



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 20, 2012

Commissioners Present: Brian Tibbs (Chair), Ann Nielson (Vice-chair), Menié Bell; Barri Bernstein; Richard Fletcher; Ron Gobbell, and Ben Mosley

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

Applicants: Michael Ward, John Root,

Council: Councilman Peter Westerholm

Public: Melinda Fish, Bill Lewis, Bob Borzak, Hans Schmidt, John Summers, Mark Medley, Rebecca Ratz, Jamie Duncan, David Briley, Kim Hatcher

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:07p.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:

Vice chairperson Nielson moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Fletcher seconded the motion, and it was approved without objection.

Chairperson Tibbs introduced the consent agenda and stated that 2114 19th Avenue would be removed from the consent agenda and heard first under new business and 1808 Ordway would be removed from the agenda altogether.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the cases that Staff determined to be eligible to be heard together as a consent item, explaining that the applicants had not opposed any of staff's conditions.

1112 FORREST AVENUE

Application: Demolition—accessory structure, Partial demotion-rear addition and dormers; New construction—addition and accessory structure and Setback reduction

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1876829

702 SHELBY AVENUE

Application: New Construction--Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1876990

809 FATHERLAND STREET
Application: New construction—addition and Partial demolition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1876988

1517 PARIS AVENUE
Application: New construction—addition, Partial demolition, Setback reduction
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1877208

2918 WESTMORELAND DRIVE
Application: New Construction--Rear and side additions with ridge raise.
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1876819

119 BLACKBURN AVENUE
Application: Amend addition approved by MHZC in May 2012
Council District: 23
Overlay: Belle Meade Links Triangle Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1872001

113 LINDSLEY PARK DRIVE
Application: New construction—Rear Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1876910

Ms. Baldock stated that all the consent items, with the exception of 2114 19th Avenue, met the design guidelines and staff recommended approval.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the consent agenda items with staff's recommendations. Commissioner Gobbell seconded and the vote was unanimous.

NEW BUSINESS

2114 19th Avenue South

Application: New construction—accessory building

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Permit ID#

Robin Zeigler, staff for the MHZC, explained that the project was removed from the consent agenda due to the receipt of public comment, which was forwarded via email.

Ms. Zeigler explained that in terms of materials and design, the accessory unit matches the existing house.

The proposed location meets the design guidelines as it is located at the back of the lot, near the alley. The applicant is requesting a setback reduction, which staff found to be appropriate since historically, accessory structures were located close to or even on the property line.

An accessory structure is also required to be subordinate to the primary dwelling. This garage will be 9' shorter than the existing.

Staff recommends approval of the accessory structure at 2114 19th Avenue South with the condition that staff review final specifications of windows, doors and the metal roof; and that the garage have two separate doors rather than one eighteen foot wide opening. With these conditions met, the project meets the design guidelines for accessory buildings in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, explained that the house is almost finished and the proposed 2-car garage has a footprint of 728 square foot, which includes a small porch. It is 1.5 stories with a rec room above that will likely be finished later. They wanted to position it close to the north side of the property line because of an existing power pole and the desire to maintain a rear yard. The lot coverage is at 38%.

Commissioner Fletcher asked for a clarification of the setback reduction being requested and Mr. Ward explained that they were asking for a reduction of 5' off the alley, as opposed to the 10' required by code.

Commissioner Mosley recused himself due to a conflict of interest and left the room at 2:16 p.m. due to a conflict of interest. The owner of the property represents Mr. Mosley in the sale of his home.

Melinda Fish read the letter she submitted via email.

I am writing in regard to the additional development of the 2114 19th Avenue South property. My husband and I are the homeowners of the adjacent property at 2112 19th. We purchased our home in 1987 and have raised our two children in this neighborhood.

I attended the December 2011 hearing when this property was first being developed by Tradition Homes. At that time I stated that the size of the home and detached garage was too much house on too little land. I maintain that position with the current request. However, as I was told "the guidelines are what they are" and lots can be developed with a 43 percent footprint. I am hopeful that the Belmont Hillsboro neighbors will at some point challenge this percentage.

I attended a meeting in late fall 2011 hosted by Belmont University attended by members of your commission, Joyce Searcy of Belmont and Keith Durbin of the Mayor's office, among others. When neighbors were asked what they loved about the Belmont Hillsboro neighborhood the overwhelming response was the mature trees and green space. I am in total agreement

with that response. When we were house hunting in 1987 the tree lined streets and old homes appealed to our family. The trees provide visual and auditory buffers within the hustle and bustle of urban living.

The proposed two story garage on the 2114 19th Avenue South property will drastically impact this buffer. On the west side of our property stands a mature hackberry tree that is approximately 65 feet tall with an approximate 30 foot drip line. Based on the plans we have received the garage will have a direct impact on the root system and overall healthiness of our tree. The developer has already asked to trim limbs on the tree. However, any trimming will have a direct impact on the power and stature of this tree, something so desired by families who live in this neighborhood.

Therefore I respectfully request that the commission deny the current placement of this garage and ask the developer to move it away from the northern property line to the center of this property where there are no trees. There is a utility pole on the east (alley) property line. However, there is adequate space for the garage to be placed nearer the pole and thus minimize damage to the tree. Trees are vastly important to the quality of life in our neighborhood; not garages.

When the construction dust and noise is done my family and many of our neighbors will still be living in this neighborhood and living with the consequences of decisions made by your commission. We are the ones who live here not developers.

Ms. Fish concluded by saying that concrete footers for an outdoor shower had been poured on her property line.

Vice-Chair Nielson asked about lot coverage and Ms. Zeigler stated that lot coverage was a codes issue.

Chairperson Tibbs stated that saving the tree was a good point but was not something that they could enforce. He also explained that the footers were something that the codes department would deal with.

Ms. Zeigler explained that they were notified of a possible violation this morning but their inspection did not reveal any additional construction that was under the Commission's purview. She suggested that the applicant could address that issue.

Mr. Ward clarified that they were constructing a masonry wall in one corner rather than a wood fence but that it was within their property boundaries that was surveyed and staked before construction began.

Ms. Fish shouted from the rear of the room that it was on her property line. Chairperson Tibbs told Ms. Fish that the best way to deal with it would be to call the codes department, as they had the authority to deal with this type of situation.

Mr. Ward said they were going to build a masonry wall instead of a fence. Chairperson Tibbs encouraged the owner to follow up with building codes.

Commissioner Bell asked if the builder could plant another tree and Mr. Tibbs explained that was not something they had the authority to do.

Commissioner Fletcher asked for clarification of the request and what the Commission was approving or not and Ms. Zeigler responded that the request before them was for the construction of a garage and a rear setback reduction. Mr. Fletcher asked if the setback reduction had to be a hardship request and Ms. Jones explained that it did not, that it was their duty to analyze the "appropriateness." Vice chairperson Nielson asked how this setback compared to others. Ms. Zeigler responded that historically garages were often on or near the rear property line and therefore the Commission had approved like requests many times in the past.

Mr. Gobbell said he was sympathetic to Ms. Fish's concerns but that the accessory structure meets the guidelines. He suggested that the builder employ remediation efforts that are available when constructing within the drip line of a tree.

Commission:

Commissioner Gobbell moved to approve the accessory structure with staff's recommendations for final review of specifications of windows and doors and the metal roof. Vice chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Mosley returned at 2:27pm.

1419 HOLLY STREET

Application: Infill, Demolition and Setback Reduction

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

Permit ID#: 1864594

Ms. Zeigler began the presentation for 1419 Holly Street by stating that they had received numerous public comments that had been forwarded to them via email and that she had just received another one at the beginning of the meeting that she was passing to them.

Commissioner Bernstein asked to hold the presentation until everyone had had a chance to receive and read the public comment that was being passed around.

Commissioner Mosley stated that he was contacted by a member of the community about conjoined duplexes, but they did not discuss this case specifically.

This is a project you have seen twice before for a duplex that reads as two separate structures. Initially it was recommended for disapproval because of the massing and not meeting historic context. When it was submitted the second time, it was with the two buildings detached; however, the Commission did not have the authority to approve detached duplexes and the project was deferred. The applicant now proposes a new design that is similar to the first, in that it is attached again, but with some of the recommendations of staff from the first submittal addressed.

The proposal also includes the demolition of the home located in the rear of the lot. The existing building first appears on the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and in the city directories in 1951. The foundation is concrete block, the siding Masonite and the roof asphalt shingle. Since it was constructed outside of the period of significance for the overlay and does not contribute to the historic character in terms of style or construction method, staff finds demolition to be appropriate.

Research of two dwellings on corner lots shows that historically the second home was towards the back of the lot, faced the numbered side street, was often the same number of stories as... but subordinate to... the primary building, and only had one garage, if any, with access from the alley, where it exists. In this case, the proposal is a primary home facing Holly Street and a smaller secondary home facing North 15th Street with a street facing carport and an alley facing garage.

The homes in the immediate context are mostly one and one-half story homes that range between seventeen and twenty-six feet (17'-26') tall.

The proposed primary building is also a one and one-half story building that varies in height due to the grade. The front, which faces Holly Street, will range between thirty and thirty-two feet (30'-32') from existing grade. On average, this type

of historic development has a secondary building that is approximately five feet (5') shorter than the primary dwelling. In this case, the secondary unit is a little more than six feet shorter.

The width of the historic buildings in the area range between thirty and thirty-five feet (30'-35') and the homes are roughly centered on the lot. The width of the proposed primary dwelling is thirty-two feet (32') and meets the context. The primary home is slightly shifted to the left in order to meet the corner lot setback requirements.

The project requires a setback reduction and the only areas that exceed the required setbacks are portions of the two porches. The historic context exhibits sides of corner buildings being as close as approximately five feet to the street. Even with the proposed setback reduction for the porch, the house will still be seven feet (7') from the street. Staff finds that the setback reduction and rhythm of spacing meets the design guidelines.

The garage is located near the rear alley and meets the design guidelines in terms of location, massing and materials.

The two-bay carport, with conditioned space above, does not comply with the design guidelines in several ways.

Although it is identified as a "carport" on the plans it is more than a simple roof on four posts, as is typically thought of for carports.

This carport has substantial corners, potentially allowing for garage doors to be installed at a later date, and second-story conditioned space, rather than just a roof.

Typically, the commission has not allowed for street-facing garages, and this one faces 15th Street.

The commission has not allowed for attached garages at any location other than a rear basement level and this one serves as part of the connection between the two units.

The commission has rarely approved new curb cuts, especially when there is an existing alley, as there is in this case.

Research of corner lots with two homes revealed that this type of development either had no garage or only one garage for the two dwellings.

In addition, the proposed duplex has approximately fifty-nine percent (59%) open space. The two historic corner developments in this area that are the closest in lot size to the proposed project site are 718 Fatherland and 1629 Fatherland which have an open space of approximately 70%. Removal of the carport open space ratio will then increase to sixty-five percent (65%) creating a more appropriate open space scenario.

All known materials meet the design guidelines and have been approved by the Commission in the past. Staff recommends final approval of windows and doors.

The project meets the guidelines in terms of roof form and pedestrian-orientation.

The windows meet the requirement of being twice as tall as they are wide and match the rhythm found in the neighborhood.

The mechanicals for both buildings are located on the interior lot line side which is the left side for the primary dwelling and the rear for the secondary building, both of which are appropriate locations. There are no known fences, walls or lighting associated with this project.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

1. Staff provide final review of windows and doors;
2. The carport be replaced with a parking pad and that windows be added to the newly exposed north side of the building; and
3. The North 15th Street driveway be redesigned to either be one lane of concrete strips or appear to be one lane by using a product such as turf-pavers.

With these conditions, staff found that the project meets section II.B for new construction in the Lockeland-Springs Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the carport was removed, as recommended by staff, if the connector would then stretch between the two and Ms. Zeigler said yes.

Vice chairperson Neilson asked if the rear structure was a foot higher than what was recommended and Ms. Zeigler said, no, that it was approximately six feet shorter than the primary dwelling.

Commissioner Fletcher asked for clarification of the pending ordinance. Ms. Zeigler explained that it was deferred indefinitely and that it was unknown when or if it would be adopted by Council. Duplexes are allowed by right and that they were not ruling on the use but the design.

Mr. Fletcher stated the public comment received had been negative and asked if staff wanted to address that issue. Ms. Zeigler explained that with the success of the historic neighborhoods came development pressures. It was not their role to freeze a neighborhood in time but to direct change and the fact is that people live differently than they used to, they want more bathrooms, bonus rooms and rec rooms and large kitchens. There is often more than one way to meet the design guidelines, stated Ms. Zeigler, and the proposal before them today is what the applicant wanted to bring to them.

Vice chairperson Nielson asked for a definition of a connector and Ms. Jones read the definition from the code. Vice chairperson expressed concern for the length of the connector and stated that, if approved, she would want them or staff to review the new design with the carport removed to be clear as to how much of an impact the long connector would have on the design. She asked Ms. Zeigler if the long connector was pushing the envelope and Ms. Zeigler stated that it could be.

Chairperson Gobbell asked for Ms. Zeigler to describe the driveway, which Ms. Zeigler did.

John Root, architect for the project, said that developing corner lots are tough but they were important. According to Mr. Root, they designed the project to appropriately address the street and following historic precedent of a primary building with a secondary home constructed behind it with the purpose of promoting positive growth and density in the urban core. He explained that since their first submittal they had worked with staff on changes to meet the design guidelines and met with the neighborhood on April 19, 2012. Since staff recommended against the carport, he asked to focus his comments on the carport. He explained that they didn't want to impact the neighborhood in a negative way and so wanted to incorporate parking into the design, and pushing it as far into the lot as they could. In addition, the carport has needed conditioned square footage above it. Another suggestion would be to reduce the height of the appendage to the building and place the bonus room there but they do not want to lose space.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the parking requirements can be met without the carport. Mr. Root said yes, but that it would create street parking.

David Briley, 3804 Bridlewood Drive, stated that he was speaking in opposition of the proposal. He pointed out that design guideline section 6 stated that the orientation of a new building must be similar to what was “adjacent” and this project did not have orientation like the proposed “attached.” He expressed his belief that additional density is needed but approval of this project will create problems for existing homes that will have requests for additional buildings with connectors.

John Summers, 5000 Wyoming Avenue, stated that the proposal was inconsistent with the intent of the ordinance and with historic precedent. Most of the two structures on one lot are remnants of WWII. Mr. Summers said there would be no more integrity to the historic zoning code if the project is approved. He stated that he would be glad to testify to the intent of the ordinance in court.

Rebecca Ratz, 1409 Gartland Avenue, explained that historically there are two types of duplexes: two units within one form and two detached houses. The proposed development does not reflect this style since it has an attachment and the secondary structure is not subordinate since it is the same height as the tallest adjacent home. In addition, once the carport is removed, the two structures are the same square footage. The project includes 2 full size homes and a 2-car garage and a 2-car carport. In her research of secondary homes on corner lots, the homes are an average of 1100 square feet, none are more than one story, and only in one instance is there is a garage, which is a single-car garage. Within the district there are 187 R6 zoned corner lots that could be affected by this decision so it is important not to set a precedent.

Mark Medley, 1414 Holly Street, expressed his concern in having a historic district if this project is approved. It is larger than any other house on the block and builds out the majority of the lot.

Bill Lewis, 1416 Holly Street, stated that the overlay is a firm foundation and the commission has stretched their ability to interpret it. The people participated in the development of overlay and the commission does not have the authority to approve the project and if the project is approved.

Hans Schmidt, 1427 Gartland Avenue and president of Lockeland Springs neighborhood association, recommended rejection of the project. He confirmed that the owner is entitled to a duplex but the design must still be approved by the commission but the project does not meet the design guidelines and there is not historic precedent. Staff and the Councilman Westerholm are working on a solution to the issue but if this one is approved, they will be required to approve it again in the future.

Councilman Peter Westerholm, 1502 Long Avenue, asked the Commission not to approve the project. He stated that the project will have a detrimental affect on every corner lot in the district. The attractiveness of the neighborhood would be undermined with this project that is out of context for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the policy of the definition of two-family and what Councilman Westerholm meant when he referenced “another solution.” Councilman Westerholm explained the previous ordinance request. The concern was that the guidelines in place for the second structure were not adequate. He stated that the 1800 maximum square feet was too large for the subordinate unit. It would be too much mass for a small property. He would like for there to be a conversation with the community and figure out a better way to accomplish this type of development and so that was why the ordinance was deferred.

Commissioner Mosley stated that he wanted to see a workable solution rather than a litigious action.

Commissioner Bernstein asked if discussions were continuing or if the indefinite deferral hamstrung everyone. Councilman Westerholm responded that the intent was to defer for one month but due to the budget hearings and the July 4th holiday they chose to defer indefinitely to allow for good discussion and to for everyone to participate. The neighborhood associations and ReDiscover East have discussed it and work sessions are planned for July but not yet scheduled.

Preston Quirk, 2801 Blair Boulevard, stated he is in support of the staff recommendation saying it was a well designed project, with a creative solution, that meets the intent of the ordinance. He referenced the cottage development in Germantown that was the impetus for the cottage development ordinance, as an example of positive increased density.

Kim Hatcher, 1501 Holly Street, acknowledged the unique problems of developing a corner lot and the effort that the architect put into the design, but that she feels the project is too large for the lot. She stated that the ordinance has neighborhood support if the neighborhood is involved in developing it.

Bob Borzak, resident of 1503 Woodland and chairperson of ReDiscover East, explained that early infill homes were hard to pick out because they fit into the neighborhood so well but recent designs stand out like a sore thumb, as this one will. It is too much for the lot, stated Mr. Borzak, and will create a dangerous precedent.

Max Myers, 1506 Holly, expressed concern that it will difficult to make this lot single family again. He is confused that there is a request to remove the carport because it is not seen historically but the connection is not seen historically either. He asked the Commission to consider other options.

Mike Loyco, 1115 Forrest Avenue, said he lived in a historic duplex on a corner lot. He believes a development can take place but not as proposed, as it erodes the character of the neighborhood.

Chairperson Tibbs closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Mosley asked Ms. Jones to read the ordinance for attached duplexes as he had concern that the carport might not count as part of the connector, which she did. Mr. Root was invited back to the podium to explain the direction he was given by the Codes Department. He was told it had to be attached by 8' but did not have to be conditioned space.

Commissioner Mosley commended the architect but the required connection negatively affects the rhythm of the street. He further stated that the type of connection required is not seen historically.

Chairperson Tibbs said he would want to see the design again, if the carport was removed.

Commissioner Gobbell stated he was concerned with the secondary building not being subordinate and further, also including a garage. He stated that the building will just be a long continuous structure rather creating the appropriate rhythm along the street, as required by section II.B.6 of the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to deny based on the applicant's inability to meet section II.B.6 of the design guidelines. Commissioner Mosley requested that the motion be amended to include that the project also does not meet II.B.2 and 3. Commissioner Fletcher agreed. Commissioner Mosley seconded the motion which was passed with a unanimous vote.

1601 RUSSELL STREET

Application: New construction--addition, Setback reduction, Exterior alterations and Setback Reductions

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1876985

Before beginning the presentation for 1601 Russell Street, Ms. Zeigler asked Mr. Root if he would like to defer since the case was similar and he declined.

Ms. Zeigler stated that 1601 Russell Street is a contributing house to the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay and was constructed in 1914.

In terms of context, the lot across South 16th Street is an example of early mixed-use development that historically took place at crossroads. 1521 Russell Street was constructed c. 1915 as the residence and grocery of George Q. and Cora Whitenton. A few years later it was the Parsons & Yocum grocery. It continued as a residence/grocery until the 1950s. 122 South 16th Street is a subdivision of the original 1521 Russell lot and may have been constructed for Parsons or Yocum in the 1920s or 30s so that both partners could live on site. Early city directories list both the Parson and Yocum families at this address at one point.

Research of two dwellings on corner lots shows that historically the second home was towards the back of the lot, faced the numbered side street, was often the same number of stories as, but subordinate to, the primary building, and only had one garage, if any, with access from the alley, where it exists.

The proposed location of the addition is to the rear of the existing house, as required by the design guidelines and as seen in the historic development of corner lots. There is only one garage proposed and it, and the parking area for the existing dwelling, is accessed from the alley.

The project includes the addition of a side dormer for the existing building. It is located behind the right bay and so will be minimally visible from the street.

With the new addition and garage, there will be approximately sixty-percent (60%) open space. The open space in the immediate vicinity varies between approximately twenty percent (20%) and eighty-five percent (85%) with an average of approximately fifty-seven percent (57%). Staff finds 60% to fit the context.

Setback and Rhythm of Spacing: The applicant is requesting rear and side setback reductions from the bulk zoning requirements. Ten feet (10') is required for a garage that has alley facing doors, as this one does; however, historically garages were located on, or near, the rear property line. This type of setback request has been granted by the Commission in numerous instances because of the historic context.

Height & Scale: Both the existing building and the proposed addition read as two different one and one-half story homes with a connector that is eleven feet and two inches tall from the finished floor and approximately sixteen feet (16') long. It sits back from the sidewall of the existing house by approximately six feet and from the front wall of the new house by fifteen feet (15'). The addition is twenty-seven feet and three inches (27' 3") from finished floor, which is three feet (3') shorter than the existing house. The eave height of the addition is approximately one foot (1') taller than the existing eave height and the foundation lines of the two homes are similar. An exact match of foundation heights is not possible due to the

grade changes of the lot. The footprint of the addition is eleven hundred and fifty-five square feet (1155 sq. ft.) or sixty percent of the existing house (1944 square feet). The porch is approximately seven and one-half feet (7.5') deep. These measurements create an addition that is subordinate to the existing dwelling.

The only section of the addition that crosses the required corner lot side setback requirement is a portion of the porch. Pulling the addition forward slightly allows for vehicular alley access to the existing building rather than requiring a new curb cut on Russell or South 16th Streets. The portion that encroaches into the setback area is a small portion of the porch, which is open in nature. In addition there is historic precedent for buildings to come up to the side property line, just across the street and immediately behind this lot.

All known materials meet the design guidelines and have been approved by the Commission in the past. Staff recommends final review of the window and vehicular and pedestrian door specifications.

There are alterations planned for the existing building that are not reviewed in a neighborhood conservation zoning overlay.

The roof pitch (12/12) and form and the proportion and rhythm of openings meet the design guidelines with the exception of the garage.

Although garages often did not have windows, the South 16th Street elevation of the proposed garage is highly visible. Two windows would maintain the rhythm of solids to voids seen along South 16th Street and break up this otherwise, blank wall.

The addition will only require the removal of the rear porch roof and slab, which is not a character defining feature and the addition, will be attached in a way that will not alter the original form of the house and require removal of the existing rear wall.

This type of minimal attachment is the best type of addition as it does not change the original form and can be removed easily without altering the historic house.

The appurtenances all appear to meet the design guidelines; however, staff recommends final review of the fence design.

The mechanicals for the new building are located on the right side, toward the front of the house. Staff recommends they be located beyond the midpoint of the house.

Staff recommends approval of the addition at 1601 Russell Street with the conditions that:

1. The applicant submit final material and design specifications for the windows of the addition, vehicular and pedestrian doors, and fencing;
2. Windows be added to the South 16th Street elevation of the garage; and
3. The mechanicals be located beyond the midpoint of the house.

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

John Root, architect, discussed precedent and noted that this type of development was constructed in the Cherokee Park neighborhood. He pointed out that 100% of the neighborhood was not present and he had spoken with others who were in favor of the project. He claimed he could not find a common ground with neighbors who are anti-development and anti-two-family. He stated that he does not have any concerns with staff's recommendations.

John Summers, 5000 Wyoming Avenue, stated that the development is inconsistent with the legislation as there are no umbilical cord duplexes historically. The applicant is entitled to make money, claimed Mr. Summers, but not at the expense of the community. He expressed disappointment with staff for noting one exception, the development across the street, as an excuse for precedent. He informed the commission the Holly Street Fire hall is zoned residential. No one is anti-development, stated Mr. Summers, but they want to preserve the neighborhood.

Rebecca Ratz, 1409 Gartland Avenue, stated that it would be an appropriate development if the b-house was moved back, the garage removed and the connector removed; however, together they create a single wall across the lot and that does not meet the historic context.

Hans Schmidt, president of Lockeland Springs Neighborhood Association, stated that there was no historic precedent, the addition is visually jarring and the secondary building is not minimal, as required by the design guidelines for additions. The applicant is permitted to have a duplex but the design does not comply with the surroundings. He stated that he is part of the group exploring solutions as he is not opposed to development as density, which is needed.

Commissioner Mosley noted that there are base issues that are larger than this body can regulate and that all should work together to a more desirable solution.

Mr. Schmidt admitted that downzoning had been discussed but that it was not a favorable outcome for the neighborhood. They prefer to see an ordinance or guidelines with clear requirements on the size, setbacks, lot size threshold, etc.

Councilman Westerholm stated that he just wanted to simply reiterate what was said previously, as the concerns are the same for this project as they were for 1419 Holly Street and he urged the Commission to vote against the project.

Kim Hatcher, 1501 Holly Street, said her level of trust in supporting a new ordinance relies on how the Commission responds to the current project, as presented.

Bob Borzak, 1503 Woodland Street, clarified that they are not Cherokee Park and what happened there does not set a precedent for what happens in the Lockeland Springs-East End neighborhood. He claimed they want development; they just don't want to be run-over by development, which is how they feel today. He stated that they presented the possibility of a side-by-side to John Root, which has historic precedent, and he dismissed it. He claimed that there would be more people present to speak against the project if they were not out-of-town on summer vacations.

Vice chairperson Nielson expressed her concern with a new house being attached to a historic structure.

Commissioner Mosley praised the project for placing all the parking and vehicular access off the alley and for creating a design that minimizes the connection; however, stated his concern over the continuous wall created. He asked staff how this could be reconciled. Staff explained that it really couldn't as the connector was required by the base zoning.

Commissioner Gobbell praised staff and the architect for working within the existing constraints but claimed that there is just too much on the site and it does not meet the context of the neighborhood.

Motion:

Commissioner Gobbell moved for disapproval based on sections II.B 2, 3 of the design guidelines. Commissioner Fletcher requested to amend the motion to include that the project does not meet section 10 of the design guidelines.

Vice chairperson Nielson seconded the amendment, which passed unanimously; the amended motion passed with six votes in favor and Commissioner Bernstein abstaining.

Chairperson Tibbs called for a 5 minute break.

Meeting resumed at 4:04 pm.

1809 SWEETBRIAR AVENUE

Application: Infill and Accessory Structure.

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1876987

Mr. Alexander presented the application for a new one-and-half-story house and a two-story accessory structure on a vacant lot.

Height & Scale: The proposed one-and-a-half story structure is drawn to show a maximum height of twenty-six feet, nine inches (26' 9") from existing grade or twenty-four feet, nine inches (24'9") above the foundation line. The infill's eave height at the front elevation is approximately twelve feet, nine inches (12'9") from grade, or ten feet, nine inches (10'9") above the foundation line. In the immediate vicinity, the historic structures are smaller than many others located further east in the heart of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Many of the houses on the 1800 and 1900 blocks of Sweetbriar represent the post-war development of the neighborhood and are unusually small compared to even modest homes of today's standards. They are primarily one to one-and-a-half stories with heights ranging from eighteen feet to twenty-four feet (18'-24') from grade. The proposed house will therefore be approximately two to three feet (2'-3') taller than some of the taller houses in the immediate vicinity. In this instance, staff finds the larger height of the proposed house to meet the design guidelines because the houses in the immediate vicinity are unusually small when compared to the average size of the historic houses in the Belmont-Hillsboro neighborhood and because the house will only be less than three feet (3') taller than the immediate context.

The appropriateness of the height of the proposed structure should be contingent, however, on staff receiving and reviewing revised drawings that accurately portray the slope of the site and the height of the foundation along the slope. The submitted drawings assume the lot is flat, but in reality there is a considerable drop from right to left on the site. On historic houses where the lot slopes from side to side, typically the foundation at the highest corner of the site will be one course of stone or block, and the foundation will get taller as the grade drops. With the staff's approval of revised drawings that show the existing grade and the foundation height, staff finds the infill's height to be appropriate.

The proposed structure is thirty-eight feet (38') wide with a maximum depth of approximately seventy-one feet, eight inches (71'8"), including the eight-foot (8') deep front porch. By comparison, the historic houses in the immediate context have widths ranging from thirty-three feet to fifty-one feet (33' – 51'), with the average width being approximately forty feet (40'). Their depths range from twenty-nine feet to sixty-eight feet (29-68'), with the average depth being about forty-eight feet (48'). Although the proposed house is deeper the other houses in the immediate context, the wider width of the lot as compared to the neighboring properties will help lessen the impact of the extra depth of the proposed house on the surrounding historic context. Staff therefore finds that the house's dimensions meet the historic context.

In total, the footprint of the house is approximately two thousand, six hundred, and sixty-three square feet (2,663 sq. ft.). The project includes a detached accessory structure that is twenty feet, seven inches by twenty-four feet, seven inches (20'7" x 24'7"), or five hundred and six square feet (506 sq. ft.). (The accessory structure will be reviewed under the "Outbuilding" section below). With the construction of the house and the accessory structure, the property will have approximately seventy-six percent (76%) open space. Properties in the immediate vicinity have open space ratios ranging between approximately seventy percent and ninety-three percent (70%-93%). Staff therefore finds that the site's ratio of open space will meet the historic context.

Staff finds that the proposed infill meets Sections II.B.1. a. and II.B.1.b. of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Location and Setback: The proposal meets all bulk zoning setback requirements. The primary building is centered on the lot, similar to other historic buildings found in the district. It will be eighteen feet, five inches (18'5") from each of the side property lines, and more than fifty feet (50') from the rear property line. The house's front porch will be approximately forty-five feet, five inches (45'5") from the front property line. This front setback is similar to the setbacks of the houses on either side of the property, which are approximately forty-six feet, four inches (46'4") and forty-eight feet, eight inches (48'8"). Staff finds that the infill meets Section II.B.1. c. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Materials: The primary cladding material will be cement fiberboard with a four inch (4") reveal, which is appropriate. The foundation will be split face concrete block. The roof will be asphalt shingle, and staff asks to approve the roof color prior to purchase and installation of the shingles. The front porch columns will have a brick base, and staff asks to approve a brick sample. The material for the column shaft was not specified and will need to be approved by staff. The materials for the porch floor, steps, and hand rail were also not specified and will need to be approved by staff.

The front door is proposed to be wood, and staff asks to approve the door specifications prior to purchase and installation. A steel door is proposed for the right/east façade, and will be located approximately twenty-two feet (22') from the front of the house. Steel doors are not typically approved on primary structures. However, in this instance, the steel door is proposed for the side façade in an area that is recessed two feet (2') from the sidewall of the house. It will likely not be visible from the street, and staff therefore finds the steel door appropriate in this instance. The windows will be Marvin Integrity windows, which have been approved in the past for new construction. The rear porch will be screened. The rear porch columns lack a cap and a base, and staff asks that these be added.

With the above-mentioned staff reviews, staff finds that the materials for the infill meets Section II.B.1. d. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Roof: The infill's primary roof form will be a hipped roof with a slope of 8/12; the edge of the roof flares with a 4/12 slope. The front dormer will also have a hipped roof with an 8/12 slope and a 4/12 flare. The front dormer is proposed to sit one foot (1') from the porch rack. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that the dormer be inset an additional foot so that it is set back two feet (2') from the porch rack.

The front and side elevations show that the side dormers will have hipped roofs with a slope of 4/12, but the rear elevation shows that the side dormers will have hipped roofs with a slope of 8/12 and a 4/12 flare. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that a new rear façade drawing be submitted showing the side dormers with a 4/12 slope, which is a more

appropriate roof slope than 8/12 for side dormers of this scale. The one-story rear extension on the right side will also have hipped roofs with an 8/12 slope and a 4/12 flare. The screened porch will have a hipped roof with a 6/12 pitch and 4/12 flare.

These roof shapes and pitches are found on historic buildings throughout the district. With situating the front dormer two feet (2') from the porch rack and the submission of a corrected rear façade elevation showing the 4/12 side dormer roof pitches, staff finds that the roof forms meet Section II.B.1.e. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Orientation: The proposed infill has a full width front porch and centered primary entrance. The infill faces Sweetbriar Avenue, as do all the other buildings on this block. No walkway was indicated, and staff recommends that a central walkway leading from the sidewalk to the front porch be added to the site. With the addition of a central sidewalk, staff finds the orientation to meet Section II.B.1.f of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Proportion and Rhythm of Openings: The primary windows on the infill are approximately twice as tall as they are wide and so meet the historic ratio of windows in the neighborhood. The largest expanse of wall space without a door or window opening occurs on the rear portion of the right elevation and is approximately fifteen feet (15') in length. Staff finds this expanse to meet the guidelines because it occurs approximately forty-four feet (44') behind the line of the front porch. Staff therefore finds that the window proportions and rhythm of openings meets Section II.B.1.g. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Utilities: 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, as stated in Section II.B.1. h. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Appurtenances: No appurtenances were indicated on the drawings. Staff asks to review and approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to walkways, lighting fixtures, and other landscape features prior to purchase and installation.

Outbuilding: The project includes a detached accessory structure that is twenty feet, seven inches by twenty-four feet, seven inches (20'7" X 24'7"). This footprint is subordinate to the primary house. The structure meets all base zoning requirements for setbacks, and will be accessed via the alley with garage doors facing the alley, which is typical for accessory structures in the area. The materials for the structure will be cement fiberboard siding and composite shingle roof. Staff asks to review and approve the window and door materials and specifications prior to purchase and installation.

The accessory structure is proposed to have an eave height of sixteen feet (16') and a ridge height of twenty-four feet, six inches (24'6"). Staff finds that the height of the accessory structure is not subordinate to the proposed infill, which will have an eave height of twelve feet, nine inches (12'9") and a ridge height of twenty-six feet, nine inches (26'9"). Moreover, the accessory structure is not subordinate to the immediate historic context, where the primary structures range in height from eighteen feet to twenty-four feet (18'-24'). Staff asks that the ridge height be lowered to approximately twenty feet (20') from grade and that the eave height be lowered by a minimum of two feet (2') so as to be subordinate to the infill and to the neighborhood context. Staff notes that new drawings showing the grade of the site as it relates to accessory structure are necessary to ensure that the eave height and ridge height are truly below the ridge and eave height of the primary structure. Lastly, staff asks that a trim board be added to the garage at the floor level to help minimize the perceived height of the structure.

With the reduction of the ridge height to a maximum of twenty feet (20'), the lowering of the eave height by a minimum of two feet (2'), the addition of the trim board, the submission of new drawings showing the slope of the site, and the staff's final approval of the windows and doors, staff finds that the proposed accessory structure meets Section II.B.1.i. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Staff recommends approval of the construction of the infill building and accessory structure with the conditions that:

1. The applicant submits new drawings indicating how the grade will be addressed in the new construction, particularly as it relates to the infill's foundation line, the overall height of the house, and the relationship of the height of the accessory structure to the height of the house.
2. A new rear façade drawing should be submitted showing the 4/12 roof pitch of the side dormers.
3. Staff approve the house's asphalt shingle color, final door design, a brick sample, porch floor and stair material, porch railing material, and the porch column shaft material.
4. The rear porch columns have a cap and a base.
5. The front wall of the front dormer be pushed back to be two feet (2') from the line of the porch rack.
6. A central walkway running from the sidewalk to the porch be added.
7. Utilities be located in the rear or on a side façade, beyond the house's midpoint.
8. Staff review and approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to walkways, lighting fixtures, and other landscape features prior to purchase and installation.
9. The ridge height of the accessory structure be a maximum of twenty feet (20') and the eave height be lowered by a minimum of two feet (2').
10. A trim board be added to the accessory structure's floor level, and staff approve all of the structure's windows, doors, and roof color.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section II.B.1. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

After Mr. Alexander's presentation, Ms. Zeigler, Historic Zoning Administrator, asked to change the staff recommendation to disapproval as there were too many inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the drawings and she had found one more as Mr. Alexander was presenting. She asked to revise the recommendation so that everyone could be clear on exactly what was being discussed.

Commissioner Mosley and Chairperson Tibbs asked for clarifications about the style, the entrance design and the fireplace. Mr. Alexander explained those that he could.

In light of the new recommendation, Chairperson Tibbs asked the applicant if she would like to defer and she declined.

Jamie Duncan, Rigid Development, explained that they now have an in-house architect and so this will be the last of this type of drawing. She clarified some of the missing information, stating that the roof color will be weathered wood, the hand rail will be painted pressure treated, they are fine with the brick being approved by staff, the back columns will match the front, although that is not reflected on the plans, the trim board will be added, the barrel entry is not a requirement for this plan, the front door will be wood, the height will be lowered and the windows will be Marvin Integrity with simulated divided lights. They understand that they need to show the grade as there is a little bit of drop from left to right but not from front to back.

The applicant agreed to a deferral and there was no decision by the Commission.

3725 PRINCETON AVENUE

Application: New Construction--addition and accessory structure

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1876823

Ms. Baldock presented an application for a rear addition and accessory structure at 3725 Princeton Avenue. The addition and the accessory structure are located behind the historic house and meet all base zoning requirements for setbacks. The site slopes approximately 4 feet from the front of the lot to the rear of the lot. The addition, which is two-stories in height, is inset from the historic house on both sides and meets the design guidelines for location.

The proposed rear addition will have maximum width of 34 feet and a maximum depth of 45 feet, 6 inches. The addition will rise to a maximum height of approximately 28 feet, 9 inches, which is about 2 feet, 9 inches taller than the existing house, when accounting for slope. Staff finds the height of the addition to meet the design guidelines for several reasons:

1. The addition does not become taller than the house until approximately 53 feet behind the front wall of the house
2. The addition will be less than 3 feet taller than the house
3. The side gabled form of the addition will help minimize its perceived height
4. The portion of the addition that is taller than the house is only 4 feet deep
5. The taller portion of the addition is inset 1' from the sidewalls of the house.

The historic house is brick. The proposed materials include stucco board and batten, cement fiberboard, and concrete block foundation with stucco rub finish, all of which meet the design guidelines. Staff asks to review and approve the roof material and color, window and door materials and specifications, and the materials for the addition's side and rear porch stairs and railings.

The proposed accessory structure will be approximately 30 feet by 22 feet, and will be two stories in height. The structure is proposed to be about 28 feet tall. Staff finds that the accessory structure's proposed height does not meet the design guidelines because it is not subordinate to the historic structure. When accounting for the slope of the site, the accessory structure will be about 1 foot, 4 inches taller than the historic house. When slope is not taken into consideration, the height of the accessory structure is 5 to 6 feet taller than the historic house. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that the accessory structure be lowered in height by a minimum of 4 feet in order to ensure that the accessory structure is subordinate to the historic structure.

Staff notes that the accessory structure has a steeply pitched roof with a slope of 17/12. This slope matches the slope of the proposed addition. Lowering the pitch of the accessory structure's roof would enable the structure to be reduced in height without significantly altering the structure's footprint.

The architect has submitted a drawing showing the relative heights of the accessory structure and the historic house, when slope is taken into consideration. He also submitted a drawing showing how the roof slope could be lowered so that the accessory structure's height matches that of the house. Staff believes that lowering the height of the accessory structure to match the height of the historic house is not sufficient to make the accessory structure subordinate to the historic house.

In summary, staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that staff approves all final materials and that the accessory structure be lowered in height by a minimum of 4 feet.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, explained that they were matching the gable pitch on the front of the existing house as to decrease the massing of the garage. He presented an additional drawing showing that if the height of the garage is lowered, it will require lifting the eaves. If he lowers the height 16” without picking up the eaves, to match the existing house, it will create a loss of headroom on the second floor space and lower the head clearance at the top of the stairs which requires the eaves to be increased.

Commissioner Gobbell stated that there are exposed rafter tails in the drawings but not seen in the photographs. Mr. Hodge said they are covered by gutters that will be removed. Chairperson Tibbs asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against the project, seeing none, he closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Mosley asked staff if the garage could be a conditional approval so the applicant could move forward with the addition. Staff stated that they could.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the use was a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit and staff told him it was not.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the proposed addition with the condition that staff reviews all final materials and that the accessory structure be lowered in height to meet the design guidelines with staff’s assistance on how that alteration will affect the overall design. Commissioner Gobbell seconded and asked to amend the motion to include the rafter tails. Commissioner Mosley agreed and the motion passed unanimously.

1703 WOODLAND STREET

Application: New Construction—addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Project Lead:

MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1876830

Ms. Baldock presented an application for a new rear addition behind a turn-of-the-century Victorian house at 1703 Woodland Street. The application meets all base zoning requirements for setbacks. The addition has a maximum width of 32 feet, 4 inches, which matches the maximum width of the house, and a maximum depth of 40 feet, 2 inches. The addition does not step in from the rear sidewalls of the historic house, as normally required. On the left side, the addition steps out from the back wall of the house by approximately 1 foot, 8 inches (shown here with the arrow). The addition is lining up with the wall of the house’s wider portion. Staff asks that the addition be inset on the left side one foot from the side wall for at least a depth of several feet before it steps back out to match the wider portion of the house. On the right side, the addition continues from the line of the rear wall of the house. Staff finds this lack of inset appropriate as long as the left side of the addition steps in as requested.

The proposed addition is subordinate in height to the historic structure and preserves its Victorian roof form. It has a maximum ridge height of 17 feet, 8 inches. The applicant will be restoring the wood siding on the historic house. The materials for the addition include Hardie panel cladding and split face block foundation. Staff asks to approve the color and material of the roof shingle, the materials and specifications for the windows and doors, and the porch column materials. On the right elevation, staff asks that a trim board be added between the end of the historic house and the new addition to differentiate the old and the new, as approximated with the blue line. This will also be necessary for the transition between the historic wood siding on the house and the hardie siding on the addition. Staff asks that a cap and a base be added to the rear porch columns.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that staff approve final materials; and a cap and a base be added to the porch columns.

Mike Garafola, applicant, requested not to bump in the addition per staff's recommendation since the existing addition already steps in and is not likely original.

The commissioners and the applicants discussed the reveal and design of the existing lap siding.

Chairperson Tibbs asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against the project, seeing none, he closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Gobbell stated the inset was to distinguish the new structure but since there already was one they do not need to have another inset. Commissioner Mosley agreed that the intent to distinguish new from old was accomplished without an additional inset and with the change in siding material.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the condition staff approve final materials and a cap and a base be added to the porch columns. Commissioner Bernstein seconded and it passed unanimously.

1203 FORREST AVENUE

Application: Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1876991

Sean Alexander presented the case for a new building at 1203 Forrest Avenue. He explained that in April 2012 the applicant received a Preservation Permit for a rear addition; however, once work began discovered that the house had suffered damage from the 1998 tornado and poor repairs. In May, the Commission approved demolition based on the economic hardship of the structure. The applicant now proposes a new building.

Analysis and Findings:

Location and Setback: The proposed infill is very similar to the historic home that was demolished, in terms of location, setbacks, width, height and massing. The side setbacks are five feet (5') and the front setback is approximately twenty-four (24'). The rear setback is sixty-two feet and the lot coverage is twenty-nine percent (29%).

Staff finds the location and setbacks of the proposed addition to meet Sections II.B.3 and II.B.10 of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Height & Scale: The foundation is slightly taller than the homes to either side; however, this additional height is necessary for new construction and the overall height of the house, from grade, is the same as the historic house, at approximately twenty-six feet (26'). In addition, the plans note that the number of steps at the front porch need to be verified with grade. Staff recommends that the grade be verified before construction begins and if changes to the height of the house and/or

foundation are necessary, that new drawings be submitted and reviewed by staff, prior to construction. The proposed eave and porch heights are also essentially the same as the historic house.

The proposed house has a maximum width of approximately thirty-one feet (31'). The original house was approximately thirty-three feet (33') wide at the front wall and the historic homes to either side are approximately thirty-two (32') wide.

The existing percentage of open space on the lot is seventy-five percent (75%). The new house will provide approximately seventy-one percent (71%) of open space. Staff finds this decrease in percentage of open space appropriate because the percentages of open space in the immediate vicinity vary from as little as fifty to sixty percent (50-60%) open space to as much as eighty percent (80%) open space.

Staff finds the height and scale of the proposed addition to meet Sections II.B.1., II.B.2., and II.B.10. of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Roof: The historic house has a complicated Victorian roof form. The front and the side facades have cross-gables with a roof slope of 10/12. The main portion of the roof is a hipped roof form with a slope of 10/12, and at the rear is a historic addition with a 10/12 gabled form. The front porch's slope is 2/12. The new building will have a front-facing gable with a 10/12 pitch and the main roof section will have a 6/12 pitch, which are both in keeping with the design guidelines and the previous historic building.

Staff finds the addition's roof to meet Sections II.B.5. and II.B.10. of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Proportion and Rhythm of Openings: Staff finds that there are no large expanses of wall space without a door or window opening and that the window sizes and proportions are appropriate. Staff therefore finds the project's proportion and rhythm of openings to meet Section II.B.7. and II.B.10. of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Materials, Texture, and Details and Material Color: The foundation will be concrete block, the siding cement fiber lap siding with a five inch (5") reveal and the roof will be asphalt shingle and metal. Trim, columns and stairs will be cement fiber or wood and the windows will be wood. The material for the doors is unknown. Staff recommends final approval of roof color and window design.

With the staff's final approval of the roof color and window and door specifications, staff finds the project to meet Sections II.B.4. and II.B.10. of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Accessory buildings: No accessory buildings are planned at this time.

Appurtenances: the project will use the existing concrete walkway.

Staff recommends approval of the application with conditions that staff review and approve the roof color, window and door materials and specifications; and foundation height.

With these conditions, staff finds the project to meet Section II.B. of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

David Baird, applicant and architect, stated that they agreed with the recommendations of staff.

Commissioner Tibbs asked if anyone wished to speak for or against the project, seeing none, he closed the public hearing.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the application with the conditions that staff review and approve: the roof color, window and door materials and specifications; and foundation height. Vice chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

1232 LILLIAN STREET

Application: Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1877685

Sean Alexander presented the case for demolition and new construction at 1232 Lillian Street. The current building was constructed circa 1960, does not contribute to the historic character of the district and was constructed outside the period of significance for the district. The two adjacent properties are recent infill approved by the MHZC in the fall of 2011. The immediate context is mainly non-contributing. The contributing structures on the rest of the street and on nearby blocks with more intact context are predominantly Transitional Victorian and Craftsman bungalows.

Analysis and Findings: The applicant is proposing to demolish the non-contributing structure and construct a new single-family dwelling.

Demolition: Because the existing structure does not contribute to the character of the district due to its age, style and materials, its demolition meets guideline IV.B.2.

Height, Scale: The new structure will be one and one-half story tall with a side-gabled roof and a front-facing gabled dormer. The height of the structure from the finished floor to the peak will be twenty-six feet (26'), with a foundation height of two feet (2'). The total height of the structure will be twenty-eight feet (28') with an eave line at twelve feet (12') above grade. These heights are similar to surrounding historic bungalows and recently approved infill, and meet guideline II.B.1. The footprint of the structure will be thirty-four feet (34') wide along the front, with a full-width recessed porch. The house will be forty-four feet (44') deep from the front wall to the rear, fifty-one feet (51') including the front porch. Staff finds these dimensions to be compatible with surrounding historic houses and meet guideline II.B.2.

Setbacks, Orientation, Appurtenances: The structure will be located with the leading edge twenty feet (20') from the front property line matching the front setbacks of the two adjacent houses, and the left side will be five feet (5') from the property line. The right side setback will be eleven feet (11'). These setbacks are compatible with the rhythm established by other houses on the street, and meet guideline II.B.3. The structure will be oriented square and perpendicular to the street, consistent with historic houses in the surrounding area and meeting guideline II.B.6.

The property is not bounded on the rear by an alley, so a driveway will be added to the right of the new structure; however it is not shown on the site plans. Staff recommends a new site plan showing the location and materials for the driveway and the location of mechanicals. The driveway should be concrete strips, at least to the front wall of the house and should continue to

at least the rear of the house. The mechanicals should be located on the opposite side, towards the rear of the house, so that they will not interfere with the driveway. There will also be a concrete walkway leading from the right-of-way to the front of the house. With these conditions, the locations of these appurtenances are appropriate and meet guideline II.B.9.

Materials: The exterior materials of the new structure will be: smooth-faced cement-fiberboard siding with a five inch (5") exposure, split-faced concrete block foundation, and a fiberglass-asphalt shingle roof. The roof color is unknown. The windows will be aluminum-clad wood, and the front door, exterior trim will be wood. The front porch columns are proposed to be battered wood columns on wood pedestals. Staff recommends final approval of window and door details and roof color. With this condition, the materials are compatible with those of surrounding historic houses and meet guideline II.B.4. There will also be an uncovered rear deck, which will be minimally visible from the right-of-way.

Roof Shape: The pitch of the primary side-facing gable roof of the structure and the front dormer will be 8:12. The roof slope will transition to 4:12 over the front porch, and on a rear shed dormer not visible from the street. These roof forms are similar to those of surrounding historic bungalows and meet guideline II.B.5.

Proportion and Rhythm of Openings: The front elevation of the structure will have a central doorway, flanked by a bay of three-part windows on each side. The window patterns on the right and left elevations match the historic context. The front dormer will be fourteen feet (14') wide with the same three-part windows as the first story. Staff finds the proportion and rhythm of windows to be compatible with surrounding historic houses and to meet guideline II.B.7.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-contributing structure and the proposed new infill with the conditions that staff review final details for windows, doors and roof color and the applicant submit a site plan showing the location and materials of the driveway and mechanicals. With these conditions, the application meets the applicable design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

The applicant was present but did not request to speak. Commissioner Tibbs asked if anyone wished to speak and seeing none closed the public hearing.

Motion:

Vice chairperson Nielson moved to approve demolition and new construction with the conditions that staff review final details for windows, doors and roof color and the applicant submit a site plan showing the location and materials of the driveway and mechanicals. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

1504 ELMWOOD AVENUE

Application: Infill and New construction—accessory structure

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1876984

Ms. Baldock presented an application for the construction of new infill and an accessory structure at 1504 Elmwood Avenue. At the May 2012 hearing, the Commission approved the demolition of a non-contributing structure on the site and the construction of new infill.

The design now before the Commission represents a new design for the site. The new infill and accessory structure meet all base zoning requirements for setbacks. The new infill will be centered on the lot and will be approximately 38 feet wide with a maximum depth of 72 feet, 8 inches, which is compatible with the neighborhood. No walkways were indicated on the site plan, and staff asks that a central walkway be added, running from the sidewalk to the front porch.

The site plan shows that the site slopes approximately 2 to 4 feet from the front of the house to the back of the house. The elevation drawings that were submitted treat the site as if it were flat. Staff asks that a condition of approval be that the applicant submits new elevation drawings showing the slope of the site and how the height of the foundation will be treated on the site.

The proposed structure is one and half stories in height and approximately 31 feet above grade. It will have a side-gabled roof with a slope of 8/12. This height and roof form matches the historic context. The proposed materials are cement fiberboard cladding, split face concrete block foundation, asphalt shingle roof, and brick porch column bases. The front door will be wood, and the windows will be Marvin Integrity windows, which the Commission has approved in the past. Staff finds the materials to be appropriate as long as staff reviews and approves a brick sample, the asphalt shingle color, material for the porch column shaft, materials for the porch floor, steps, and handrail; and all window and door specifications.

The drawings show that the front dormer sits just one foot back from the porch rack. Staff asks that the dormer be pushed back another foot so that it is 2 feet from the line of the porch rack. Staff notes that the proportion and rhythm of openings for the infill meets the design guidelines. Staff also asks that a cap and a base be added to each of the rear porch's columns.

The garage is proposed to be approximately 20 feet, 7 inches by 24 feet, 7 inches. It will be accessed from the alley and its garage doors will face the alley. It is proposed to have a ridge height of 24 feet, 6 inches and an eave height of 16 feet. Since the site slopes up towards the rear of the property, staff will want to look at the relative height of the infill to the accessory structure before determining whether or not the accessory structure's height is subordinate to the infill. Staff also asks that a trim board be added to the structure's floor level.

Ms. Baldock showed photos of the surrounding historic context and noted that staff has determined that the proposed structure meets the context.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the project with several conditions, including:

1. The applicant submits new drawings indicating how the grade will be addressed in the new construction, particularly as it relates to the infill's foundation line and the overall height of the house.
2. Staff approves all final materials.
3. The rear porch columns have a cap and a base.
4. A central walkway running from the sidewalk to the porch is added.
5. Utilities are located in the rear or on a side façade, beyond the house's midpoint.
6. Staff review and approve all appurtenances
7. Staff reviews the height of the accessory structure relative to the slope of the site prior permitting to ensure that it is subordinate to the infill.
8. A trim board is added to the accessory structure's floor level.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the existing stone wall would be retained and Ms. Baldock said that was the understanding so staff was asking to include it on the plans. Commissioner Mosley stated that there was also an inconsistency with the chimney.

Jamie Duncan, Rigid Development, stated that they have followed the design guidelines in the past and they can easily provide the information requested by staff. The homeowners are ready to begin construction and she would appreciate a decision. She stated that the dormer would be pushed back as requested and the fireplace was ventless and so there would be no flue.

Motion:

Commissioner Gobbell moved to approve the application with the conditions that:

- 1. The applicant submits new drawings indicating how the grade will be addressed in the new construction, particularly as it relates to the infill's foundation line and the overall height of the house.**
- 2. Staff approve all final materials**
- 3. The rear porch columns have a cap and a base.**
- 4. A central walkway running from the sidewalk to the porch be added.**
- 5. Utilities are to be located in the rear or on a side façade, beyond the house's midpoint.**
- 6. Staff review and approve all appurtenances**
- 7. Staff reviews the height of the accessory structure relative to the slope of the site prior permitting to ensure that it is subordinate to the infill.**
- 8. A trim board is to be added to the accessory structure's floor level.**

Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Zeigler presented the case to make a recommendation to Metro Council for a revision to the makeup of the MHZC. Ms. Zeigler explained that the request was to alter the requirements in Section 17.40.400 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws for the composition of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission. The current board make up requires there to be two members who own property or a business in the Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay; however, this is a small district (45 properties) and it is difficult to fulfill this requirement. The original purpose of this language was to assure the representation of downtown property and business owners, at a time when Second Avenue was the only downtown overlay. Staff recommends increasing the pool of potential candidates and maintaining downtown representation by opening up these two slots to include a person who owns property or a business within any overlay (current overlays and any future overlays) or current or future National Register districts located in the downtown core. Representation from Second Avenue will still be possible, whenever there is an interested and qualified candidate. This alteration will not change the overall number of members or the method of appointment.

Current language:

17.40.400

A. The commission shall consist of nine members who are residents of Davidson County, with a composition as follows:

1. One registered architect;
2. One member of the metropolitan planning commission;
3. One member representing the metropolitan historical commission of Nashville;
4. Four members selected from the community, two of whom shall reside within an historic overlay district;

5. One member who must be a property owner of property located in the historic preservation overlay district bounded by the south margin of Union Street, the west margin of First Avenue North, the north margin of Broadway, and both sides of Second Avenue North, as adopted by the metropolitan county council; and
6. One member who must be a person (i) whose principal place of business is, or (ii) who must be a property owner of property, located in the historic preservation overlay district bounded by the south margin of Union Street, the west margin of First Avenue North, the north margin of Broadway, and both sides of Second Avenue North, as adopted by the metropolitan county council.

Proposed Language:

Legal counsel recommends the following language:

- A. The commission shall consist of nine members who are residents of Davidson County with a composition as follows:
 1. One registered architect;
 2. One member of the Metropolitan Planning Commission;
 3. One member representing the Metropolitan Historical Commission of Nashville;
 4. Four members selected from the community, two of whom shall reside within an historic overlay district; and,
 5. Two members who must be property owners of real property or a person whose principal place of business is located in an historic overlay or National Register district within the downtown core.

Commissioner Gobbell explained that he was around when this qualification was first added and that it was when Second Avenue was the first commercial district. At the time they felt it was important to have representation from the commercial are but that now that Broadway is included it makes sense to follow staff's recommendation.

Motion:

Commissioner Gobbell moved to approve the proposed alteration of the Section 17.40.400 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws for the composition of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission. Vice chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Jones corrected staff that the pool of candidates would come from the Downtown *Code* rather than the Downtown *Core* based on the Planning Commission's recommendation from last week. Director, Tim Walker, concurred that they were in agreement with the change.

Motion:

Commissioner Gobbell moved to approve the proposed alteration of the Section 17.40.400 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws for the composition of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission with the wording clarification. Vice chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Tibbs thanked Commissioner Gobbell for his service.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:30 p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON JULY 18, 2012