



# 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 April 18, 2012

**Present were Commissioners:** Brian Tibbs, Chair; Barri Bernstein; Richard Fletcher; Jim Forkum (representing MHC in Menié Bell's absence); Ben Mosley; and Judy Turner.

**Zoning Staff:** Robin Zeigler (Historic Zoning Administrator), Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Fred Zahn, Jon Michael (City Attorney).

**Applicants:** Councilperson Burkley Allen, Berdelle Campbell, Ernest Campbell, Richard Eadler, John Hornton, Jamie Pfeffer, Preston Quirk, Drew Sloss.

**Public:** Richard Eadler, Carole Kenner, Matt Pogue.

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:09p.m. and read aloud the process for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission.

### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairperson Tibbs asked the Commissioners if there were any comments or questions on the minutes, and there were none.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Mosley seconded the motion, and it was approved without objection.**

### II. CONSENT AGENDA

Staff member Fred Zahn presented the cases that Staff determined to be eligible to be heard together as a consent item:

1203 Forrest Avenue  
New construction—Addition, Demolition

126 Windsor Drive  
New construction—addition, Demolition

1809 Sweetbriar Avenue  
Demolition

117 Mockingbird Road  
New construction—accessory structure

Mr. Zahn noted that 1715 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North was removed from the consent agenda. The item was moved to the first item under new business. All other items on the consent agenda, with their respective conditions, meet the design guidelines for their districts and Staff recommended approval of the consent agenda. There were no requests to remove other items from consent.

**Commissioner Bernstein moved to approve the consent agenda, and Commissioner Fletcher seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion unanimously.**

### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### 1217 5<sup>TH</sup> Avenue North

**Application: New construction—addition, Setback reduction**

At 2:12 Commissioner Mosley recused himself from the case because of a financial interest in submitting the proposal, and he left the room.

The case at 1217 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North was removed from the consent agenda due to public comment received via email from a neighboring property owner. That property owner, who lives out-of-state, was not present. Sean Alexander presented the case for a rear addition and setback reduction.

The new addition will be four hundred, fifty square feet (450 sq. ft.) in footprint, stepping out to the left of the outside edge of the earlier addition by four feet, six inches (4'-6"). This location will not negatively impact the appearance of the original structure because it will be attached to an earlier "sunroom" addition, which extends more than twenty-five feet (25') behind the rear wall of the original structure.

The roof of the new addition will be a shed-roof, matching the pitch of the earlier addition, but meeting the side wall one foot (1') below the eave. The eave line will terminate eight feet (8') above grade. Staff finds the height and massing of the addition to be subordinate to and compatible with the historic house, and to meet guidelines 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, and the roof to meet guideline 2.2.7.

Under the current Zoning regulations, single family dwelling on this lot is required to meet a three foot (3') side setback, although historically structures in Germantown were built with little or no setback buffers. The proposed addition would sit one foot from the left property boundary. Because the reduced setback would be in keeping with the historic pattern of development in the neighborhood, Staff finds it to be appropriate and to meet guideline 22.1.

The exterior of the addition will be clad with wood and trim, with a fiberglass-asphalt shingle roof to match the materials of the earlier addition. In the small front-facing wall of the addition will be a wooden double-hung window. These materials are compatible with the historic house and meet guideline 2.2.4 and 2.2.6.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed addition and setback reduction, finding it to be compatible with the historic context and to meet the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the commission had received a letter against the setback reduction and noted the neighbor's concerns with the setback reduction, which included the circulation of air and light and the health of a tree.

Ms. Campbell, property owner, spoke to the case and presented the commission with photographs of the property. She addressed several items noted in the neighbor's letter by stating that the addition will not affect the tree whether it is within the setback or not. She answered questions from the commission clarifying the photographs. Ms. Campbell showed images of their garage and the neighbor's garage and how the rooflines overlap. She explained that their request was compatible with the neighborhood because there were many buildings historically constructed on or close to property lines within the Germantown overlay. They could not build on their neighboring property because it was a separate lot and would have to be combined.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if trees are part of their purview, and Ms. Zeigler said that they were not.

John Horton, presiding at 1231 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North and serving as legal counsel for the applicant explained the hardship and why the addition was designed the way it was. The two story rear section has two rear doors with one of them serving as access into the proposed addition. The plan will allow for access into the addition and rear access to the yard while maintaining original historic fabric. The project is slab construction and so will not likely have any impact on tree roots. Mr. Horton talked about the density of the neighborhood and how the project was appropriate to the context. He explained that they did not want to build on the neighboring lot as it decreased the value of their property; the two properties are not combined and the design guidelines strive to have additions placed at the rear of a property as opposed to the side.

Richard Eadler, contractor for project, clarified that they were not asking to build on the property line but a foot away from the property line.

Mr. Campbell, property owner, noted that there is already precedence for building on the property line because of the neighbor's carriage house. He further clarified that the tree at the rear of the property belongs to the neighbor and is not on the property line.

There were no additional requests to speak and Chairperson Tibbs closed the public hearing.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project including the setback reduction based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Bernstein seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

*Commissioner Mosley returned to the meeting after the vote.*

**1408 Woodland**

**Application: Infill**

Ms. Zeigler presented the proposal for a new single-family dwelling on a vacant lot. She explained that there is an existing curb cut with a driveway that currently terminates just beyond the front corner of the house. At this time, the applicant does not know if they plan to keep the driveway. Assuming that it will be kept, Staff recommends moving the building to the right just enough to allow for the driveway to continue past the mid-point of the house, eliminating the need for front yard parking. Staff further recommends that the driveway be concrete

strips at least up to the front wall of the house. There are no known walkways, lighting, fences, walls or accessory structures at this time.

The proposed infill design, claimed Ms. Zeigler, meets the guidelines for height, scale, setback, rhythm of spacing, and rhythm of openings. It also meets the guidelines for orientation; although Staff recommends that mechanicals be located on the side, beyond the midpoint of the house or in the rear.

All of the known materials meet the design guidelines and have been approved by the Commission in the past with the exception of multiple lap siding reveals and change in materials vertically rather than horizontally. Historically, material changes happened horizontally at foundation and floor lines, noted Ms. Zeigler.

The design guidelines also encourage belt courses or a change in materials from one story to another to break up the massing. Staff recommends a belt course be added between the first and second floors; cladding have a consistent reveal of five inches (5"); and that Staff provide final review of railing, window materials and roof color and materials.

The design guidelines require that the roof shape and orientation be visually compatible with the neighborhood. Generally, the primary historic roof pitches are between 6/12 and 12/12, with lower slopes for the roofs of dormers, porches and bays. The proposed roof pitches for this project are 5/12 and 7/12 for an asymmetrical roof line and the porch roof is 5/12. The rear bedroom will appear to have a flat roof. The rear bedroom and porch roof are appropriate for the neighborhood; however, the front and side gables do not meet the minimum 6/12 usually required. Historically front gables are symmetrical and although the design guidelines allow for contemporary versions of historic homes, they also require that the overall form, including the roof shape, be similar to what is seen historically. Staff recommends that the projecting gables be symmetrical with a 12/12 pitch to be more consistent with the historic context.

The guidelines require that window openings on the primary street-related or front façade be similar to the historic patterns seen within the district. Typically, the front facades of historic houses have a large amount of window area relative to the amount of wall space. Frequently, front windows are seen as pairs of double hung windows twice as tall as they are wide, or large picture windows. It is atypical for small awning/hopper windows to be on a primary historic façade; therefore, Staff recommends an alteration to the primary window configuration so that all windows on the front are approximately twice as tall as they are wide.

The awning windows on the side are appropriate, as smaller windows around chimneys are seen historically.

The gable vent on the main façade is out of scale for the building. Staff recommends either removing the vent or diminishing the size by 50%. With these recommended alterations to the window pattern and gable vent of the main façade, the project meets section II.B.7 of the design guidelines.

Ms. Zeigler showed some images reflecting the immediate context and then recommended approval of the project with the conditions that:

1. a belt course be added between the first and second floors;
2. cladding have a consistent reveal of five inches (5");
3. the gable vent be removed or diminished by 50%;
4. all windows on the primary façade be twice as tall as they are wide;
5. the projecting gables be symmetrical with a 12/12 pitch;
6. the porch rack be a minimum of one foot (1');
7. mechanicals be located on the side, beyond the mid-point of the house, or at the rear;
8. Staff provide final review of railings, windows, and roof color and materials; and

9. the building be moved to the right just enough to allow for the driveway to continue past the mid-point of the house, eliminating the need for front yard parking or removing the existing driveway.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the project meets section II.B. for new construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Drew Sloss, general contractor for the project and residing at 708 Porter Road, stated that could agree with all of the Staff conditions with the exception of: addition of a belt course, cladding have a consistent reveal of 5"; all windows on the primary façade be twice as tall as they are wide; and the projecting gables be symmetrical with a 12/12 pitch. He provided a hand-out for the commission and presented posters of images.

Mr. Sloss made the argument that the recommended conditions keep the building from being a modern interpretation of a historic building. He showed several homes that are within several blocks of the proposed lot and stated that he found 14 historic two-story homes without a belt course and 9 infill two-story homes without a beltcourse with in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Mr. Sloss stated that 19 historic homes had exposed lap siding as small as 3" and that there were 4 infill homes with a 6" reveal. It was their intent, stated Mr. Sloss, not to change materials, but simply the reveal and to use the material in a modern way.

Mr. Sloss explained that transoms, ovals and diamond shape windows can be found in the district and complement the surrounding windows and that the proposed awning windows were a historic interpretation of the same principle. He said that there were 3 new infill homes with transom windows on the front façade.

In terms of the symmetry and slope question, Mr. Sloss said that there are 4 homes with asymmetrical and low sloped roofs that have been approved by the commission.

The presented design is a modern interpretation of a Victorian, stated Mr. Sloss. They are honoring both the past and present with this design.

Chairperson Tibbs clarified that the conditions the applicant did not agree with were 1,3, 4 and 5 of the Staff recommendation, and Mr. Sloss agreed.

Commissioner Mosley noted that there was a change in form that corresponds to the change in materials in the examples given but not on their proposal. He asked how the transition happens between the two cladding reveals and Mr. Sloss said there would be a flat 1"x4" trim piece, a boxed-in detail. Commissioner Mosley explained that there is distinction between the front façade and the secondary facades, in terms of the need to strictly meet the design guidelines. In the past, the Commission has given far more weight to the front elevation than to secondary elevations. Commissioner Mosley asked about the lack of corner boards on portions of the drawing. Mr. Sloss responded that there will be no siding wrapping around without corner boards.

Matt Pogue, residing at 103 South 13<sup>th</sup>, stated that his understanding of new construction was that it also applied to additions so he noted several additions that had asymmetrical roof lines and presented a poster showing four homes.

Commissioner Fletcher asked Staff to respond to the comments. Ms. Zeigler clarified that belt courses are not found on all historic buildings and were not something always asked of two-story buildings, just in cases where the massing was large. She explained that the issue with the cladding was not that it was a mix of reveals but that the change happened vertically rather than horizontally, as traditionally found on older buildings. She cautioned the Commission with comparing the proposed project to approved additions since they follow different design

guidelines. She further clarified that several of the projects presented were half-a-gable but still read as symmetrical from the street.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if this was a subjective question or if the applicant was simply interpreting the design guidelines differently than Staff. Ms. Zeigler stated that they were trying to interpret the design guidelines as the Commission has for the last few years.

Commissioner Mosley explained that in principal he does not have issue with a modern interpretation of the design guidelines but the windows are very prominent. He stated that in their review of past approved projects the small window is sometimes used in a bathroom or in a stairwell but that proportionally the proposed shape is odd when found on the primary façade. He further stated that he did not like to make a habit of having a flat façade with a change in materials. In this case, it is more of a change in pattern than materials so could be appropriate but there needs to be an engaged pilaster or something that makes the transition under the porch roof purposeful.

Commissioner Tibbs said there didn't seem to be enough volume to require a beltcourse. Commissioner Turner agreed that the amount of windows helped to break up the massing.

Commissioner Turner didn't object to any part of the design with the exception of the small windows. Looking at the floor plan there didn't appear to be any reason for the smaller windows, at least on the ground floor.

**MOTION: Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions the gable vent be removed or diminished by 50%; there be an engaged pilaster on the porch to distinguish between the changes in siding; all corner boards be installed even though those not currently shown on the elevations; alternate window design be submitted with a proportion that meets the design guidelines; the porch rack be a minimum of one foot (1'); mechanicals be located on the side, beyond the mid-point of the house, or at the rear; Staff provide final review of railings, windows, and roof color and materials; and the building be moved to the right just enough to allow for the driveway to continue past the mid-point of the house, eliminating the need for front yard parking or removing the existing driveway. Commissioner Turner seconded and the vote was unanimous.**

Sloss asked if he could approach the Commission to request a clarification. He asked if they could simply remove the awnings windows without moving the corner windows. Commissioner Mosley responded that the windows did not need to be removed but simply be a different shape that would meet the design guidelines. He further clarified that they did not need to be the same size but they need to be more in proportion with the design guidelines.

## **2801 Blair Boulevard**

### **Application: New construction—accessory structure, Setback reduction**

Mr. Alexander presented the case for new construction of an accessory structure at 2801 Blair Boulevard. He described the existing house and the location of the lot. He explained that the existing garage was constructed in 1988 and does not contribute to the character of the district. Its demolition meets guideline III.B.2.b.

The new garage will have a roof peak twenty-one feet, three inches (21'-3") above the finished floor level and an eave height of nine feet (9'). The eaves of the garage will be nearly six feet (6') lower than the eaves of the house in actual elevation. Due to a significant drop in grade behind the house, the floor level of the garage will be

approximately seven feet (7') lower than that of the house. The height of the new garage is subordinate to the house and meets guideline II.B.1.a.

The footprint of the garage will be "L-shaped," with two bays facing toward a central driveway that enters from Westmoreland Drive. The total footprint of the structure will cover one thousand, six hundred, and sixty square feet (1,660 sq. ft.) which is  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the footprint of the primary structure. Additionally, because of the large size of the corner lot, the total area of the house and garage will cover only twenty-one percent (21%) of the lot. The shape of the proposed garage helps to hide a great deal of the massing of the structure, as seen from the street. Although larger than typical historic garages, the conditions of this lot, including the significant grade difference at the location of the garage and the size of the lot, allow for the structure to be subordinate whereas it might not be on a more typical lot. For these reasons, Staff finds the scale to meet guideline II.B.1.b.

The proposed garage would be located behind the primary structure, in roughly the location of the existing non-contributing garage, with a ten foot (10') setback from Westmoreland Drive and a five foot (5') buffer from the property boundary it shares with the adjacent property at 2802 Westmoreland Drive. This location would not meet the required rear setback of twenty-feet (20'). However, considering the unique lot configuration (large corner lot, curvilinear street, wide street frontage), the proposed location would not disrupt the rhythm of houses along either Blair Boulevard or Westmoreland Drive. Staff finds these setbacks to meet guideline II.B.1.c and recommends the setback reduction.

The materials to be used on the structure will reflect the character of the house, including stucco textured cement-fiber panel siding with decorative half-timbering and a fiberglass-asphalt shingle roof matching the color of the house. The trim will also be a cement-fiber composite. The foundation will be split-faced block, which is compatible with the stone foundation of the house. The structure will have wood/composite windows and metal doors, including metal "carriage house" style doors. These materials are compatible with the house and surrounding historic structures, and meet guideline II.B.1.d. Staff will need to review the windows prior to purchase/installation in order to verify they are appropriate.

The roof of the structure will be hipped with a 9:12 pitch, which is similar to the pitch of the clipped gable of the house. This roof form is common to historic structures, and meets guideline II.B.1.e.

The "L-shaped" structure will be oriented on the lot with one of the wings oriented toward Blair Boulevard and the other toward Westmoreland Drive. From either perspective, the structure will have a twenty-five foot (25') wall parallel to the street with the other wing angled away. Because of the irregular shape of the lot, and because the structure will be compatible with the orientation of both streets, Staff finds the orientation to meet guideline II.B.1.f.

Typically, less scrutiny is given the window patterns of accessory structures because of their location at the rear of a property and because they are more utilitarian in nature. This structure, however, will be visible from Westmoreland Drive because it will have a ten foot (10') setback. The window pattern will be compatible with that of surrounding historic houses, as there will be no more than nine feet (9') between any window or door opening along any of the walls visible from the right-of-way. Staff finds the window pattern to meet guideline II.B.1.g.

Because of the location behind the primary structure, the drop in grade, and the use of compatible materials, the structure will meet guideline II.B.1.h., which pertains specifically with the compatibility of accessory structures.

Staff recommended approval of the application to demolish the existing garage and construct a new four-car garage with reduced setbacks with the condition that Staff review the windows prior to purchase/installation in order to verify they are appropriate, otherwise finding the scale, location, and materials of the new structure to be

compatible with surrounding structures and to meet the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Commissioner Mosley asked if Staff had concern about the building being forward of the neighboring primary building. Mr. Alexander explained that even if the building were ½ the size it would be in the appropriate location.

Mr. Quirk, architect for the project and property owner, explained that they have been in the house 25 years and they have several cars and a boat that they would like to move inside.

Commissioner Mosley asked if there was a sidewalk on Westmoreland and if additional windows on that side would help. Mr. Quirk explained that there will be 10' between the edge of the sidewalk and the wall facing Westmoreland and that additional window wouldn't be seen because of an existing hedge.

There was no request for public comment.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the application to demolish the existing garage and construct a new four-car garage with reduced setbacks with the condition that Staff review the windows prior to purchase/installation in order to verify they are appropriate, based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Mr. Mosley seconded the motion and provided the clarification that this project met the design guidelines because of the unusual shape and size of the lot as well as its corner location. The motion passed unanimously.**

**209 South 16<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Application: Demolition, Infill**

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the case for demolition and infill construction at 209 South 16<sup>th</sup> Street.

209 S. 16<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed after 1951, and does not fall within the primary period of significance for the Lockeland Springs-East End overlay. Its form and materials do not fit within the historic context of the neighborhood, and Staff believes that the structure is non-contributing to the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Staff finds that the demolition of the existing building at 209 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street meets IV.B.1.d. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposed dwelling is two stories and approximately twenty-eight feet, ten inches (28'10") tall from existing grade. By comparison, the other historic houses on this side of North 16<sup>th</sup> Street range in height from twenty-four feet (24') to thirty-two feet (32'). The house to the left, 1600 Gartland Avenue, is a non-contributing house, as is the house at the corner of North 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Forrest Avenue (201 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street). The houses on the west side of this block of North 16<sup>th</sup> Street face their respective side streets. These houses range in height from eighteen feet (18') to thirty-one feet (31'). Staff finds that the proposed height of the infill closely matches the historic context.

The new structure will be thirty-five feet, eleven inches (35'11") wide. By comparison, the historic house to the left is approximately thirty-seven feet (37') wide at the front. The other two contributing properties on the east side of this North 16<sup>th</sup> Street block are both approximately thirty-five feet (35') wide. The new infill will have a total depth of seventy-seven feet (77'). However, this depth will be mitigated by the house's form. The thirty-five

foot, eleven inch (35'11") wide portion of the infill at the front will be forty-five feet, nine inches (45'9") deep. The back portion of the infill will read as an addition, as it steps in from the left sidewall of the house by one foot, eleven inches (1'11") and from the right sidewall by eleven feet (11'). This back portion will be thirty-one feet, three inches (31'3") deep. By comparison, 207 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street, next door to the site, is approximately sixty feet (60') deep. No. 205 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street is seventy-feet (70') deep, and in this instance, the entire width of the house extends to the full depth of the house. The other historic houses in the immediate vicinity have depths in the range of fifty-five to sixty-five feet (55'-65'); many of these properties also have accessory structures on their sites. Staff finds the proposed depth to be appropriate because the house's form will mitigate the extra depth.

Staff notes that a wall dormer is proposed for second story of the right side elevation. Although Staff typically finds wall dormers to be inappropriate, Staff has determined that this wall dormer is appropriate because it is located towards the back of the house, and because it is located on a building plane that is inset 11' from the outer wall of the house. The wall dormer will be, at most, minimally visible.

The new structure will have a foot print of approximately two thousand, three hundred, and eighty-four square feet (2,384 sq. ft.). Once the infill is constructed, the site will be approximately sixty-eight percent (68%) open space. This is nearly identical to the percentage of open space for the property at 205 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street (two houses down from the site). In addition, this is in keeping with the typical percentages of open space in the immediate vicinity, which range from approximately sixty-four to seventy-five percent (62%-75%).

Staff finds the height and scale of the new construction to meet Sections II.B.1. and II. B.2. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposal meets all bulk zoning setback requirements. The structure will be sited slightly off-center on the lot, towards the left/north. In the immediate vicinity, the historic structures vary from being centered on the lot to being sited slightly off-center like the new infill. The proposed structure will be set back approximately twenty-five feet (25') from the front property line. By comparison, the historic house to the right, 207 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street, is set twenty-feet (20') from the front property line. The additional inset of five feet (5') will help mitigate the infill's height and represents the approximate average of setbacks in the immediate vicinity.

Staff finds the setback and rhythm of spacing of the proposed structure to meet Section II.B.3. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The primary cladding material for the building will be cement fiberboard. Wood brackets and rafter tails and trim will also add detail to the structure. The front door will be wood, and the windows will be clad wood. Staff asks to approve the specifications for all windows and doors, including the vehicular garage door, prior to purchase and installation. The foundation will be split face concrete block. The porch columns will be wood but the material of the porch floor and stairs was not specified. The primary roof will be asphalt shingle. Staff asks to approve the color of the asphalt shingle prior to purchase and installation. The rear deck railing will be wood. Staff asks to approve the material and design of the front porch railing if one is installed. The chimney is proposed to be Hardie stucco panel. Hardie stucco panel is not appropriate for chimneys because they are smooth in appearance and look more like wood than stucco. In addition, corner boards are typically necessary with this material and are not appropriate. Staff asks that the chimney be clad in stucco, stone, brick, or another masonry material, which the applicant has agreed to. With the above-mentioned Staff approvals and the change in the chimney cladding, Staff finds the proposed materials to meet Section II.B.4. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The primary roof form is a cross gable with a slope of 10 /12. The roofs of the front porch and the rear porch will be hipped and will have a slope of 4/12. The wall dormer on the right façade will have a shed roof with a slope of

5/12, and the bay window on the left facade will have a gabled roof with a slope of 10/12. These roof shapes and pitches are found on historic buildings throughout the district and so meet Section II.B.5. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposed structure has an asymmetrical façade with a centered front entrance. It has a porch that extends the entire width of the house. The house is oriented to face North 16<sup>th</sup> Street, as are the majority of the buildings on the east side of North 16<sup>th</sup> Street. Only 1600 Gartland, which is to the left of 209 North 16<sup>th</sup> and is non-contributing, does not face North 16<sup>th</sup> Street. Staff finds that the orientation meets section II.B.6. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The infill's windows are approximately twice as tall as they are wide, with the exception of some more utilitarian windows on the side and rear facades. The windows therefore meet the historic ratio of windows in the neighborhood. On the right-hand part of the front façade will be French doors leading to the front porch. The largest expanse of wall space without a window or door opening is seventeen feet (17'), but that expanse does not occur until the back portion of the house on the left elevation. Staff therefore finds that this expanse meets the design guidelines. Staff finds that the window proportions and rhythm of openings meets Section II.B.7. of Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The applicant is proposing an attached garage at the rear of the building. The garage will be accessed from the alley. Staff finds the proposed attached garage to meet the design guidelines in this instance because it is located towards the rear of the property where garages typically would have been placed and because its garage doors will be on the rear façade and will not be visible from the street. In addition, because of the slope of the site, the garage will be located at the basement level, below the grade of the front of the house. Staff finds that the location of the proposed garage meets Section II.B.8. of Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

No driveways, sidewalks, or other significant appurtenances are part of the project at this time. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, additional pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, driveways, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these features. In addition, the location of the HVAC system is unknown at this time. Staff recommends that it be located at the rear of the home or on the side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Staff recommends approval of the infill with the following conditions:

- 1) Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color; all window and door specifications; the front porch floor and stair material; and the design and material of a front porch railing, if one is installed;
- 2) The chimney be clad in stucco, brick, stone, or another masonry material;
- 3) Any utilities be located in the rear of the house or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house; and
- 4) Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, driveways, pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these features.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the proposed infill meets Section II.B. and IV.B. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Jamie Pfeffer, applicant, was present but did not speak. There was no request for public comment.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions that Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, all window and door specifications, the front porch floor and stair material, and the design and material of a front porch railing, if one is installed; the chimney be clad in stucco, brick, stone, or another masonry material; any utilities be located in the rear of the house or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house; and Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, driveways, pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these features based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Fletcher seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **4302 Elkins Avenue**

#### **Application: Demolition, Infill**

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the case for demolition and infill construction at 4302 Elkins Avenue. Although the existing house at 4302 Elkins Avenue was constructed within the period of significance for the Park and Elkins district, Staff has determined that it has lost its architectural and historic integrity and significance. Staff extensively examined the exterior of the house and portions of the interior and determined that the structure is non-contributing. Staff therefore finds that the demolition of 4302 Elkins Avenue and its accessory structure meets Section III.B.2. of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposed dwelling is one-and-a-half stories, and is approximately thirty-two feet, six inches (32'6") tall from existing grade to the ridge. To the house's right is a historic house that is approximately twenty-three feet (23') tall. To the house's left is a vacant lot that extends to the end of the block. The majority of the historic houses in the immediate vicinity are one and one-and-a-half stories in height and are in the range of twenty-three feet to thirty-two-feet (23' to 32') tall. Nearby, at the corner of Park Avenue and 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, is a historic house at 4210 Park Avenue that is nearly thirty-seven feet (37') tall. Staff finds the proposed height of the new construction to be appropriate for several reasons. It is comparable in height to other houses on this block of Elkins Avenue. In addition, the main side-gable form of the house helps to minimize its height. The maximum height of the house is not reached until twenty-eight feet (28') behind the front wall of the house, which will help to minimize the impact of the height.

The width of the building is a maximum of thirty-six feet, two inches (36'2") although the front of the building is thirty-two feet (32') wide. By comparison, the house next door at 4300 Elkins is approximately thirty-six feet (36') wide, and the houses across the street on Elkins are between twenty-eight feet and forty feet (28'-40') wide. The depth of the house is a maximum of eighty-three feet (83'). This depth is mitigated by the house's form. The full width, one-and-a-half story portion of the house is fifty feet (50') deep, and at the rear is a one-story, half-width extension which is thirty-feet (30') deep. By comparison, the house next door at 4300 Elkins is fifty-six feet (56') deep, and the houses across Elkins range in depth between forty-eight and seventy-six feet deep (48'-76') deep. At the corner of Elkins and 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, at 4211 Elkins, is a house with a depth of approximately ninety feet (90'). The depth of the infill's porch is eight feet (8'). Staff finds the width and depth of the infill to meet the historic context.

The footprint of the infill is approximately two thousand, three hundred and eighty-four square feet (2,384 sq. ft.). The percentage of open space on the site will be approximately seventy percent (70%). By comparison, the house next door at 4300 Elkins has a percentage of open space of approximately seventy-four percent (74%), and the neighboring context (excluding the large empty lot to the house's left) has percentages of open space ranging from sixty-four percent to eighty-seven percent (64%-87%). Staff therefore finds that the infill's percentage of open space is in keeping with the historic context of the immediate vicinity.

Staff finds the height and scale of the new construction to meet Sections II.B.1.a. and II. B.1.b. of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposal meets all bulk zoning setback requirements. The structure will be centered on the lot, similar to its neighbor at 4300 Elkins Avenue. The new house will be set back approximately thirty-four feet, six inches (34'6") from the front property line. By comparison, the house next door at 4300 Elkins is set back approximately forty feet (40') from the front property line. Staff finds that there are several reasons that a shorter setback than the historic house on the right is appropriate and will not negatively affect the district. One reason is that the first six feet (6') of the house is a one-story porch and therefore the bulk of the house is towards the back. In addition, there are no other houses on the north side of this block of Elkins, and the houses across the street are set closer to the front property line (20-25'). Staff therefore finds the structure's setback and rhythm of spacing to be appropriate for its historic context. Staff finds the setback and rhythm of spacing of the proposed structure to meet Section II.B.1.c. of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The primary cladding material for the building will be cement fiberboard. Hardie shake will be used as an accent material in the front and rear dormers, side bays, and upper portions of the gable fields. Wood brackets, rafter tails and trim will also add detail to the structure. The windows will be wood clad, and the material for the doors was not specified. Staff asks to approve the specifications for all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation. The foundation will be split face concrete block, and the chimney will be split face concrete block or stucco. The porch columns will be wood with a split face concrete block base, and the porch railing will be wood. The material of the porch floor was not specified. The roof will be asphalt shingle. Staff asks to approve the color of the asphalt shingle prior to purchase and installation. The materials for the rear, uncovered deck were not specified. With the Staff's approval of the windows and doors, roof color, porch floor material, and deck material, Staff finds the proposed materials to meet Section II.B.1.d of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The primary roof form is a side gable with a slope of 10/12. The front dormer will have a gabled roof with a pitch of 10/12, and the front porch will have a shed roof with a pitch of 4/12. The rear dormer will have a roof pitch of 4/12. The rear, one-story extension will have a gabled roof with a pitch of 10/12. The roof shapes and pitches are found on historic buildings throughout the district and so meet Section II.B.1. e. of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposed structure has a symmetrical façade with a centered front entrance. Its porch extends the entire width of the house. The house is oriented to face Elkins Avenue, as are all of the buildings on this block. Staff finds that the orientation meets section II.B.1.f. of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The windows of the proposed structure are approximately twice as tall as they are wide, with the exception of some more utilitarian windows on the side and rear facades. The windows therefore meet the historic ratio of windows in the neighborhood. The largest expanse of wall space without a window or door opening is seventeen feet (17'). However, Staff finds that expanse appropriate because does not occur until the back portion of the house on the left elevation and it is inset on the lot. Staff finds that the window proportions and rhythm of openings meets Section II.B.1.g. of Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

No driveways, sidewalks, or other significant appurtenances are part of the project at this time. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, additional pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, driveways, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of

these features. In addition, the location of the HVAC system is unknown at this time. Staff recommends that it be located at the rear of the home or on the side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Staff recommends approval of the infill with the following conditions:

- 1) Staff review and approve all window and door specifications, the asphalt shingle color, the porch floor material, and deck material prior to purchase and installation.
- 2) Any utilities be located in the rear of the house or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.
- 3) Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, driveways, pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these features.

With these conditions, Staff finds the project to meet II.B.1. and III.B.2. of the Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the setbacks in the context. Ms. Baldock said generally that they look at the ones on the same side of the street and there was only one other house on the block and other setbacks in the area varied.

Jamie Pfeffer, applicant was present but did not present. There were no requests for public comment.

Chairperson Tibbs asked the applicant if he agreed with the conditions and he nodded in affirmation.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions that Staff review and approve all window and door specifications, the asphalt shingle color, the porch floor material, and deck material prior to purchase and installation; any utilities be located in the rear of the house or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house; and Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, driveways, pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these features. Commissioner Fletcher seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**1005 Seymour Avenue**

**Application: Infill**

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the case for infill construction at 1005 Seymour Avenue. The proposed dwelling is one-and-a-half stories, and approximately twenty-eight feet, six inches (28'6") tall from existing grade to ridge. The historic houses to the right and the left of the site are both approximately twenty-two feet (22') tall. Although the majority of the historic houses on Seymour Street are one to one-and-a-half stories and between twenty and twenty-four feet (20'-24') tall, there are a handful of tall two and two-and-a-half story historic structures on the street that range in height from twenty-nine to thirty-five feet (29'-35'). Nos. 946, 1022, and 1030 Seymour Avenue are all historic houses that are over thirty feet (30') tall.

Staff finds the proposed height of the new construction to be appropriate for several reasons. The side-gable main form of the house helps to minimize its height, as the maximum height of twenty-eight feet, six inches (28'6") is not reached until thirty feet (30') behind the front wall of the house. The most forward-portion of the house is a projecting cross gable that is approximately twenty-four-feet (24') tall. Staff also finds that the height matches the historic context because it is several feet lower than other existing historic houses on Seymour Street.

The width of the building is a maximum of thirty-one feet, eleven inches (31'11") although the majority of the building is thirty feet, eleven inches (30'11") wide. This is the same approximate width as the contributing house next door 1007 Seymour, and is in keeping with the neighboring historic houses which have widths in the range of thirty to forty feet (30'-40'). The depth of the house is a maximum of fifty-four feet, two inches (54'2"), which matches the historic context. The front porch is approximately seven feet, six inches (7'6") deep.

The design guidelines require that the neighborhood's context of "mass in relation to open spaces" be preserved. After construction of the infill, the site will be approximately eighty-two percent (82%) open space. Staff finds that this percentage of open space is in keeping with the historic context of the immediate vicinity, which ranges from approximately seventy-two to ninety percent (72%-90%) open space. Staff finds the height and scale of the new construction to meet Sections II.B.1.a. and II. B.1.b. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposal meets all bulk zoning setback requirements. The structure will be sited off-center on the lot, towards the left/west, to allow for the use of an existing curb cut. This siting is similar to the siting of other nearby houses, including the one next door at 1003 Seymour Avenue. The proposed structure for 1005 Seymour Avenue matches the front setback of its historic neighbor at 1003 Seymour Avenue, and therefore Staff finds the setback and rhythm of spacing for the infill to meet the design guidelines. Staff finds the setback and rhythm of spacing of the proposed structure to meet Section II.B.1.c. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The primary cladding material for the building will be cement fiberboard lap siding with a five inch (5") reveal. The front dormer and the house's gable fields will be clad in cement fiberboard board and batten. The roof will be architectural shingles, the color of which should be approved by Staff, and the foundation will be split face concrete block. The porch posts will be wood, and Staff asks that the porch posts have a cap and a base on them. The materials and specifications for the windows and doors, as well as the porch floor and steps were not indicated. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that Staff review and approve the windows and door specifications and the porch floor materials prior to purchase and installation. With the above-mentioned approvals, Staff finds the proposed materials to meet Section II.B.1.d. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The primary roof form is a cross gable, and the front and side gables will have a roof slope of 12/12. The front and rear dormers will have a shed roof with a slope of 3/12. The front bay window will have a shed roof with a slope of 6/12, and the front porch roof will have a slope of approximately 3/12. The roof shapes and pitches are found on historic buildings throughout the district and so meet Section II.B.1.e. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The proposed structure has an asymmetrical façade with a centered front entrance. Its porch is located on the right portion of the front façade. The house is oriented to face Seymour Avenue, as are all of the buildings on this block. Staff finds that the orientation meets section II.B.1.f. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

The windows of the proposed structure are approximately twice as tall as they are wide, with the exception of some more utilitarian windows on the side and rear facades. The windows therefore meet the historic ratio of windows in the neighborhood. In addition, there are no large expanses of wall space without a window or door opening. Staff finds that the window proportions and rhythm of openings meets Section II.B.1.g. of Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

There is an existing curb cut and the remnants of a gravel driveway on the right side of the lot. The application involves creating a new driveway that will extend from the curb to the back corner of the house. Because there is no existing hardscape driveway, Staff asks that the new driveway be concrete strips to at least the front wall of the house.

A walkway from the driveway to the front of the house is planned. Staff asks that a pathway from the sidewalk to the front porch also be added to the site. The location of the HVAC system is unknown at this time. Staff recommends that it be located at the rear of the home or on the side, beyond the mid-point of the house. No other appurtenances were indicated on the plans, and Staff asks that a condition of approval be that Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, additional pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these materials. Staff finds that with the addition of a central pathway, the known appurtenances meet Section II.B.1.h. and II.B.1.j. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The front and rear porch columns have a cap and a base.
2. Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, porch and step material, and the window and door materials and specifications prior to purchase and installation.
3. The driveway be concrete strips to at least the front wall of the house.
4. A central pathway from the sidewalk to the front porch be added.
5. Any utilities be located in the rear of the house or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.
6. Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, additional pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these materials.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the project meets II.B.1. of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Ms. Baldock stated that the applicant was not present and she believed that the applicant agreed with the conditions.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the application with the conditions that the front and rear porch columns have a cap and a base; Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, porch and step material, and the window and door materials and specifications prior to purchase and installation; the driveway be concrete strips to at least the front wall of the house; a central pathway from the sidewalk to the front porch be added; any utilities be located in the rear of the house or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house; Staff review and approve any new appurtenances, including, but not limited to, additional pathways, paving, lighting fixtures, and fences, prior to the purchase and installation of these materials based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Fletcher seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**3000 Granny White Pike**

**Application: Infill**

Ms. Zeigler presented the case to demolish the existing 1963 community center and construct a new community center with associated parking and vehicular entrance in the same general location at the corner of Clayton Avenue and Lealand Lane. The building will have major facades facing Clayton Avenue and Lealand Lane, with

the primary entrance facing the interior of the park. The parking area will be to the left of the entrance with a new curb cut on Lealand Lane. The current curb cut at the corner of Clayton Avenue and Lealand Lane will be slightly reoriented for a walking path entrance.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the period of significance for this site is 1853 to 1930, which encompasses the times when major alterations were made to Sunnyside. The community center was constructed in 1963, well outside of the period of significance. Because the current community center does not contribute to the site's historical and architectural character Staff recommends approval of demolition as meeting section III.B.1 of the design guidelines.

The site around Sunnyside and its historic accessory buildings has been significantly altered over the years. The original homestead began as 38 acres and is now 20.35 acres. In addition, the property surrounding the buildings has had a park use for many years and includes park related structures. Staff finds that adding a new community center in the far south portion of the park, well away from the collection of historic structures, is appropriate and meets section II.1 and 2. of the design guidelines.

Guideline 3, claimed Ms. Zeigler, requires that new construction not create a false sense of historic development. The planned building is of a contemporary design, and does not attempt to mimic the look of the historic building.

Guidelines 4 requires that a new building not detract from the landmark. In this case, the building is planned for an area far away from the historic collection of buildings. In addition, it sits behind and below Sunnyside. The project meets section II.4 and 5

An archaeological study was conducted in the 1980s and there is no evidence of archaeological features in this location. Construction is not expected to conflict with design guideline II.6.

Staff recommends approval of demolition of the current community center and construction of a new community center as the project meets all guidelines for demolition and new construction.

Applicant did not speak and there was no request for public comment.

Commissioner Forkum stated that he sits on the Greenways Commission but did not know of any conflict or relationship with this project from the Parks Department.

Commissioner Forkum moved to approve the application for demolition and infill construction based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Bernstein seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

##### **Belmont-Hillsboro Expansion**

Ms. Zeigler presented the three proposed extensions to the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. She recommended that although all three extensions were presented in one Staff recommendation, she recommended that the Commission hear and vote on each of the three separately.

She first presented the expansion for Linden Avenue, explaining that the 1200 and 1400 blocks of Linden Avenue consisted of mainly Colonial Revival and Craftsman style bungalows constructed in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Fifty-seven percent are contributing to the historic character of the neighborhood.

This is a continuation of the architectural styles and periods seen in the current overlay and meet section 17.36.120.A.3 as they contain a significant amount of architecturally important buildings that embody the distinctive characteristics of their type and period.

Staff suggested the Commission recommend to Metro Council that the Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded to include approximately the 1200 and 1400 blocks of Linden Avenue, and recommends that the Commission adopt the current design guidelines for the additional properties.

There was no public comment.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Fletcher moved to recommend to Metro Council that the Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded to include approximately the 1200 and 1400 blocks of Linden Avenue, as shown on the map included in the Staff recommendation, and to adopt the existing design guidelines based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Mosley seconded and it passed unanimously.**

Ms. Zeigler presented the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Gale Lane which are to the east of Belmont Boulevard and dead end into I-440 right-of-way property. The homes are Colonial Revival and Craftsman style bungalows constructed in the first half of the 20th century, and 68% are contributing.

This is a continuation of the architectural styles and periods seen in the current overlay and meet section 17.36.120.A.3 as they contain a significant amount of architecturally important buildings that embody the distinctive characteristics of their type and period.

Staff suggested the Commission recommend to Metro Council that the Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded to include approximately the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Gale Lane, and recommended that the Commission adopt the current design guidelines for the additional properties.

Councilperson Allen spoke in support of all three extensions. She explained that she was approached by neighbors to expand the district and they have sent letters, hosted house meetings and knocked on doors to inform their neighbors. She requested the district be expanded to include all three extensions.

**Motion**

**Commissioner Turner moved to recommend to Metro Council that the Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded to include approximately the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Gale Lane, as shown on the map included in the Staff recommendation, and to adopt the existing design guidelines based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Bernstein seconded and it passed unanimously.**

## **Cedar Lane**

The portion of Cedar Lane under consideration is approximately from Hawthorne west to I-440 right-of-way property. It represents later development for the neighborhood with Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival homes constructed mainly between 1920 and 1945. 63% is contributing. Several of the non-contributing buildings are ones that were constructed in the same period as the contributing buildings but have been greatly altered.

Staff suggested the Commission recommend to Metro Council that the Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded to include approximately the 1900 and 2000 blocks of Cedar Lane and recommended that the Commission adopt the current design guidelines for the additional properties.

Carol Kenner, 1901 Cedar Lane, stated that the buildings on this street were constructed between 1932-1940 and include a wonderful mix of styles that should be maintained. One house has been lost, stated Ms. Kenner, and another one is coming down soon. She explained that this is one of the hottest streets in the neighborhood so houses will continue to be demolished without this tool in place.

### **Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to recommend to Metro Council that the Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded to include approximately the 1900 and 2000 blocks of Cedar Lane, as shown on the map included in the Staff recommendation, and to adopt the existing design guidelines based on the findings and facts of the Staff recommendation. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and it passed unanimously.**

## **Duplex Policy**

The MHZC has begun the process of altering the ordinance's definition of two-family structures (17.04.060) that would allow the MHZC to use BL2007-45 to allow for detached duplexes in historic overlays. The alteration would be to delete the language, "two detached dwelling units within a historic zoning overlay district shall not be permitted" from the definition of the term "Two-family."

BL2007-45 allows the MHZC to determine the maximum building size and area in which a building can be constructed. However, Staff does not recommend allowing for this alteration to the bulk zoning without criteria that directs new development so that it is similar to historic development. This policy would not allow for the use itself. For example, duplexes will only be allowed on lots already zoned for duplexes. The policy would simply provide criteria for the development of duplexes where such use is allowed by the zoning code.

Staff recommends adopting policy criteria for the construction of duplexes to encourage infill development in a context sensitive way.

The suggested policy in the commissioners' packets came from researching existing conditions in the current overlays and how duplexes historically developed. Staff took three different approaches based on the location or size of lot. Ms. Zeigler summarized the policy for the Commission.

Chairperson asked if Staff had considered how other communities deal with the situation. Ms. Zeigler explained that they did not as the current attachment criteria was unique to Nashville and the desire was to match the local context.

Commissioner Fletcher asked for clarification of the examples and vehicular access which Ms. Zeigler provided.

Commissioner Forkum asked if Staff knew how many properties within the overlay this would affect. Ms. Zeigler said she did not have a number but that it would be few as the detached duplexes would really only be allowed on those properties that were an unusual wide for the context or a corner lot.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the policy for detached duplexes. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and it passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Fletcher clarified that since it was simply a policy it could be revised or amended if they found that it was moving in an adverse direction.

**IV. New Business**

Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission on several events coming up: Tennessee Preservation Trust annual conference, Commissioner Assistance Mentoring Program, and the NAPC Forum 2012 in Norfolk VA.

Meeting was adjourned.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMISSION MAY 16, 2012