



# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

## METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

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

January 15, 2014

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brian Tibbs, Vice-chair Ann Nielson, Menié Bell, Aaron Kaalberg, Rose Cantrell, Hunter Gee, Sam Champion, Richard Fletcher, Aaron Kaalberg, Ben Mosley

**Zoning Staff:** Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Robin Zeigler (Historic Zoning Administrator), Tim Walker (Executive Director), Susan T. Jones (City Attorney)

**Applicants:** Burkley Allen, DeRon Jenkins, Derek Wilson, Robin York, Jeff Zeitlin

**Public:** Lindsey Trella-Moffat, Martha Stinson, Hunter Moore, Greg Asadourian, Miriam Mimms, Ed King, Ann Toplovich, Paul Weighell, Angela Kaset

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. and read aloud the process for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission and the time limits on presentations.

### I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council member Burkley Allen present.

### II. MINUTES:

#### Motion:

**Vice-chair Nielson moved to approve the December 18, 2013 minutes without changes. Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### a. DESIGNATION OF EXPANSION OF HILLSBORO-WEST END NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ZONING OVERLAY

Application: Designation

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Councilmember Allen thanked the neighborhood for their work. The boundaries include the areas that expressed any interest in the idea of changing boundaries as needed. She stated she was in support of the overlay. Development is happening rapidly and the neighbors are concerned about new development that is not appropriate for the character of the district.

Martha Stinson, representing the neighborhood association, gave information about the neighborhood's history and about the actions the neighborhood had taken to inform property owners about conservation overlays and gauge their interest.

Hunter Moore, 2515 Natchez Trace, expressed his support of the overlay. He lives in the existing overlay and is vice-chair of the board who voted unanimously to support the expansion. Rising development pressures are resulting in increased demolition. Expansion of the overlay district will promote guided infill and accommodate growth. He served as a block captain and went door-to-door several times.

Greg Asadourian, 2113 Ashwood, expressed his support for the overlay. He owns multiple properties in Nashville and most are in an overlay. He said he had heard it was anti-development, but as a landlord he feels it supports the neighborhood. He lives on Sunset which has experienced an enormous amount of development that makes him feel that he lives in a new development.

Miriam Mimms, 2410 Blair Blvd, stated she has seen a great deal of change in the area that is not in the overlay, compared to the area that is in the overlay. She said that one of the things that makes this area so alluring to others outside of Nashville is the history and the look of the city. She passed around a book about bungalows around the country, where the publishers chose several Nashville bungalows in the Hillsboro-West End neighborhood as good examples. Often when a historic home is demolished what they see is an out-of-scale home constructed in its place.

Ed King, 2810 West Linden Avenue, expressed his opposition to the overlay. While it would take care of new construction it wouldn't eliminate what they have done on Sunset Place. He said it would limit his property rights and if he wanted to construct a garage, he will not be able to. There are areas near him that were not included and will not have to follow the same rules.

Ann Toplovich, 2715 Westwood Avenue, supports the expansion. She worked as a volunteer with the door-to-door surveys and there is wide support.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the expansion of the district and the adoption of the current design guidelines to apply to the expanded area. Vice-Chair Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Gee asked if the design guidelines prohibited street-facing garages. Ms. Zeigler explained that they did not and she wasn't sure of the specifics of Mr. King's project. Commissioner Gee said that they need to be careful about the design guidelines preventing such actions.

**b. 1810 ASHWOOD AVE**

Application: Demolition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1955700

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for demolition of the principle building at 1810 Ashwood. It is a one-story bungalow constructed c. 1923. Based on its age, form, materials and architectural details, the house is contributing to the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The request meets section IV.B.a for inappropriate demolition.

In order for a historic building to be demolished it must be beyond repair, in essence the requirement to keep the building must render the applicant with an unusable property. In this case the building is usable, in fact, the property owner has a house-sitter living there.

The applicant provided an engineer's report that provided information on necessary repairs but the engineer did not recommend that the house be condemned or make any comments about the house being unsafe or uninhabitable. In addition, staff's review of the building did not reveal a home that was unusable.

A true estimate for repairs is unknown. The applicant provided two different rehab estimates. One states repairs are between \$185,000 to \$225,000 and the letter explains that the price includes “modernizing the interior,” replacing windows, siding, roof and chimney, landscaping, installing a concrete surfaced drive/parking area, reconfiguring the interior, and replacing all electrical, plumbing and HVAC. None of these repairs are necessary to make the building habitable. The letter contends that the kitchen and bathroom are not functional; however, the owner does have someone living in the building and they appeared to be usable in staff’s inspection.

A second and more detailed estimate of approximate \$308 thousand was also provided by the same contractor. In this case, the expenses are to replace every element of the building from the foundation to the roof but again, there is no documentation that this is necessary.

Neither estimate provides expenses for just the repairs noted in the engineer’s report as being necessary. Staff recommended disapproval of the project based on the fact that the building is historic therefore meeting section IV.B.a for inappropriate demolition and the fact that the building is habitable and useable and therefore does not meet section IV.B.a-c for appropriate demolition.

The applicant, or a representative, was not present.

Lindsey Trella-Moffatt, representing the neighborhood association, stated that they supported staff’s recommendation. Losing the smaller historic buildings disrupts the character of the district and keeping them is part of the reason for the overlay. She explained that the owner claims his house is not worth the current value and yet has not protested this value with the tax assessor.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Fletcher moved to disapprove demolition. Commissioner Gee seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Fletcher stated that the applicant sent an incredulous and very inappropriate email, and he felt that the applicant owes the Commission and staff an apology.

Commissioner Mosley reiterated the staff’s analysis that the estimate to reconstruct the house did not include the items that they are there to review. The supports identified by the engineer’s report, he added, could be installed for a few hundred dollars.

**c. 1114 LILLIAN ST**

Application: New construction-infill  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 1955623  
and

**d. 1112 LILLIAN ST**

Application: New construction -infill  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 1955621

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for both 1112 and 1114 Lillian Street, which are applications for new construction. He explained he would be presenting them together since they're from the same applicant and the proposals are similar.

1112 Lillian Street is currently a non-contributing house, for which demolition meets the design guidelines. 1114 Lillian Street is a vacant lot. The two lots are each about 17 feet narrower than the lots in the area, which are typically 50 feet wide.

The proposed new houses on the lots would be two stories tall with an additional story gained as the grade drops toward the rear. All other houses in the surrounding area are only one story. Recent infills approved by the Commission in the 1300 block of Lillian Street (11-13 blocks run together) are only 1.5 story.

New construction on these lots would inevitably be narrower than surrounding houses because the lots are narrow, but staff finds that a two-story house would be incompatible with the neighborhood. Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed two story houses.

The applicant worked with staff to come up with another design that is appropriate for the context and fulfills their needs. The day before the meeting, they had submitted a new front and side elevation that achieves that and will meet the guidelines, but a complete application was not submitted in time for a full review by staff, or to prepare a recommendation to the commission.

Mr. Zeitlin asked to present the new design drawing; but the Commission did not accept it, stating their policy on not accepting new information. Zeitlin stated that Lillian Street has little historic context and that these particular lots were problematic because of their size. He expressed concern with meeting staff's recommendation for a 1.5 story house as it would not be marketable and that there are homes on Boscobel Street that are 2-stories; however, he met with his architect and they were able to come up with a 1.5 story design that he is ready to present today. He said that he could not defer until February, and asked the Commission to approve the current design submitted before them, with the understanding that their plan is to construct the 1.5 story home he now has plans for. The Chair encouraged the applicant to defer the case so that the new plans could be fully reviewed and the applicant chose not to defer.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Ms. Jones, counsel for the Commission, explained they had a policy for "new information". She read the definition and explained that section 8 allowed for exceptions in extraordinary cases as long as Commission set out their reasons for an extraordinary exception.

The Commission debated whether or not to accept the new drawings and determined that there was no extraordinary exception. The Commission also debated allowing staff to review an infill property in these particular instances, but there was no consensus.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked about context and agreed with staff that in this case, where there isn't historic context, they should look at the context of the new construction built with the current design guidelines.

Commissioner Gee stated that throughout the neighborhoods, one and two story homes are mixed together and create a context for a great neighborhood. He doesn't find two-stories to be out of scale or out of context for the area. This street has both 1 and 1.5 story buildings and these lots are particularly challenging. Commissioner Gee asked for clarification of the other ways the proposal doesn't meet the design guidelines. Mr. Alexander explained that the proposed house is narrower than what it could be, creating an inconsistent rhythm of street; the materials are not known, the window rhythm doesn't meet the spacing found on historic homes, and it is not typical to see a wall space of more than 10'-12' without a window, which this proposal has.

Commissioner Kaalberg agreed that the neighborhoods are eclectic but there aren't any examples of 2-story homes in this immediate context. He suggested one option was to combine the lots and construct a two-story building. He agreed that they were challenging lots, but if it was for two different buildings, he was leaning toward 1 and 1.5 stories.

Commissioner Fletcher said they have frequently seen 2-story homes going in next to 1 and 1.5 story homes and there is a precedent established to keep infill compatible with adjacent structures.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to approve demolition of the existing house at 1113 Lillian Street. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the application based on the narrow lots, lack of historic context and nearby historic context of 2-story buildings, with the conditions that the applicant work with staff on the window placement and rhythm, providing appropriate materials, and location of appurtenances and utilities. Commissioner Rose seconded. Commissioners Gee, Champion, Mosley and Cantrell voted in favor; Commissioners Nielson, Bell, Kaalberg and Fletcher voted against the motion. Chairperson Tibbs, in order to break the tie, voted against the project and the motion failed.

The Commissioners asked the applicant to explain his reasons for not waiting until the next meeting. Mr. Zeitlin explained that he has a contract that doesn't give him until February to keep the properties. In answer to several commissioners, Mr. Zeitlin explained that the sale is subject to obtaining a building contract. Although a specific date is not specified in the contract, he does not feel the seller will work with him until February. Commissioner Kaalberg stated that it was odd to have an application after a buyer's due diligence time has passed and that the application should have been before them months ago.

Commissioner Gee moved to allow staff to review the infill design based on staff's comments, the hardships of the lot and the willingness of the applicant to work with staff on altering the design. Commissioner Mosley seconded. Commissioner Gee voted in favor and Commissioners Bell, Nielson, Kaalberg, Mosley, Cantrell and Fletcher voted against the motion. The motion failed.

Vice-chairperson Nielson stated her concerns with asking staff to react quickly enough to meet the applicant's deadline of "right after the meeting." Commissioner Kaalberg agreed and said he didn't want to set a precedent that just because someone has a tight schedule, the commission should suspend their rules. The fact that they are seeing this for the first time after the due diligence period indicates that the urgency may be self-imposed and shouldn't be transferred to staff. Commissioner Cantrell agreed and said she didn't hear the reason for the urgency from the applicant. Commissioner Bell agreed and said that once they make an exception it creates other issues for their board to approve such cases in the future.

**Motion**

**Commissioner Kaalberg moved to disapprove both cases based on the findings and facts of the staff recommendation. Vice-chairperson Nielson seconded. The motion passed with Commissioner Gee in opposition.**

**e. 1816 5TH AVE N**

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1955624

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for 1816 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, which is currently a vacant lot. The applicant proposes to construct a new two story, two-family dwelling, with a form, more or less, similar to that of a "gabled-L", a

common historic house form in the area. The new house will be 36 feet tall and 36 feet wide. The width is compatible with historic houses (which range from 26-37') but the height is taller than what is typically found on two-story houses in the area. Staff recommends that the roof pitch be lowered in order to bring the ridge down to a height more compatible with the historic context, and the applicant has agreed to do so.

The proportion and rhythm of windows on the front are appropriate, but more windows are needed to break up the long wall-spaces on the side elevations, which the applicant has also agreed to do.

The materials will include cement-fiber siding and an asphalt-shingle roof. The materials of the foundation, porch elements, trim, and the windows and doors have not been specified. Staff would need to approve those materials in order to ensure that they meet the guidelines.

There will also be a 440 sf garage at the rear of the lot. It is a one-story two-car garage, divided so that each unit has half of the building. The location and scale are appropriate, but the materials of would need to be approved by staff as well.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal with the conditions that:

- The height of the roof is lowered to thirty-three feet (33') by lowering the pitch of the roof;
- The house be pushed back on the lot to align with the house next door at 1814 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North;
- Staff review and approve the roof color and the materials for the porch columns, porch floor, and foundation;
- Staff review and approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation;
- Staff review and approve the materials of the outbuilding; and
- The HVAC unit be placed at the rear, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

Meeting those conditions, staff finds that the proposal will meet the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines.

Vice-chair Nielson and Commissioner Gee asked about the lack of windows on the side elevation and Mr. Alexander stated that the applicant had agreed to add three windows and he identified the rough locations. Vice-chairperson asked about the front setbacks and Mr. Alexander explained that the leading edge of the structure would match the leading edge of the home next door.

Robin York, applicant for the project, said he would comply with any conditions needed.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the upper-story windows sitting on the ridge of the porch and if there was concern about actually constructing that scenario. Mr. York said he could change the porch roof, providing for 6" below the windows.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Gee and Bell asked about the historic and non-historic context, specifically the fact that a 2-story home was recommended for approval in a context of 1.5 story homes. Commissioner Gee expressed concern about keeping decisions consistent and referenced the prior case. Ms. Zeigler explained that this neighborhood was a little bit different than the other conservation overlays. While this neighborhood has only one historic 2-story building, the context is approximately 50% non-contributing, with many of those buildings being 2-stories. Although the Commission does not typically look at non-contributing buildings, the neighborhood felt this would be appropriate because of the high concentration of non-contributing buildings. She explained that staff was working hard to assure that the combination of heights and widths created an appropriate massing for the neighborhood.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that:**

- **Windows be added to the side elevations;**
- **The height of the roof is lowered to thirty-three feet (33') by lowering the pitch of the roof;**
- **The house be pushed back on the lot to align with the house next door at 1814 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North;**
- **Staff review and approve the roof color and the materials for the porch columns, porch floor, and foundation;**

- Staff review and approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation;
- Staff review and approve the materials of the outbuilding; and
- The HVAC unit be placed at the rear, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**f. 1210 GARTLAND AVE**

Application: New construction – infill; Setback determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 1955155

Staff member Paul Hoffman introduced the application for 1210 Gartland Avenue, infill construction of a two-family residence and a detached outbuilding. The house currently on the site is a noncontributing building and was administratively approved for demolition the previous month.

The proposed residence is two-and-a-half stories with a cross-gable hipped roof and will be clad in cement fiber lap siding. The windows as drawn on the front façade are unusually narrow; Staff asks that they be changed to be wider than two feet, yet still maintain historic proportion.

The new building meets the design guidelines for setback and rhythm of spacing. The site plan submitted does not show the footprint of adjacent properties; Staff asks that the front setback of this home match the established setback along the street by lining up with the neighboring homes.

The new structure meets guidelines for height and scale. Its height is between that of its immediate neighbors, and there are several homes within a block that are this height or taller.

Side dormers are present elsewhere in the neighborhood, even on one of the homes next door.

The garage will be located at the rear of the lot. A setback determination is requested from 10 feet to 6 feet. Several outbuildings on the same block have been built closer than 6 feet to the alley. Other appurtenances include a fence to be 6 feet high from the midpoint back, and no taller than 3 feet from that point forward. The applicant has agreed to note this on revised drawings.

Staff finds the proposed infill construction meets design guidelines for materials, roof form, orientation, outbuildings and appurtenances.

**Recommendation Summary:** Staff recommends approval of the proposed infill construction, with the conditions that:

- the front wall of the house be placed in line with front walls of the homes on either side, keeping with established front setback;
- the windows of the main façade be wider than two feet, yet maintain historic proportion;
- HVAC be located on the rear façade, or beyond the midpoint of the side façade of the house;
- the six foot (6') fence wrap around the rear yard from the midpoint of the home, and that the three (3') fence only be located forward of the mid-point of the building;
- Staff provide final review of all materials for the project; and
- revised drawings be submitted prior to the permit being issued, showing the true foundation height, the scale of the site plan, fence height and any other revisions.

Meeting these conditions, staff finds the new building meets the guidelines for new construction in the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Commissioner asked if there was a reason the beltcourse did not wrap around the front. The applicant said it would wrap around.

DeRon Jenkins, applicant for the project, stated he was in agreement with all conditions. The foundation will be a minimum of 32" all the way around.

Paul Weighell, 1206 Gartland, stated that the concept of a two-story townhouse is unique for the block. He doesn't have any objection to townhouses in general, but as a stand-alone project it looks incompatible with the Victorians on the street. In terms of scale it is too large, and in terms of depth it will be longer than the context and will eat into the backyard. Lastly, the neighborhood was only given 4 days to respond.

Angela Kaset, 1208 Gartland, explained that the street is a premier street. She said that her house is large, but most of the homes are about 2000 square feet and the proposed house is more than five times the size of the house it is replacing. There will be a fence dividing the yards in the back, which is odd because they can see down through the back yards. The townhouse looks very different. The original duplex had one front door so it looked like a single-family house. All of the homes have large front porches and it is part of the deal with the neighborhood. She understands the developers need to maximize profits but the big picture is about the people who live here. East Nashville is historic, fun, and quirky; and they want to keep it that way. She told the developer they were willing to work with him on the design issues.

Commissioner Champion asked for clarification that the existing house was a duplex and Mr. Hoffman said it was.

Commissioner Bell asked for clarification of setbacks. Mr. Hoffman explained that the setback determination is about changing the garage from 10' to 6', which meets the historic context. The front setback is probably correct, staff just wanted to ensure that it met the established setback.

Commissioner Cantrell said she was moved by the public comment against the project as well as an email she received. She said she is in agreement because it doesn't look consistent with the neighborhood. It appears to be too tall and the large porches do add to the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Gee added that they also face issues due to the crudeness of the exhibits. It may be a beautifully crafted home but the drawings often make that difficult to see. They need to be careful about managing the details. He further explained that the applicant is missing an opportunity to have a large front porch that might make it more marketable.

Commissioner Bell asked the materials and Ms. Zeigler said that it was common for the details of the materials not to be known at the time of the approval and that staff works with the applicants to finalize review of those.

Commissioner Kaalberg stated he is not concerned about the scale because there so many large homes in the immediate vicinity. The single and 2-family dwelling isn't an issue the commission can address because it is a base zoning issue. He asked that the applicant work with staff to design a larger front porch and maybe a shared front porch so that it looks less like a 2-family dwelling.

Mr. Jenkins stated he did not want the porches together because he didn't want the building to look like one large mass and he wants the homes to be separated with their own identities.

Commissioner Champion suggested that the two doors are what made the building incompatible with the neighborhood. Ms. Zeigler explained that there are many historic examples of duplexes in the neighborhood that have two doors and that the design before them is very similar to several other duplexes already approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Fletcher expressed concern over the conflicting feedback given to staff and stated that they could not dictate architectural styles or details. Chairperson Tibbs said that the applicant could look at doing more with the porch, maybe it is not a wraparound, and the beltcourse could wrap around the front.

Commissioner Kaalberg reiterated that homes like this have been approved but outside of that they could encourage a result that the builder and the neighborhood can live with. Ms. Zeigler explained that the decision belongs to the Commission and if the applicant would like to work with the neighborhood that is his decision, but the Commission cannot make that a requirement of their decision.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the details are not apparent in the drawings. On the upstairs there is a 12” bump-out that doesn’t continue to the first floor, which is an unusual condition. At the roofline the 12” bump out will create a break in the roofline so that to have a consistent depth the bump out needs to be resolved below the ridge. He added that it doesn’t have to be done one way or the other; simply that the drawings do not answer those questions.

Commissioner Gee asked that the front sill heights match the ones on the side, which are more consistent of historic character. He stated that part of the issue with the porch design is that the scale feels a bit puny compared to the character of the context and the mass of the building. The height of the door appears to be shorter than the windows, which is not typical of the district.

Chairperson Tibbs reopened the public hearing and invited the applicant back to address the Commission. Mr. Jenkins said his plan was based on buildings that have already been approved.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked the applicant if he was willing to make the changes that had been discussed and work with staff on modifications. Mr. Jenkins agreed.

*Commissioner Fletcher left the meeting at 4:09 p.m.*

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve with the conditions that:**

- **the front wall of the house be placed in line with front walls of the homes on either side, keeping with established front setback;**
- **the windows of the main façade be wider than two feet, yet still maintain historic proportion;**
- **HVAC be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house;**
- **the six foot (6’) fence wrap from the midpoint of the home, back around the rear yard, and that only the three (3’) fence be located forward of the mid-point of the building;**
- **Staff provide final review of all materials for the project;**
- **prior to the permit being issued, revised drawings be submitted showing the true foundation height, the scale of the site plan, fence height, details of paired windows, corner boards, window casings, and the bump out;**
- **front sill heights match the side window sills;**
- **band continues around the front of the house;**
- **foundation be no more than 32” tall; and,**
- **the applicant works with staff to design a front porch that is shared by both units and more consistent with the porches on the south side of Gartland in that particular block. If a dual porch remains, there needs to be more attention paid to the scale of the porch.**

**Cantrell seconded and the amended motion passed unanimously.**

Gee verified that the intent of the motion was that the front sill heights be lowered to match the side. Kaalberg agreed. Commissioner Gee stated that there are examples of dual porches and he would caution the commission to eliminate the dual porch; but if it remains, careful attention should be paid to the scale, details and height. Commissioner Kaalberg said that it was not his intent to set a precedent for dual porches, but that there is clear consistency with this block and it would contrast greatly to interject a dual porch in this location.

Commissioner Mosley asked that the condition that the 12” bump out be resolved at the roofline and down to grade and that the integration is clear in the revised drawing. Commissioner Kaalberg and Cantrell stated that they agreed with all amendments.

**g. 1702 EASTLAND AVE**

Application: New Construction - Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 1955159

Mr. Hoffman presented the application for 1702 Eastland Avenue, infill construction on a recently subdivided lot. The house will be centered on the lot side-to-side.

This house will sit 70 feet back from Eastland Avenue. The homes on each side, 1700 and 1704 Eastland, are 30 feet and 111 feet off the street, respectively, so there are two levels of historically-established setback. 1702 will sit approximately halfway between the front setbacks of the neighboring houses.

The new home meets the design guidelines for setback and rhythm of spacing. Staff has requested that a new concrete walkway be built to the sidewalk on Eastland Avenue.

The new structure is a one-and-a-half story Craftsman-style bungalow. The size and height of the structure are acceptable for the context and meet the design guidelines for height and scale. Staff also finds the proposed infill to meet the design guidelines for materials, roof form, orientation, and appurtenances. The designer is submitting a revised site plan that will reflect the actual location of the driveway to be built.

Staff finds that the proposed proportion and rhythm of openings meet the design guidelines.

*Photos were shown of neighboring homes at 1700 and 1704 Eastland Avenue, to the right and left, eastward and westward respectively, from the site.*

In conclusion, staff recommended approval of infill construction at 1702 Eastland Avenue with the conditions that

- Staff approve materials of windows and doors;
- Staff approve brick and roofing color;
- HVAC location to be approved;
- A concrete walkway be added to the front sidewalk;
- Multiple windows have a four to six inch mullion between them
- A revised site plan be submitted showing the actual location of the driveway.

The applicant was not present. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner asked if the front setback was determined by splitting the difference between the homes on either side and Ms. Zeigler responded that it was.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Gee moved to approve with the conditions that:**

- **Staff approve materials of windows and doors;**
- **Staff approve brick and roofing color;**
- **HVAC location to be approved;**
- **A concrete walkway be added to the front sidewalk;**
- **Multiple windows have a four to six inch mullion between them; and**
- **A revised site plan be submitted showing the actual location of the driveway.**

**Vice-chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Zeigler announced that the Old House Fair has been scheduled for March 8, 2014, 9am-3pm, 2400 Fairfax/ Martin Center.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:33.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 19, 2014