



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 August 15, 2012

Commissioners Present: Brian Tibbs (Chair), Jim Forkum (for Menié Bell); Hunter Gee, Aaron Kaalberg, Ben Mosley, Judy Turner

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

Applicants: Joe Bucher, Paul Plummer, Russell Skrabut, Dallas Caudle, Rebecca White, Van Pond, Brent Hunter, Brad Northcut, John Tirrill

Public: Russell Skrabut, Roxanne Caruso, Jack Henry, Sandi Adams, Mona Hodge

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:06p.m. and read aloud the process for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion:

Chairperson Gee moved to approve the July 2012 summary minutes without changes. Commissioner Mosley seconded and it passed unanimously.

II. CONSENT

1501 BEECHWOOD AVENUE

Application: New construction--addition.

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1884138

2605 OAKLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction--addition and Detached accessory dwelling unit;

Demolition--Accessory Structure.

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1884481

1720 LINDEN AVENUE

Application: New construction—addition; Partial demolition.

Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1884441

1113 WOODLAND STREET

Application: New construction – Accessory structure with Setback reduction
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1884505

1211 PARIS AVENUE

Application: New construction - addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1884482

Chairperson Tibbs explained the process for consent agenda items and there were no requests to remove any items. Staff members Baldock and Alexander provided brief overviews of the consent agenda items.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve all consent items. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion was passed unanimously.

Commissioner Kaalberg recused himself from the next case and left the room.

III. NEW BUSINESS

217 SOUTH 10th STREET

Application: (VIOLATION) Alteration, incorrect siding
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1872266

Staff member, Robin Zeigler presented the appeal case for a modular building at 217 South 10th Street. She explained that the applicants received a permit last year for the first of two planned modular classrooms—shown here. It was installed with vertical cladding rather than horizontal, as specified in the permit. Staff chose not to make them correct it at that time as the second unit would obscure the view of it.

On May 16, 2012, the applicant requested approval of the second modular building. Because of the limit on choices available for modular buildings, the applicant requested a reveal of 7.25 inches, even though the Commission has consistently required a maximum reveal of 5". The Commission approved the building with the

wide reveal since the building is long-term temporary. Ms. Zeigler noted that she was bringing up the reveal issue and the inappropriate siding on the first unit just to show that compromises have already been made and staff was uncomfortable making another one that clearly did not meet the design guidelines.

During a routine check on July 17, 2012, staff noticed that the building had embossed siding. The applicant was notified and they chose to appeal to the Commission to keep the inappropriate siding.

Embossed siding is a material that has never been approved by the Commission in the past and does not meet section II.B.4 of the design guidelines for new construction. The guidelines require that material textures be visually compatible with and similar to those of adjacent buildings. Historic wood lapped buildings have a smooth finish as opposed to a deep grain. Further, the design guidelines explain the Commission's policy for cement fiberboard siding, stating that is appropriate for new construction but when used it should "be smooth and not stamped or embossed and have a maximum of a 5" reveal."

In order to obtain a temporary occupancy permit, the applicant agreed to replace the siding within two weeks of the Commission's hearing, if the decision is to disapprove. Staff recommended disapproval of the request to retain the inappropriate siding based on the facts that the building is highly visible and the existing siding does not meet Section II.B.4 of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Joe Bucher, applicant, provided an overview of all the concessions they made to staff's request that are not standard issue for a modular building, such as a parapet wall and store-front door. They felt that they have met the intent of the permit and not meeting it fully was simply an error in reading the permit. He also provided a timeline starting with discussions with staff and up to the time the building was installed. Replacing the siding isn't a simple or inexpensive solution so they recommend a landscape buffer to mitigate the view of the siding.

Commissioner Mosley explained that to approve the siding placed the Commission in a difficult position because it is not an isolated case, they have denied other requests. He stated that he sympathized with the applicant and hoped he understood the position they were in.

Commissioner Forkum asked about the difference in costs between the landscaping and replacing the siding. Mr. Bucher stated that the siding would be twice as expensive.

There were no requests from the public to speak and the public hearing was closed .

Commissioner Mosley asked which sides were visible and staff explained that three sides are highly visible since the building is on a corner lot.

Commissioner Gee expressed his belief that it wasn't worth making them remove the siding. Chairperson Tibbs stated that he liked the landscaping as a buffer. Staff member Zeigler explained that in the past the Commission has always required that applicants remove inappropriate siding and that landscaping has never been allowed to mitigate a violation. Commissioner Gee asked about the landscape plan.

Motion:

Commissioner Turner moved to disapprove the request to retain the siding at 217 South 10th Street. Commissioner Mosley seconded. Commissioner Gee voted in opposition. There not being four concurring votes, Chairperson Tibbs voted in favor of disapproval which carried the motion.

At 2:34pm Commissioner Kaalberg returned to the meeting.

905 B BOSCOBEL STREET

Application: New construction – primary building
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1884460

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for infill design at 905 B Boscobel stating that the new design will be two-stories, 29' tall and 32' wide with a clipped gable roof. The materials of the new building will be fiberglass-asphalt single roof, wood composite siding and a parged concrete block foundation. Staff recommended approval with the conditions that the roof shall be hipped in order to be more compatible with surrounding two-story historic homes; additional windows be added to the left and right elevations; staff approve the color of the roof material, stone, windows and doors; the eaves extend to overhang at least 18", and staff approve exterior appurtenances, light fixtures, landscape features, fences, and the location of outdoor mechanical units. Mr. Alexander explained that all conditions had been agreed upon with the applicant.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the 4" trim would be on all four sides of the windows and the applicant said it would. Mosley also encouraged the applicant to construct the porch in a manner that prevents the porch posts from hanging over the edge of the porch floor.

The applicant provided additional drawings but declined to provide any statement. There were no requests from the public to speak to the project and the public hearing was closed.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions that the roof shall be hipped in order to be more compatible with surrounding two-story historic homes; additional windows be added to the left and right elevations; staff approve the color of the roof material, stone, windows and doors; the eaves extend to overhang at least 18", and staff approve exterior appurtenances, light fixtures, landscape features, fences, and the location of outdoor mechanical units. Commissioner Gee seconded and it passed unanimously.

1902 RUSSELL STREET

Application: Demolition; New construction – primary building
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1884477

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for demolition of the non-contributing building at 1902 Russell Street, explaining that the applicant decided to remove their request for infill at this time. The applicant was not present, there were no requests from the public to speak, and the public hearing was closed.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve demolition of the non-contributing structure. Commissioner Turner seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

1713 SWEETBRIAR AVENUE

Application: New construction—addition and alterations
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1884772

Ms. Zeigler stated 1713 Sweetbriar Avenue was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

1809 SWEETBRIAR AVE

Application: New construction - Primary building and Accessory building
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1884465

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for infill design with accessory building at 1809 Sweetbriar Avenue. The project is for a one and one-half story house with a two-story accessory building. The primary structure will resemble a side-gabled craftsman with a ridge height of twenty-six feet and an eave height of thirteen feet and six inches. The accessory structure will have an eave height of sixteen feet and a ridge height of twenty-three feet, six inches. Both structures will be clad with cement-fiber siding with a fiberglass-asphalt shingle roof and Marvin Integrity windows.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that: staff shall review any grading changes greater than 18” including retaining walls, excavation and infill; staff approve brick samples, front door specifications, and changes from the materials indicated on the drawings; staff approve the driveway, walkways appurtenance and mechanicals; the ridge height of the accessory building be reduced to 20’ and the eave height be lowered at least 2’. With these conditions staff recommends approval and finds the project to meet the design guidelines.

Commissioners Kaalberg, Mosley and Tibbs asked about for clarification about the height, where measurements were taken from and the garage doors.

Commissioner Turner expressed concern about the garage doors and staff stated that typically when garage doors face the street, they have asked for two doors rather than one and that might help with her concern.

Ms. White, the applicant, stated they can separate the door and agree to all other recommended conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions that: staff shall review any grading changes greater than 18” including retaining walls, excavation and infill; staff approve brick samples, front door specifications, and any changes of materials indicated on the drawings; staff approve the driveway,

walkways appurtenance and mechanicals; the ridge height of the accessory building be reduced to 20' and the eave height be lowered at least 2' using the average grade as a base for measuring height and that the garage have two separate doors rather than one large door.

1404 CLAYTON AVENUE

Application: New construction--addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1884489

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the case for an addition at 1404 Clayton Avenue, which is a minimal traditional home constructed c. 1925. The application is for a new rear addition.

The new addition, marked in red, meets all base zoning requirements for setbacks. It is located entirely behind the historic house, and is inset 2 feet from each of the sidewalls of the house. Note that the application does not include any changes to the existing rear accessory structure.

The applicant is proposing to add two window openings on the left façade towards the back of the house, indicated with the dotted red line. Staff finds the addition of these window openings appropriate because they match the neighboring window opening and are located towards the rear of the side façade, making them only minimally visible.

The proposed addition is outlined here in red. It is a two-story addition to a one-story house. The addition ties into the historic house at the house's ridge. At a point 40 feet behind the front wall of the house, the addition rises in height to be a total of 3 feet, 10 inches taller than the historic structure. The design guidelines note that a structure can be up to 4 feet taller than a one story house like this one, if the taller portion of the addition is more than 40 feet behind the front of the house and the addition is set in from the sidewalls of the addition. Staff finds that the addition meets these criteria.

The guidelines further state that an addition that is taller than the historic house should have a hipped, side gable, or clipped gable roof to decrease the visual mass of the addition. Staff notes that a portion of the addition will have a front-facing gable and asks that a condition of approval be that the roof form be changed to be a clipped gable, hipped roof, or side gable. In addition, staff asks that the eave height of this portion of the roof be lowered 9 to 12 inches to match the eave height of the remaining portion of the addition.

Staff also notes that the front façade shows the addition being approximately 4 feet, 6 inches taller than the house. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that the addition be no taller than 3 feet, 10 inches taller than the house, as shown on the side elevations, and that a new front façade drawing be submitted reflecting this height and the new roof form.

The application also involves recladding the existing side enclosed porch with hardie panel siding with 4" trim and battens. Staff finds this alteration appropriate because this side portion would have originally been an open side porch, and the existing enclosure is not historic.

The proposed materials for the addition include hardie plank siding with a reveal matching that of the historic house, a split face concrete block foundation, architectural shingle roof, miratec trim, and cedar porch posts and metal screens. Staff finds that the known materials meet the design guidelines, but asks to review and approve the window and door materials and specifications and the color of the asphalt shingle roof prior to purchase and installation of these materials. In addition, staff asks that 4 to 6 inch mullions be included between all new double and triple windows on the project.

In conclusion, staff finds that the proposed addition meets the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro neighborhood with the following conditions:

1. The applicant submit a new front façade elevation showing that the addition will only be 3'10" taller than the existing house
2. The front facing gable portion of the addition have a clipped gable, hipped roof, or side gable roof form
3. The eave height of the front-facing gable portion of the addition be lowered by approximately 9 to 12 inches to match the eave height of the remaining portion of the addition.
4. 4 to 6 inch mullions be included between all double and triple windows
5. Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color and the specifications and materials for all windows and doors.

Commissioner Mosley asked for clarification of altering the eave heights. The applicant declined to speak and there were no requests from the public to speak.

Chairperson Tibbs asked if the applicant approved of conditions and Ms. Baldock informed the Commission that the applicant was not present and had not responded to her most recent email about the conditions.

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the project with the conditions that the applicant submit a new front façade elevation showing that the addition will only be three feet, ten inches taller than the existing house; the front gable portion of the addition have a clipped gable, the eave height of the front-facing gable portion of the addition be lowered by approximately nine to twelve inches to match the eave height of the remaining portion of the addition; four to six inch mullions be included between all double and triple windows, and staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color and the specifications and materials for all windows and doors. Commissioner Mosley seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

At 3:04 pm Commissioner Gee recused himself from the next case and left the meeting.

1515 5TH AVENUE NORTH

Application: Demolition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1884768

Staff member Robin Zeigler presented the case for demolition of portions of the Werthan Bag site starting with an explanation of what buildings were historic and which were not.

Buildings noted in the application as 2, 3, and 4, stated Ms. Zeigler, were all constructed after 1950 or significantly altered after 1950 which is outside of the period of significance noted in the National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Werthan complex. Demolition of these buildings meet 7.2.2 since they do not contribute to the historic character of the site.

Building 1 was constructed in 1869, 1914 and 1955. Portions of the building were constructed within the period of significance; however, it is in extremely poor condition due to damage caused by a tornado and deferred repairs. The building suffers from water damage, decomposing brick and mortar and decayed wood.

The damage is severe enough that a complete reconstruction would be required with little original material being able to be reused. Staff has inspected the building and finds that demolition is appropriate due to the economic hardship involved with the repair or reconstruction of the older portions of the building.

Staff recommends demolition of all buildings on this portion of the Werthan complex, finding that demolition meets 7.2 of the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Applicant, John Tirrill explained their desire to appropriately develop the site but wanted a clarification of what buildings needed to be kept before they begin design work.

Dallas Caudle, with Smith Gee Studio, explained that they and a structural engineer inspect the building and found a severe case of decay and a significant portion of the structure has already been replaced, including the roof. The existing owner has been notified by their insurance company that they cannot occupy or use the historic building.

Russell Skrabut, with Genesis Engineering, explained that he was the structural engineer for the project. He found that the exterior walls have settled significantly. The north mortar lines sag up to 1' in some cases. There is significant interior damage due to storm damage and previous use of the building damaged load bearing columns. Timber girders are deteriorated so badly that someone stacked pallets up to the roof to hold the beam. The walls are a loading bearing system without reinforcement. In summary, he stated that rehabilitation would far exceed the value of the property.

Commissioner Mosley asked for clarification of the exhibits. John Tirill, applicant stated that building 3 will be leased back to Werthan Packaging. Building 5 will be adaptively reused.

The applicants revised their original request to demolish all buildings and requested approval to demolish buildings 1, 3, and 4 as marked on the submitted plans.

Commissioner Forkum asked if #3 will be demolished once Werthan's lease is over. The applicant explained that Werthan is only using 3a and not 3b but it is their thought to eventually reconnect 6th Avenue, which would require the demolition of at least part of building 3 but it is not a part of their request at this time.

There was no request from the audience to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Tibbs requested photo documentation of the site.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the demolition of buildings 1, 2 and 4 noting that 1 has been deemed by staff to be an economic hardship to repair and 2 and 4 are non-contributing. Commissioner Forkum seconded and passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON NOVEMBER 19, 2012