explained that they purchased the house without a full understanding of the requirements of the overlay. Mr. Long said that they originally wanted to raise the ridgeline and they have since revised the drawings. He thought that by changing the pitch it would make it less visible and so that is why the roof pitch of the addition is inappropriate. Ms. Swafford noted that they had an issue that the grade rising in the back, the narrowness of the house, the shallowness of the lot, and their desire is to keep some of the back yard. There is no inset as typically required of additions because it is a long narrow house and they need the square footage. They agree to rework the windows and they requested feedback from the applicant.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Champion stated that they cannot go back the required 40' in order to increase the height because of the narrow depth of the lot.

Commissioner Mosley expressed concern over the height, scale, roof pitch, and the clarity of the drawings.

Commissioner Champion stated that all the issues are solvable and they should keep working with staff. Acting Vice-chairman Gee agreed that all staff recommendations are achievable but was concerned with how far they have to go and the inaccuracy of the drawings. It would be easier for staff and the commission to review if the details were accurately reflected. Commissioner Kaalberg expressed concern with turning a single-story into a full two-story house and it might be better to try for a 1.5 story addition.

Commissioner Mosley agreed that a full second story is unusual for a house that is this size and scale. He advised the applicant that they would either need to lose some additional rear yard or square footage in the addition. He recommended a 1.5 story addition, steeper roof slope and cross gables to help to break up the massing of the addition and acknowledge that this would mean reworking the interior of the plans.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to disapprove the application based on the findings that the project does not meet the design guidelines in terms of height, scale, roof shape, and proportion and rhythm of openings. Commissioner Champion seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

126 BLACKBURN AVE

Application: New construction- addition and outbuilding, Setback reduction

Council District: 23

Overlay: Belle Meade Links Triangle Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1925395

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 126 Blackburn. He explained that there were several requested alterations that could be approved by staff and in consideration of the commission's time he will just present the porte cochere and the garage.

126 Blackburn Avenue was built circa 1949, but because of several alterations to the building before the designation of the Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay it was determined to have lost its contributing status. Construction of two front dormers was approved by the MHZC in 2005, and other front alterations and a rear addition were constructed in 2009 and 2010.

Additional alterations to the front entrance and the construction of a rear screened porch were also reviewed administratively earlier this month.

The applicant is proposing to construct a porte cochere addition and also a new detached outbuilding.

The applicant proposes to construct a new porte cochere on the right side of the house, covering a parking area next to a door on the side of the earlier addition.

Because the house is non-contributing, and there are historic houses with porte cocheres in the neighborhood, this type of side addition could be appropriate. On its own, the height and width of the proposed porte cochere is compatible with the house.

However, in projecting ten feet to the right it would encroach into the required minimum side setback buffer and the resulting space between this house and the adjacent house would be fairly minimal.

The applicant also proposes to construct a new outbuilding, a one-car garage with a recreation room in an upper half-story. Because the property base zoning is RS10, a detached accessory building cannot be used as a dwelling.

The garage will be three feet from the side property line and eight feet from the rear. This location is appropriate for an accessory building, and because it is at the rear it will not have the effect on the street rhythm that the addition would have.

The building will be sixteen feet wide along the front, and the roof ridge will be a front-oriented gable. The roof ridge height will be twenty feet. Outbuildings of this size are often approved at staff-level, however there will be a hipped-roof cupola atop the building bringing the total height to twenty-five feet.

The design guidelines state that the design of outbuildings should be utilitarian or reflect the character of the period of the house to which it relates. Cupolas, like the one proposed, are more commonly associated with Italianate and Greek Revival architectural styles, as well as with vernacular agricultural or industrial buildings, and are not typical of the Minimal Traditional or Cape Cod-Colonial Revival style of this house.

Staff finds that the cupola is not in keeping with the character of the house or other historic buildings in the overlay. With the condition that the cupola is removed, the proposed outbuilding would be compatible with surrounding historic buildings and the primary house.

The applicant, Scott Wilson, architect stated that he agreed with Mr. Alexander, but they would like to keep the whimsical cupola. He passed around photographs of porte cocheres in the neighborhood. He stated that the design is appropriate and their neighbors did not have issue with the setback reduction. He asked for consideration of the porte cochere's setback reduction and the garage's cupola.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Fletcher asked staff to respond to the photographs submitted. Mr. Alexander stated that none of the examples were setback reductions, as was being requested in this case.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that in the other examples the neighbor's homes are further back and this one is close to the property line. Acting Vice Chair Gee pointed out that the porte cochere is set back quite a bit from the front wall of the house and that the adjacent house appears to stepback from where the porte cochere will be located. Commissioner Kaalberg agreed that that the setback of the house next door helped make the project appropriate.

Commissioner Mosley stated, that in terms of the appropriateness of side additions, there isn't a distinct rhythm of development on the block face and since the porte cochere is open in design it appears to be less intrusive than it might have.

Commissioner Bell noted that the neighbors were not present to speak against it.

Motion;

Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve the project with the condition that the cupola be eliminated and the applicant seek administrative approval of all materials. Commissioner Bell seconded.

1100 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925481

The applicant proposes a one-story, mixed-occupancy, 7000 square foot building on a vacant lot at the corner of Fatherland and South 11th Streets.

The project meets the design guidelines in terms of height, setback, rhythm of spacing, known materials, roof shape, orientation, and appurtenances.

The corner building reads more residential in scale due to the type of materials and window configurations. For this reason, staff finds that the design of the current corner building would provide a better transition from the commercial corner to the residential area and so recommends flipping the two pieces.

The majority of windows meet historic proportions with the exception of three narrow (2' x 7.5') windows within a paneled recess. This type of window and window configuration is not seen historically and are located on a highly visible facade. Staff recommends that these windows be replaced with one or two windows that are more historically proportioned.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- The applicant obtain staff approval of brick, windows and doors;
- the cement fiber panels have a smooth finish;
- utilities be located towards the rear of the lot or on the roof;
- the two buildings be flipped on the lot; and
- the tall narrow windows on the right side are replaced with windows of more historic proportions.

With these conditions, Staff finds the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Rich McCoy, architect for the project, explained that the materials are oriented in the proposed manner because the materials on the corner are larger in scale. It is primarily brick except for the pop-out and continues the translucency of that corner.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Mr. Alexander left the meeting at 3:11.

In response to several questions, Ms. Zeigler again explained the recommended conditions.

Acting Chair Gee asked the applicant to clarify which conditions he had concerns about. Mr. McCoy stated that they disagreed with flipping the two buildings. They could change the windows but don't understand why they were a concern.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the façade was fairly flush with the street and Mr. McCoy confirmed that with the exception of the corner recessed entrance.

Acting Chair Gee stated the box window was more of a commercial application than an interpretation of a residential bay window. Mr. McCoy agreed and explained that it helped to break up that façade.

Acting Chair stated that both the buildings looked commercial and the corner building was primarily brick.

Fletcher said he had a hard time differentiating between the two.

Motion:

Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve the project with the conditions:

- The applicant obtain staff approval of brick, windows and doors;
- the cement fiber panels have a smooth finish;
- utilities be located towards the rear of the lot or on the roof; and,
- the tall narrow windows on the right side be replaced with windows of a 1:3 proportion.

Commissioner Mosely seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioners Kaalberg left the meeting temporarily. Commissioner Mosley left the meeting.

129 2ND AVE N

Application: Signage & Alteration

Council District: 19

Overlay: Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925116

The applicant proposes to reconstruct the storefront, replace upper-story windows and install signage and lighting. The project meets the design guidelines in terms of materials, upper story window replacement and lighting.

The proposed new storefront meets the design guidelines with the exception of the window. The proposed window is a NANA-wall system with butt-jointed glass to read as one window.

This type of storefront window was approved as a test case at 322 Broadway, Margaritaville. The Commission must now decide whether or not this type of window successfully meets the design guidelines for a new storefront that has “arrangement, features, materials, and proportions typically found on buildings of the same style and period of the building involved.”

Two signs are proposed: a projecting three-sided sign and a shingle sign above the door. All appear to meet the new signage guidelines but staff requested more detailed drawings to be sure of what is proposed.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that applicant obtain administrative approval of all signage, windows and doors. With these conditions, Staff finds the project to meet the design guidelines for signage, lighting and new storefronts in the Second Avenue Historic Zoning Overlay.

Jim Lowen stated he was present to answer questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the conditions that the applicant seek administrative approval of all signage, windows and doors. Commissioner Cantrell seconded. The motion passed with Acting Chair Gee voting in favor of the project and Commissioner Champion in opposition.

316 BROADWAY

Application: Signage & Alteration

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925111

This project includes alterations and repairs of existing building and signage. The alterations to the side of the building and upper story window replacement meet the design guidelines. The existing storefront is not historic as early photographs show a different configuration without a bulkhead. The applicant proposes to retain the existing beltcourse and replace the storefront with a NANA-wall system with butt-jointed glass to read as two single-glazed storefront windows.

This type of storefront window was approved as a test case at 322 Broadway (Margaritaville). The Commission must now decide whether or not this type of window successfully meets the design guidelines for a new storefront that has “arrangement, features, materials, and proportions typically found on buildings of the same style and period of the building involved.” The materials for the bulkhead and panels above the storefront are not indicated.

The proposed awning is appropriate in terms of location but not materials. The design guidelines require that awning materials be canvas, cotton duck or similar natural material; however, the applicant proposes corrugated metal. Staff recommends approval of the awning with the condition that the material be canvas, cotton duck or similar natural material of a solid color, not counting the sign image.

Three signs are proposed: a projecting sign on the right edge of the building; a sign on the awning; and signs on the storefront windows. Assuming the storefront signage is installed on the inside of the glass, the window signage is not reviewed by the MHZC.

The existing “Hatch Show Print” sign that has been relocated previously, will be relocated outside the boundaries of the historic district at the Country Music Hall of Fame. Although moving a historic sign outside of the district is typically not appropriate, the location is in close proximity to the district and assures preservation of the historic sign.

Together the signs exceed the allotted 52 sq. ft so staff recommends that one or both be resized to meet the maximum.

The illumination includes bare bulbs and neon. The bulbs will outline the sign but it is unclear where the neon will be located. Bare bulbs are a prohibited light source, according to the design guidelines.

Cabinet signs should have a solid, dark opaque background. The background of this sign is not indicated. Staff recommends a detailed drawing of the sign so that it is clear what is proposed.

The awning sign meets the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- The awning material be canvas, cotton duck or similar natural material of a solid color;
- The total square footage of the two signs be reduced so that they do not exceed fifty-two square feet (52 sq. ft);
- Applicant obtain staff approval for signage and submit detailed drawings of both signs showing the location of neon, background color and how the awning sign will be adhered;
- The bare bulbs be removed or replaced with neon; and,
- The applicant obtain staff approval of final window design and materials.

With these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines.

Andrew Pulliam, applicant, stated that they wanted corrugated metal because the brand of the business is “tin roof.” They would be willing to forgo the awning if the metal was inappropriate, to move forward and they were in agreement with all other recommended conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak for or against the project.

Commissioners Kaalberg and Champion stated that branding was not a circumstance that would allow for deviation from the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **There be no awning or the awning be canvas, cotton duck or similar natural material of a solid color;**
- **The total square footage of the two signs be reduced so that they do not exceed fifty-two square feet (52 sq. ft);**
- **Applicant obtain staff approval for signage and submit detailed drawings of both signs showing the location of neon, background color and how the awning sign will be adhered;**
- **The bare bulbs be removed or replaced with neon; and,**
- **The applicant obtain staff approval of final window design and materials.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

310 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925374

310 Broadway is a non-contributing building constructed in 2011.

The project meets the new design guidelines; with two exceptions and a modification is being requested.

Cabinet signs should have a solid, dark opaque background. This one is proposed to be ivory. Staff recommends a solid, dark opaque background.

The projection width should not exceed six feet (6') and the projection width of this sign will be a total of seven feet (7'). Staff recommends altering the size of the sign so that it projects no more than six feet (6') from the side of the building.

The illumination shall be neon with a small amount, the "fire" at the bottom of the pot, being sequential. Typically, sequential lighting is inappropriate but allowed on Broadway with a modification from the MHZC. Staff finds the sequential lighting to be appropriate since it is a relatively small portion of the overall sign but requests additional information about the rate of movement.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- The cabinet sign have a solid, dark opaque background;
- The projection width be no more than six feet (6'); and

With these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Acting Chair Gee asked what an appropriate rate would be for the sequential lighting. Ms. Zeigler explained that is on a case-by-case basis, this is a small area of the overall sign, and that similar signs made by the same company have three different rates of 4, 6 and 7. Staff wanted to assure that it wasn't an extremely quick change, but that due to the nature of the design it is likely not something the applicant would want either.

Ryan Taylor, applicant, explained that the sequential lighting will be approximately 1 second per minute. He further explained that the requirement that a sign project no more than 6' was likely a typo in the design guidelines.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Bell asked if this was another case of branding. Ms. Zeigler stated that it was not a branding issue, as the applicant had originally requested a digital faux wood grain background and had changed that at staff's request. She stated that she would like to rescind the condition of the dark background since the cabinet sign will not have internal illumination.

Commissioner Champion explained that if the code said 6' that they should stick to 6'.

Motion:

Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve the project with the conditions the projection width be no more than six feet (6'); and the rate of change on the sequential lighting be between 1 and 3 seconds. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

400 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925376

400 Broadway historically is two different buildings although one business occupies the two with one address. A wall sign is proposed for the building towards the interior of the block (A) and a projecting sign is proposed for the corner building (B). Both signs will incorporate neon and the wall sign will be internally illuminated.

Because a projecting sign is used on the corner building, building B, it is allotted a maximum of fifty square feet (50 sq ft). The sign for building B is proposed to be approximately sixty-six square feet (66 sq ft) or sixteen feet (16') more than the maximum allowed. Because building A did not use the full square footage allowed staff recommends that the signs be diminished by just fourteen square feet (14 sq ft).

The projection width should not exceed six feet (6') and the projection width of this sign at its widest point is (6' 6"). Since so much of the sign is far less than the six feet maximum, staff finds the additional six inches to be negligible.

The wall sign has no moving parts but the head on the projecting sign is proposed to rotate. the Commission may approve this as a modification on Broadway. In this case, only half of the sign will rotate at a rate of 4, 5 or 6 rotates per minute. Staff finds the movement to be appropriate as less than half the sign will have a rotating element and the rotation fits the character of the district.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with the conditions:

- That the wall sign project no more than thirteen inches (13') from the face of the building; and,
- The overall square footage of both signs be diminished by fourteen square feet (14 sq. ft.).

With these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Ryan Taylor, applicant explained that the pink background is meant to be aluminum and only the head will have internal illumination.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Acting Chair Gee asked for clarification of the design guidelines vs. the DTC sign regulations and that they both require no more than 6'. He asked if the Commission had approved any other projects to be more than 6' and Ms. Zeigler explained that this was the first application of the new design guidelines. Commissioner Champion stated that they shouldn't be making exceptions.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with conditions that the sign not project more than 6'; the wall sign project be no more than thirteen inches (13') from the face of the building; and the overall square footage of both signs be diminished by fourteen square feet (14 sq. ft.). Commissioner Rose seconded and the project passed unanimously.

205 S 10TH ST

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1925112

Applicant proposes to construct a multi-use development on a vacant lot at the corner of S 10th and Russell Streets.

The development includes 16 residential units facing S 10th Street and Russell Street and the interior of the lot. The interior lots are connected to Russell Street by a pedestrian court and walkway.

A commercial building is placed at the corner vehicular access for all from the alley. Facing Russell Street are two units that are optional live/work or office condo units. The majority of the parking is at the rear of the lot with some parallel spaces along Russell Street.

A SP for mixed used development was approved by the Planning Commission in 2007 for a layout that is similar to what is proposed, with three story buildings and approximately 54,000 GSF.

The project meets the design guidelines in terms of height, scale, Setback, Rhythm of Spacing, known materials, Roof Shape, orientation, Proportion and Rhythm of Openings, and Appurtenances.

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the applicant obtain administrative approval of materials: windows; doors; masonry color, dimensions and texture; cement fiber connections, walkway materials and the lap siding reveal. With this condition the project meets the design guidelines for new construction.

There were no requests from the public or the applicant to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the conditions that the applicant obtain administrative approval of materials: windows; doors; masonry color, dimensions and texture; cement fiber connections, walkway materials and the lap siding reveal. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Recommended Revisions to Rules of Order and Procedure

It has long been the Commission's unofficial policy not to accept "new information" in the meetings for the reason that the Commission and the Staff have not had the opportunity to review the information in advance or review it thoroughly. Applicants have been able to provide supplemental information which had not been reviewed by Commissioners or Staff, if it did nothing more than further illustrate the application they initially submitted. At a recent meeting, the Commission requested staff help to clarify what is "new information." To that end, Staff, with direction from legal counsel, presents a revised Rules of Order and Procedure that includes clarification in section VIII.C.5 and 6. The proposed language is in your staff recommendation, but essentially requests that all materials be submitted by the application deadline. Any information provided at the meetings will be given first to the Chair, so that he or she may determine if it is new information.

5. Applications shall not be considered "complete" ("includes sufficient data for review") as required by section 17.40.420 of the ordinance, and thereby scheduled for a public hearing or reviewed administratively until staff has received all information necessary to fully understand and communicate about the project. Basic items required for applications shall be communicated to

the public on the Preservation Permit application. The historic zoning administrator shall determine when an application is complete.

6. The applicant or his representatives may not provide new information at the public hearing unless invited to do so by the Commission. "New information" may be photographs, drawings, materials, written information, or models that are in different from the application as submitted by the application deadline. The Chair of the commission shall review any information that an applicant wishes to submit to the full body and will make the determination as to whether or not it is new information.

Staff recommends removing section VIII.D.6. that covers regulation of paint colors. Regulation of paint is not a procedural issue but rather a design guideline issue and therefore more appropriately dealt with in the design guidelines. This clarification of when paint is reviewed is already in each design guideline.

The new draft also includes a numbering correction.

Staff recommends approval of the revised Rules of Order and Procedure.

Commissioners agreed that "new information" needs to be better explained/defined.

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve alterations to the Rules & Procedures that includes removal of section VIII.D.6. and the numbering correction. Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON JULY 17, 2013.