



# 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

**October 15, 2014**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brian Tibbs, Vice-Chair Anne Nielson, Menié Bell, Rose Cantrell, Richard Fletcher, Hunter Gee

**Zoning Staff:** Sean Alexander, Paul Hoffman, Robin Zeigler (Historic Zoning Administrator), Susan T. Jones (City Attorney)

**Applicants:** John Root, Tom White

**Public:** Brett Withers, Jason Quiram

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:10 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**

There were no council members present.

### **II. MINUTES:**

#### **Motion:**

**Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve the August 20, 2014 minutes without changes. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

### **III. CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **a. 1511 ELMWOOD AVE**

Application: New construction - outbuilding; Setback determination  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 2002338

#### **b. 312 BROADWAY**

Application: New construction - addition; Rehabilitation  
Council District: 19  
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 2002339

#### **c. 110 PEMBROKE AVE**

Application: New construction-addition  
Council District: 23  
Overlay: Belle Meade Links Triangle Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN  
Permit ID #: 2002019

**d. 4000 CAMBRIDGE AVENUE**

Application: New construction—addition; Setback determination  
Council District: 24  
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK  
Permit ID #: 2002496

**e. 3105 OVERLOOK**

Application: New construction—addition  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK  
Permit ID #: 2002507

**f. 2619 A ASHWOOD AVE**

Application: New construction - infill  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 2002342

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the cases for the consent agenda.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Nielson moved to approve all the consent items with their applicable conditions with the exception of 3105 Overlook Drive which was moved to MHZC Actions. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**I. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS**

The items below were deferred from a previous MHZC meeting at the request of the applicant.

**g. 114 SOUTH 17<sup>th</sup> STREET**

Application: Demolition; New construction—infill; Setback determination  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK  
Permit ID #: 2002500

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented the application to demolish an existing structure, and construct new infill and a detached carport. The project requires a setback determination. The existing building at 114 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street is a one-story building constructed c. 1940. The building is situated at the rear of the lot of 1621 Holly Street. The house at 1621 Holly Street is used as a duplex, so there are currently three units on the lot. The Codes Administration considers both the duplex in 1621 Holly Street and the residence at the back of the lot to be “nonconforming legal” uses. So Codes permits three residential units on the lot.

The style, form, and detailing of this house do not match the historic context of the neighborhood. Staff finds that the structure does not contribute to the architectural and historical significance of the district, and that its demolition meets the design guidelines.

The proposed infill will be in the approximate location of the house that is to be demolished. It is shifted to the right of the site, closer to the alley, which allows for more room in between it and the Holly Street house. The proposed building is approximately thirty-three and a half feet (33 ½') wide and thirty feet (30') deep. The house is slightly narrower and shallower than the historic context, where the houses range from about thirty-five to thirty-eight feet (35'-38') wide and forty-four to sixty-five feet (44'-65') deep. Comparing the two houses on the lot, the new structure's footprint is about 2/3 the size of the Holly Street house.

The infill will be approximately twenty-seven feet (27') from the front property line, which is about six feet (6') forward of the house across the alley at 112 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street. The front wall of the new construction, however, will be 4' behind the 17<sup>th</sup> Street façade of the house at 1621 Holly. Staff finds the front setback to be appropriate because the lot is shallow and because it is behind the 1621 Holly Street.

The infill requires a setback determination. It will be 5' from the alley and 5' from the west property line dividing 1621 Holly and 1619 Holly Street. Staff's review is that these setbacks are appropriate because they shift the house away from the Holly Street house, towards the alley, and because the shallowness of the buildable area makes locating the structure farther away from the west property line impractical. In addition, the existing structure is situated less than twenty-feet (20') from the rear property line.

The proposal includes a one-story, one bay carport, located to the left of the house in between the 1621 Holly and the new residence. The carport meets all base zoning setbacks.

The proposed infill will be one and a half stories with a ridge height of twenty-three feet, six inches (23'6") above grade. It will have an eave height of approximately thirteen feet (13') above grade, and a two foot (2') tall foundation. Staff finds that the proposed height matches the historic context. The house at 1621 Holly Street is approximately twenty-five feet (25') tall so the new infill will be appropriately shorter. The other houses along 17<sup>th</sup> Street range in height from twenty-one to twenty-six feet (21'-26') tall.

The house is oriented to face 17<sup>th</sup> Street, with a front porch located near the front left corner. To meet the guidelines for orientation, Staff recommends a walkway be added connecting the house to the street. All known materials have been approved by the Commission in the past. The primary cladding material will be five inch (5") fiber cement lap siding, the foundation will be split face concrete block, and the roof will be architectural shingles. The proposed carport will have an eave height of nine feet, six inches (9'6") and a ridge height of fourteen feet, six inches (14'6"). The roof will be a gable with a slope of 6/12. Staff finds the carport to meet the design guidelines.

Here are the side and rear facades. (*shown*) The infill will have a side gabled roof with a slope of 7/12. The front façade will have a gabled dormer that is inset two feet (2') from the wall below. The primary windows on the infill meet the historic proportion and rhythm of openings.

The materials of the carport will be similar to those of the house, and include wood posts, architectural shingles, and fiber cement siding. An existing double-width driveway will be shifted a few feet to the left and will be less than ten feet (10') wide.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- Staff review the color of roofing;
- Staff review windows and doors;
- The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;

- A walkway be added from South 17<sup>th</sup> street to the front porch of the proposed new building; and,
- The HVAC and other utilities be located to minimize their visibility from South 17<sup>th</sup> street.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets the design guidelines.

Rebecca Devane with Shamrock Homes stated that they agreed with the conditions and she was available for questions.

Jason Quiram, the next door neighbor spoke against the project stating that the building was not legal. Jack Matthews, who lives across the street, spoke in favor of the project, as it will be an improvement over existing conditions.

Commissioner Gee noted that Mr. Quiram's full comments were received via email prior to the meeting.

Historic zoning administrator, Robin Zeigler and legal counsel, Ms. Jones, informed the Commission that BZA informed staff that replacing the unit removed is legal and that their charge was to simply review the design, not the use.

**Motion:**

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

- Staff review the color of roofing;
- Staff review windows and doors;
- The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
- A walkway be added from South 17<sup>th</sup> Street to the front porch of the proposed new building; and,
- The HVAC and other utilities be located to minimize their visibility from South 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**II. MHZC ACTIONS**

**e. 3105 OVERLOOK**

Application: New construction—addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2002507

Historic zoning administrator, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for additions and alterations at 3105 Overlook Drive. Its date of construction and typical Cape Cod form meet the historic context of this part of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay, that was developed between 1940 and 1950. This application is to construct a new front dormer and a side and rear addition. Staff is recommending disapproval because the project is too massive for the existing historic house.

The side portion of the addition does not sit back to the midpoint—as the commission has required in the past for side additions. The midpoint would be about 12' and the proposed addition only sits back 5'. The guidelines state that side additions should be subservient in height and mass to the historic house but the addition adds a second level above the one-story portion of the house.

Currently the house looks like a typical Cape Cod style home with a garage to the right and an enclosed connector between. With the proposed addition, the house will look like a historic home with a new home attached to its right side, which does not meet the design guidelines for rhythm of the street or scale.

The addition wraps the rear corner of the house which changes its original roof form, a design that the Commission has typically not allowed because it doesn't meet the design guidelines for roof form.

A central dormer is proposed to be added. In the past, where there was no evidence of a historic dormer, you (the commission) has only allowed for new dormers to be added on secondary elevations, because conjectural architectural elements are not to be added if they create a false sense of history. The two gabled-dormer on either side of the central doorway is a typical Cape Cod house configuration, and the proposed third, central dormer interrupts this original form. Front additions do not meet the design guidelines for additions.

The proposed walled terrace at the front of the house does not meet the design guidelines as it adds a conjectural feature to the house, and obscures significant architectural features of the Cape Cod's front façade. In addition, it alters the perceived orientation of the historic house by minimizing the primary entrance and giving more prominence to the secondary entrance.

Staff recommends disapproval of the project, finding that the dormer and the side addition do not meet Sections II.B.1.a., b., e., f., and j. and II.B.2. of the *Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Staff does not recommend approval with conditions since a redesign is needed to meet the design guidelines. We felt this could not be accomplished at the meeting, but staff is happy to continue to work with the applicant on a solution.

Van Pond, architect for the project, stated that they could work with the conditions for the terrace and the dormer but would like to request approval of the addition due to the constraints of the lot.

Commissioner Gee requested to see floor plans, to better interpret the project and Mr. Pond provided those. Commissioner Gee stated that staff's analysis was correct but that the constraints of the site, due to the steep rise in grade, make an addition difficult to accomplish in a manner that hides the massing behind the house. He stated that since they place an emphasis on what can be seen from the street, according to the design guidelines, they may want to consider breaking the ridge and hiding the bulk of the addition behind the house.

Commissioner Fletcher agreed with staff that the addition may be too much for this particular home.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to disapprove based on the fact that the proposed application did not meet sections II.B.1.a., b., e., f., and j. and II.B.2. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**h. 1706 A 4TH AVE N**

Application: New construction – infill cottage development

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemton Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2002343

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the application, which is to construct six houses on a 100' wide by 174' deep lot. The lot was recently rezoned to Specific Plan or "SP" that permits up to six detached dwellings.

An earlier version of this application was reviewed and disapproved by this Commission in August 2014. In discussion, the Commissioners stated they found the massing and scale of the project to be incompatible with the surrounding context, that the rear buildings were not subordinate to those at the front, and that the project lacked a courtyard (a necessary feature of a cottage development).

In the current proposal, the two structures at the front of the lot are unchanged, but the rear structures have been reduced in height by 5' and in width by 2'. This results in an increase in the width of the courtyard from 10' to 14'. Even with these changes, staff finds that they do not remedy the issues of scale and massing sufficiently, as six buildings, all two-stories tall, overbuild the lot and does not leave enough room for a proper courtyard.

The Commission asked for clarifications from legal about the legality of the building and determined that use and number of units was not in their purview.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed infill, finding that the scale and massing of six two-story houses on a one hundred foot (100') wide lot does not meet the design guidelines for the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

*Commissioner Cantrell recused herself from the case due to her friendship with the applicants.*

Tom White, legal counsel for the applicant, explained that the neighbors and Council member were in support of the project. His client has lowered the rear units by 5' and shortened the footprint by 2'. Mr. White handed out a letter from a neighbor who expressed support. Jeremy Leggo, builder for the project, explained the reasoning behind the design, the changes made and the fact the Councilmember is in support of the project.

Jason Preston, 1726 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, spoke in favor of the project.

Commissioner Bell stated that infill development in Salemtown is difficult to review, due to the lack of context but that this development seems to follow those of others. She, Commissioner Fletcher and Vice-chair Nielson stated that the requirements they requested have been met. Vice-chair Nielson also stated that if approved, she hoped that it would not become precedent for future projects.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Gee moved to approved because of the limited historic context, there were 6 units on the site originally, there is no neighborhood opposition, Staff requested a smaller scale and that was accomplished with the new design proposed with reduced height and footprint of the rear units. Commissioner Bell seconded. The motion passed with all in favor with the exception of Commissioner Cantrell who recused herself.**

**i. 2002 EASTLAND AVE**

Application: New construction - infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2002344

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for two new buildings at 2002 Eastland Avenue. The applicant proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure that straddles a lot line and to construct two new buildings, one on each original lot.

Mr. Alexander reminded the Commission that this project has gone before the commission twice and was disapproved twice. The applicant has revised the plans in several ways: the roof forms have been revised to be more in keeping with the roofs of nearby historic houses, the height has been reduced by six feet (6'), and the widths have been increased by two feet (2'). Additionally, the windows on the current proposal are more like typical residential windows, and a front-yard parking area on the original submittal has been eliminated.

It is Staff's opinion that the applicant has addressed the concerns about the scale of the buildings and compatibility with the context.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that:

1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. Staff approve the roof colors and the final details, dimensions and materials windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
3. Staff approve the materials of the porch floor and front steps;

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the project will meet the guidelines for the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

John Root, architect, noted that there is a typo in the staff recommendation and that the buildings have been reduced 3'-4' in height, not 6'. This was accomplished by widening the home and changing the roof slope.

Brett Withers, representing the Eastwood Neighborhood Association, thanked the applicant for working with the neighbors.

#### **Motion**

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

- 1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Staff approve the roof colors and the final details, dimensions and materials windows and doors prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- 3. Staff approve the materials of the porch floor and front steps.**

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

#### **j. 207 GENTRY AVENUE**

Application: New construction – infill cottage development; New construction-addition; Partial demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2002510

The property consists of two large lots that have received an SP zone change for 10 units and currently include just one historic building constructed in early 1920. It should be noted that the current plans show full bathrooms in the outbuildings, which the Codes Administration determines as a dwelling unit, but the applicant tells us that they will not be dwelling units. We do not review the use or number of units, but want to point out that it is our understanding that the outbuildings will not be dwelling units.

In the past, the Commission has approved cottage developments that do not meet the traditional development patterns of historic neighborhoods and have required elements such as connections to the street with walkways for interior units and a central courtyard. This “cottage development” is more in keeping with traditional development patterns in that it has four principal houses facing the street with 4 garage units at the rear in an area that is the typical size and configuration of a standard lot.

Where it differs is that a new road is essentially being created off the alley at the rear with a row of units addressing the interior road. For this reason, some of the requirements that have been required of other clustered cottage developments are not necessary for this one.

There is very little historic context along this stretch of Gentry Avenue. 207 Gentry Avenue is the only house on the west side of the street that faces Gentry Avenue. Across the street, on the east side of Gentry, most of the lots are the rear yards of houses facing Porter Road.

The plan is to construct an addition to the historic building, infill on either side of the historic building, an outbuilding for each of these principle dwellings, and six (6) more small units at the back of the deep lots. The project meets the design guidelines in terms of the addition and partial demolition related to the historic home, setbacks, rhythm of spacing, orientation, parking, height, scale, proportion of openings and outbuildings.

To meet the requirements for materials staff recommends the conditions that all lap siding have a maximum of a 5” reveal, staff approve windows and doors, roof color and masonry samples, the foundation be split-face concrete block, and House 1 have a change in material at the foundation level. To meet the requirements for roof form, staff recommends that the dormer of House #1 be pushed back so that it is inset a minimum of two feet (2’) from the wall below. To meet the requirement for

rhythm of openings, staff recommends that several changes be made in order for the windows on the side elevations to meet the proportion and rhythm of openings generally found in the historic neighborhood. On House 1's side facades, the windows towards the front of the house (one on the right façade and two on the left façade) should be enlarged so that they are three feet (3') tall rather than two feet (2') tall. On House 2's right side facade, the two windows in front of the bay should be enlarged so they are at least three to four feet (3' – 4') tall and vertically oriented. On House 2's left façade, the triple window opening should likewise be elongated so that the windows are three to four feet (3' – 4') tall and vertically oriented. Similarly, on House 4's right side facade, the two windows towards the front should be enlarged so they are at least three to four feet (3' – 4') tall and vertically oriented, and on its left façade, the triple window opening should be elongated so that the windows are three to four feet (3' – 4') tall and vertically oriented. To meet the requirements for utilities, staff asks that the HVAC units be located on the rear façades, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the houses.

In summary, Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. On House 1, there be a change in material from the foundation to the wall above;
2. On House 1, the side dormers be set back a minimum of two feet (2') from the wall below.
3. The windows on the side facades of Houses 1, 2, and 4 be vertically oriented, and at least three feet (3') tall;
4. The finished floor heights of the three new houses facing Gentry Avenue be consistent with the finished floor height of existing historic house at 207 Gentry, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
5. All horizontal lap siding on all new construction have a maximum reveal of five inches (5");
6. The HVAC units for the primary houses facing Gentry Avenue be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;
7. Staff approve the window and door specifications, the roof shingle color, and a brick sample prior to purchase and installation of these materials; and
8. The concrete block for the foundation be split faced.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Sections II.B.1., II.B.2., and III.B.2. of the *Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Matthew Smith, designer of the project, stated that he agreed with most of the conditions but would like to request more than a 5" reveal on siding for the rear properties, to push the dormer back 1' instead of 2' due to egress issues, and to keep the windows as-shown.

Brett Withers, representing the Eastwood Neighborhood Association, thanked the applicant for working with the neighbors.

Commissioner Gee stated that he understood the issue of egress and so didn't mind the dormer only sitting back 1', rather than the typical 2'.

Commissioners Gee and Fletcher stated that the project was innovative and well designed for the historic neighborhood. Commissioner Bell thanked the developer for keeping the historic building, which they could have demolished prior to the extension of the overlay.

**Motion:**

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

1. **The applicant will work on staff to resolve the majority of the window issues noted in the conditions of the staff recommendation;**
2. **On House 1, there be a change in material from the foundation to the wall above;**
3. **On House 1, the side dormers be set back a minimum of 1' from the wall below.**
4. **The finished floor heights of the three new houses facing Gentry Avenue be consistent with the finished floor height of existing historic house at 207 Gentry, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
5. **All horizontal lap siding on all new construction have a maximum reveal of five inches (5");**
6. **The HVAC units for the primary houses facing Gentry Avenue be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**



7. **Staff approve the window and door specifications, the roof shingle color, and a brick sample prior to purchase and installation of these materials; and,**
8. **The concrete block for the foundation be split faced.**

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

**k. 1813 HOLLY ST**

Application: New construction - addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2002340

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the application, which is for a rear one-and-a-half story addition to a contributing Craftsman-style home. A similar plan was approved in July of 2014. Previously, the addition would match the height of the house; in the revised plans, the addition will be taller than the historic house.

It can be appropriate at times for an addition to be taller than an historic house if the addition is far enough to the rear, but in the staff recommendation, you'll read that we recommend pushing the right wall in to reduce the massing of the taller portion.

Since that approval, the applicant has sent a revision that would instead lower the height of the addition, and found that the existing roof is a little taller than they'd originally believed. With that information, staff finds that the revised plan would also be sufficient in reducing the massing.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- The right wall of the upper story of the addition is pushed in two feet (2'); or with the height of the addition lower as revised.
- The selections of windows, doors and patio material shall be approved by Staff.

With these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Craig Kennedy, applicant for the project, stated he was available if the Commission had questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

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

- **The right wall of the upper story of the addition is pushed in two feet (2'); or with the height of the addition lower as revised.**
- **The selections of windows, doors and patio material shall be approved by Staff.**

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

**l. 1414 BOSCOBEL ST**

Application: New construction-infill; Demolition-principle building

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2001980

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented 1414 Boscobel Street, an application for demolition of the existing building on the site, and infill construction. The existing house dates to 1948, and does not contribute to the architectural or historic character of the neighborhood.

The proposed infill is two stories and 28 feet tall. New construction of two stories may be built in the 1400 to 1600 blocks of Boscobel, where historic context is minimal. It is proposed to be 40 feet wide. Contributing buildings nearby have a range in width from 26 to 40 feet.

The foundation will be concrete block, the cladding will be fiber cement siding, panels and board-and-batten. A panel of stained wood is proposed on the front façade.

With Staff approval of windows, doors and roofing color, the project will meet the guidelines for materials. The windows generally meet the appropriate proportion. The largest expanse of wall space without an opening is about 19 feet on each side. The design guidelines state that there should be an opening every 8 to 13 feet. Staff requests an opening be added in this location, approximately, to break up this long run of wall area on each side. Staff recommends approval of the demolition and new construction, with the conditions that:

- The finished floor height of the new building shall be consistent with that of adjacent historic houses;
- A window opening be added to each side façade;
- Staff shall approve the selection of, windows, doors, color of roofing, and intended walkways, driveways and parking;
- And HVAC and other utilities shall be located to minimize their visibility from Boscobel Street.

Ms. Zeigler explained that these homes were dramatically different than what they typically see because when the overlay was expanded to include this area, the neighborhood recognized that these few blocks of Boscobel had no significant historic context and therefore new construction should be allowed to follow the current development patterns.

In answer to a question from Commissioner Gee, Ms. Zeigler stated that they had not received any comments from the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bell asked if there was a specific year that was used to determine if a property was historic or not and Ms. Zeigler answered that there were multiple factors used to make that determination, including year of construction, historic integrity, context and the history of the neighborhood and building. Commissioner Bell expressed concern that the nature of this portion of the neighborhood is post-war and those home should also be preserved. Ms. Zeigler explained that post-war homes could definitely be considered historic; however, they typically look for collections of good examples and these particular homes are not particularly good examples of that era of construction and so were deemed non-historic.

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

Commissioner Gee questioned that the project meet the guideline for orientation because of the wall which obscures the entry and the orientation of the porch off to the side.

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

- **The finished floor height of the new building shall be consistent with that of adjacent historic houses;**
- **A window opening be added to each side façade;**
- **Staff shall approve the selection of, windows, doors, color of roofing, and intended walkways, driveways and parking;**
- **The parking be accessed from the rear alley;**

- **And the porch be redesigned so that the front entrance is more prominent by reorienting the porch to the street or other methods; and**
- **HVAC and other utilities shall be located to beyond the midpoint of the house or at the rear.**

Vice-chair Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**m. 805 PETWAY**

Application: New construction—infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2002501

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for a new single-family infill and a detached garage on this lot at the Western edge of the district, adjacent to the Ellington Parkway.

The house will have the form similar to that of a Craftsman style bungalow, which is a common historic house in the area. Staff finds that the new 1.5 story house and associated garage are compatible with the historic context, and...

Staff recommends approval of the infill with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. MHZC verify in the field that the front setback of the new infill's front wall matches the front setback of the adjacent property at 807 Petway Avenue;
3. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
4. Staff approve the shingle and metal roof color, and the materials of the front porch floor and steps;
5. A central walkway be installed from the front of the property to the front porch, with material to be approved by staff; and
6. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the infill meets Sections II.B.1. of the *Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Gee expressed concern with the lack of detail on the drawings and asked the Staff to work with the applicant to be sure that it is constructed as required.

**Motion:**

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

1. **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
2. **MHZC verify in the field that the front setback of the new infill's front wall matches the front setback of the adjacent property at 807 Petway Avenue;**
3. **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
4. **Staff approve the shingle and metal roof color, and the materials of the front porch floor and steps;**
5. **A central walkway be installed from the front of the property to the front porch, with material to be approved by staff; and**
6. **The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.**

Vice-chair Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**f. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW**

**n. 1505 & 1507 HOLLY ST**

Application: Preliminary SP Review

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2001989

Ms. Zeigler introduced the new preliminary SP review process that has been established between the Planning Department and staff for the MHZC.

Staff member, Paul Hoffman presented the application for 1505/1507 Holly Street. This is a preliminary review for a proposed Specific Plan. The intent of the SP is to create a third property facing Lindsley Park Drive, from these two properties on Holly Street. If the preliminary plans are approved by the Planning Commission, Historic Zoning Commission, and Council, the applicant will return to this Commission with final details of the project. The project meets design guidelines for setbacks and orientation.

The proposed structure is 42 by 34 feet, for a total footprint of 1,428 square feet. These dimensions are compatible with the widths and heights of nearby contributing buildings. The roof is a side gable with 7/12 pitch and dormers. The proposed design meets guidelines for height & scale, and roof form.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed Specific Plan (SP), finding that the project meets the applicable design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

The Commissioners discussed the SP process and the Planning Department's role in development of SPs. Ms. Jones and Ms. Zeigler explained the Commissions charge in reviewing the massing and scale of the project, but not the details at this time, or the number of units.

Rich McCoy, architect for the project explained the thought behind the development pattern and that they met with the neighborhood that approved with the project.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Gee moved to approve a recommendation to the Planning Department for development of the property. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Gee thanked staff of the MHZC and Planning Department for working out a system that will be easier for the applicants and for the architect's thoughtfulness in designing the project.

**g. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS**

- o. Approve Duplex, Outbuilding and Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit Policy**

Ms. Zeigler presented a brief overview of the policies. Commission Gee requested that all "shalls" be changed to "shoulds."

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Nielson moved to approve the policy and Commissioner Fletcher seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

- p. Approve change to Rules of Order and Procedure**

The Commission discussed the ramifications of the proposal.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Gee moved to disapprove the proposed changes to the Rules of Order and Procedure and Vice-chair Nielson seconded with the motion passing unanimously.**

**h. OTHER BUSINESS**

- Administrative Permits Issued for Prior month
- 2015 MHZC filing deadlines & Meeting Schedule

There was no discussion about these items.

Meeting adjourned.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON NOVEMBER 19, 2014.