



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

September 16, 2015

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Vice-chair Ann Nielson, Menié Bell, Sam Champion, Richard Fletcher, Hunter Gee

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Susan Jones (city attorney)

Applicants: Mark Bixler, Matt Schutz, Matthew Allen, Allard Ward and Brian Hunter, John Root, Jeremy Bockman

Public: None

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:07 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 COUNCILMEMBERS

There were no councilmembers present. Chairman Tibbs took the opportunity to introduce Dan Brown, CLG coordinator with state historic preservation office. Mr. Brown thanked the commission for their volunteer service and reminded them of the yearly training requirement to maintain their Certified Local Government status.

Chairman Tibbs also introduced new staff member, Melissa Sajid.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. August 19, 2015

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS

b. None

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: Items on the Consent Agenda will be voted on at a single time. No individual public hearing will be held, nor will the Commission debate these items unless a member of the audience or the Commission requests that the item be removed from the Consent Agenda.

a. **1618 17TH AVE S**

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2068129

b. 611 BOSCOBEL ST

Application: New construction-additions
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2068133

c. 1807 BEECHWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2067920

d. 1515 FORREST AVE

Application: New construction: outbuilding (Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit); Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2067924

e. 325 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2068120

f. 414 N 16TH ST

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2067881

g. 1914 20TH AVE S

Application: New construction-addition; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2068389

Staff member, Melissa Sajid read the items on the consent agenda. There were no requests to have any items removed.

Motion:

**Commissioner Nielson moved to approve all consent agenda items with their respective conditions.
Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

None

VI. MHZC ACTIONS

j. 110 2ND AVE N

Application: New construction-rooftop addition; Alteration; Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 2068190 and 2068179

The applicant is proposing to replace a historic industrial steel window on the 2nd level of the First Avenue side of the building (see image 2), add signage and lighting to both the First and Second Avenue sides and add a rooftop addition.

Staff has analyzed the existing window and finds that although it could be repaired, replacement is also a reasonable treatment option, due to its poor condition. The applicant proposes a fixed window along the bottom with $\frac{3}{4}$ of the upper portion of the opening being a rollup door. Because the floor will be raised on the interior, the bottom $\frac{1}{4}$ of the opening will be obscured glass. The applicant did not specify how that will be accomplished.

The raising of the floor level does not meet the design guidelines for “upper facades: general principles” which states that “interior changes that affect the exterior appearance of upper facades including lowering ceiling heights or raising floor levels should be avoided.” The raising of the floor level requires the reconfiguration of the window and the need for obscured glass.

The Commission has not approved rollup doors on upper facades or primary facades in the past, finding that they do not meet the design guidelines that require that replacement windows “should replicate originals” and that “steel windows should be replaced with steel or aluminum designs that replicate the appearance of the original window” and because rollup doors are not found on upper levels or primary facades historically.

The industrial steel windows were a common alteration of the First Avenue side of this block and have become historic in their own right. A window with a fixed window in a portion of the opening with obscured glass and a roll up door is not a design that replicates the original. Staff recommends disapproval since the proposed window does not match the historic windows and therefore does not meet section II.H.3 for window replacement or section II for rehabilitation: upper facades, general principles.

Signage

There are three neon wall signs proposed on the First Avenue side of the building. The allotment on this side of the building, for wall signs, is approximately forty square feet (40 sq. ft.) All three signs together total fifty-nine square feet, greater than the allowed allotment.

The top sign does not meet the design guideline that states that “no portion of a wall sign may extend above the roof line or above a parapet wall.” This sign extends above the roof of the addition and above the parapet wall of the existing building. Staff recommends removal of the top proposed sign, because it exceeds the allotment and is located in an inappropriate location and recommends to lower the total square footage of the remaining two signs to meet the forty square foot (40 sq. ft.) allotment. Since the creation of the current signage guidelines which match the overall DTC requirements, the Commission has not approved any signs to exceed the allotment or to be located in inappropriate locations.

There is one projecting sign proposed for the Second Avenue side where the allotment is fifty-three square feet (53 sq ft). The proposal is for a twenty square foot (20 sq. ft) neon sign. The applicant claims that the proposal meets the requirement that it be at least twenty-five feet (25’) from any other projecting signs.

The sign does not obscure architectural details and is located in an appropriate location. The design guidelines require that the sign have a minimum of spacing from the building of twelve inches (12”) and not project more than a total of six feet (6’). The proposal meets those specifications. The depth of the cabinet meets the maximum of eighteen inches (18”) and the height of the sign does not exceed the maximum.

The project includes bare bulbs along two sides of the sign; however, this is a “prohibited” light source according to the design guidelines. Staff recommends that the bare bulbs be removed from the design.

The rooftop addition meets the setback requirements but not the height maximum in two places: the CMU elevator shaft and the First Avenue side of the addition which includes a sign above the roofline. The elevator shaft is less than one foot (1’) taller than the maximum and located towards the center of the roof. Because of the minimal additional height, the minimal portion of the addition that exceeds the maximum and the location, staff finds the additional height of the elevator shaft to be appropriate.

The signage above the First Avenue wall of the addition already does not meet the design guidelines for signage but also causes the addition to exceed the height maximum. With its removal, the addition will otherwise meet the maximum height requirement. Staff recommends removal of the signage above the addition to meet the minimal height requirements and the signage location requirements.

Staff recommends final review of masonry and exterior lighting prior to purchase and installation and the location of proposed speakers.

In summary, Staff recommends approval of the signage and the rooftop addition with the conditions that:

- The top proposed sign of the First Avenue side be removed because it exceeds the allotment for signage, is located in an inappropriate location, and causes the addition to exceed the height maximum;
- Signage not include bare bulbs;
- The railing on the First Avenue side not be used to support additional elements such as speakers, lighting, plants or signage;
- Staff approve dimensions and locations of speakers; and,
- Staff review final masonry prior to purchase and installation.

With these conditions, staff finds the project to meet the design guidelines for rooftop additions and signage. Staff recommends approval with all conditions or disapproval.

Furthermore, Staff recommends disapproval of the replacement of the historic industrial window with a roll-up door finding the project does not meet section II.H.3 for window replacement nor section II for rehabilitation: upper facades, general principles.

Staff does not recommend approval with conditions of the replacement window as the applicant has a current permit for replacement of the window with a replica window and the applicant is not interested in the additional option that would meet the design guidelines. A decision of disapproval does not preclude the applicant from submitting an application to repair the existing window or for alternative designs.

The applicant was not present and there were no requests from the public to speak. Commissioner Gee moved to approve the rooftop addition and signage with conditions and disapprove the roll-up door. The applicant came in later, stating that he had had a car accident. At the end of the meeting, the Commission voted to rescind their motion and rehear the case, giving the applicant the opportunity to present.

Mark Bixler, architect for the project, stated that he appreciated the board re-hearing the case. He explained that the idea of the business is a kitchen on the lower level with a bar/restaurant on the second level and event space above that. The window is not the original window, which was likely 3 arched windows. The non-original window looks like there are components that should be operable but are not. They would like an operable window. The floor will be raised to create additional height in the kitchen. The roll up door will replicate the three bays of the historic window.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that the new design doesn’t relate to historic design.

Commissioner Bell asked if the roll up door would look like a garage door. Mr. Bixler said it would and Commissioner Bell expressed concern over it not looking historic.

Commissioner Gee asked if the full second level was being raised and Mr. Bixler explained that about 200’ of the floor will be raised with about 10’ at the second avenue entrance remaining at the current level.

There was no request from the public to speak.

Commissioner Champion stated that it may not be necessary to have the window open and that it shouldn't matter how the window operates. Commissioner Gee asked if every building in the district asked for roll up doors, would he be OK with it.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that he believed there had to be an alternative to the rollup door, maybe large casements of windows that pivot. If they open the door on a garage door they are going to be everywhere. Commissioner Gee said he did not disagree that buildings evolve, in fact that changes they approve today might become historic at some point. There are changes that they have allowed that allow these buildings to evolve, such as rooftop decks, but windows are such an important detail of historic buildings. It would be a real challenge with rollup doors to mimic what is there today and he is concerned about allowing this to be allowed everywhere.

Mr. Bixler was invited back to state that if you look along first Avenue façades there are only two buildings that have openings of this side so no precedent would be set. Ms. Zeigler disagreed, stating that there have been numerous requests and others who are planning to request rollup doors in inappropriate locations in the future.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the rooftop addition and signage with the conditions that:

- **The top proposed sign of the First Avenue side be removed because it exceeds the allotment for signage, is located in an inappropriate location, and causes the addition to exceed the height maximum;**
- **Signage not include bare bulbs;**
- **The railing on the First Avenue side not be used to support additional elements such as speakers, lighting, plants or signage;**
- **Staff approved dimensions and locations of speakers; and,**
- **Staff review final masonry prior to purchase and installation.**

Commissioner Fletcher further moved to disapprove the roll up door on the First Avenue facade.

Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

k. 1300 ELMWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2067933

Melissa Baldock presented 1300 Elmwood Avenue, an application for a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit. Staff is recommending disapproval, finding that the DADU's dormer size and eave height do not meet Ordinance 17.16.030 for detached accessory dwelling units. Staff does not recommend approval with conditions, as meeting the standards of the ordinance will likely require a redesign of the project.

The proposed garage does meet all base zoning setbacks and has a footprint of 550 square feet. The eave height and ridge height on the alley façade meet the design guidelines and the DADU ordinance. However, the dormer size does not. The DADU ordinance requires that dormers be set in a minimum of two feet from the wall below, and this dormer is only inset one foot from the wall below. The DADU regulations further state "The detached accessory dwelling may have dormers that relate to the style and proportion of windows on the detached accessory dwelling and shall be subordinate to the roof slope by covering no more than 50% of the roof." In the past, the Commission has interpreted this as a linear measurement from side wall to side wall and the dormer on that plane should be 50% of that linear measurement. In this case, the dormer should be no more than twelve feet, eight inches (12'8") in width, compared to the twenty one feet and four inches (21' 4") proposed.

Staff finds that the eave height and the scale of the house-facing façade do not meet the DADU ordinance. The DADU ordinance limits the eave height of one-story structures to ten feet (10') for one-story DADUs. And the

Commission has only allowed one-story DADUs behind one and one-and-a-half story houses like this one. Staff considers the design of this façade to be two stories with an eave height of seventeen feet (17'). The applicant has included an ornamental roof form in between the first and second stories on this section to make the upper portion appear to be a dormer. However, the second story does not sit fully on the roof but over the first floor as well as the roof. Staff found this to be a full second story with a seventeen foot (17') eave height.

In conclusion, Staff recommends disapproval, finding that the DADU's eave height and dormers do not meet the DADU ordinance 17.16.030 or Section II.B.i. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Staff does not recommend approval with conditions as meeting the standards of the ordinance will likely require a redesign of the project.

Matt Shutz, applicant for the project, handed out some additional drawings. He explained the reason behind the design, how the project meets the design guidelines and code, and presented examples of approved projects. They wanted to leave a location for solar panels and keep the building subordinate to the existing house.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Gee stated that there was a lot that the applicant brought up that he agrees with. It's a clever design that fits into the neighborhood well. He asked Ms. Jones about their ability to determine bulk standards outside of the zoning ordinance since all the issues fell were bulk standards. He also stated that even if they have the ability to change the standards, that may not be a precedent that they want to set. It is not up to them to change the ordinance today. Commissioner Bell agreed.

Ms. Jones explained their authority that does give them some ability to deviate, if they thought it was appropriate to do so. They should decide how they want to set precedent and alter the ordinance.

Commissioner Gee expressed his concern with requirements that are so prescriptive it takes away their ability to do their job but that staff made a good point that the current standards went through a public process and if they were going to deviate, that too should likely go through a public process

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to disapprove, finding that the DADU's eave height and dormers do not meet the DADU ordinance 17.16.030 or Section II.B.i. of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

I. 1214 CALVIN AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit); Setback determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2068130

Staff member Sean Alexander preseted the case for a DADU at 1214 Calvin Avenue: an application to construct a one and one half-story outbuilding with a two-car garage on the lower level with a five hundred fifty square foot (550 s.f.) accessory dwelling above. The building will have a side-gabled roof with shed dormers on the front and rear slope. The applicant is requesting a determination on the appropriateness of a proposed ten foot (10') rear setback.

The section of Mero Code that allows DADUS, Ordinance 17.16.030.F.8.b., says that dormers shall be subordinate to the roofslope of the DADU by covering no more than fifty percent of the roof.

There are a few ways to calculate the size of a dormer, but for consistency the Commission typically uses the width of the building wall-to-wall as a basis for comparing the size of the dormer. Other methods can be greatly affected by pitch and eave overhang, or are unreliable when comparing gables to sheds, vice versa.

By width, staff determined the front dormer is 67% of the width and the rear dormer will be 83% of the width. Staff finds that the scale of the dormers as proposed do not meet Metro Ordinance Section 17.16.030.F.8.b,

Staff recommends approval of the detached accessory dwelling unit with a ten foot (10') rear setback, with the following conditions:

The dormers are reduced to twelve feet, nine three (12'-3") wide.

- Staff approves the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
- Staff approves the roof shingle color; and
- Staff receives a copy of the filed restrictive covenant for the detached accessory dwelling unit.

With these conditions, staff finds that the detached accessory dwelling unit meets Ordinance 17.16.030. F. and Sections II.B. and IV.B. of *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Matthew Allen, property owner, handed out additional information and made the case that the ordinance has been misinterpreted in terms of the DADU covering 50% of the roof. Staff member Sean Alexander passed out public comment received via email.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that the reason for the interpretation is that they don't want a long linear dormer to take up 60%-80% of the roof.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Bell stated that the neighborhood association submitted an email stating that they were not in support of deviation from the ordinance.

Commissioner Gee stated that they can change their interpretation at any point as long as they stay consistent from that point on. His tendency is to approve the north elevation with twice as much glass, since typically dormers were fully glazed historically, and the south elevation should be narrower and also with more glass.

Vice-chairperson Nielson asked for additional research on the topic. Chairman Tibbs stated that they should rule on what they have. Commissioner Fletcher said the handout was lengthy and difficult to review without more time to review and research additional information.

Ms. Jones explained that the ordinance allows them to interpret portions of the design guidelines that are not prescriptive and to even to change the ordinance.

Commissioner Gee said that given the specific language of the ordinance and the design guidelines for the neighborhood and past reviews, he believes that the language should be interpreted to measure the width of the dormer wall relative to the building's roof. The north elevation would be close to that.

Motion

Commissioner Gee moved to approve based on the findings and facts of the staff recommendation, with the conditions that:

- **the north elevation have twice as much glazing and that the south elevation should match the revised north elevation;**
- **Staff approves the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approves the roof shingle color; and**
- **Staff receives a copy of the filed restrictive covenant for the detached accessory dwelling unit.**

Vice-chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

m. 2121 BELMONT BLVD

Application: New Construction--Infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2067947

Melissa Baldock presented 2121 Belmont Boulevard, a multi-family development on what are currently four lots at the corner of Blair and Belmont Boulevards. In March, the Commission approved the massing of the street-facing structures. In July, City Council rezoned the property to an SP that allows up to 15 attached residential units. The application before the Commission today is for the approval of the massing of the rear structure and the project’s design details.

The five rear units will not have any street frontage, but will be connected to Blair Boulevard via a walkway. These units will be subordinate to the front-facing units by being one story and approximately six feet (6’) shorter. Staff finds this to be appropriate. The parking for the units will be uncovered surface parking, at the rear, just off the alley, which is appropriate. Staff finds that the rear units’ massing, height, scale, setback, rhythm of spacing, roof form, orientation, and parking plan all meet Section II.B. of the design guidelines.

The primary cladding material for all of the buildings will be brick, with accent cladding of tile and cement fiberboard. All of the known materials have been approved by the Commission in the past. The project’s proposed fenestration pattern is appropriate for a multi-family residential structure.

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

- Staff approve brick and tile samples;
- Staff approve the materials and design of the windows and doors, balcony railings, roof material, and rear balcony privacy walls prior to purchase and installation; and,
- Staff approve the location and design of all appurtenances and utilities, including, but not limited to, the HVAC units and dumpsters, prior to their installation.

With these conditions, staff finds the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Michael Ward and Brian Hunter with Allard Ward Architects made themselves available for questions. Commissioner Gee asked about sill height for windows on the ground floor and if the new code was considered. Mr. Hunter explained that the sills are approximately 2’ from the finished floor.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **Staff approve brick and tile samples;**
- **Staff approve the materials and design of the windows and doors, balcony railings, roof material, and rear balcony privacy walls prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- **Staff approve the location and design of all appurtenances and utilities, including, but not limited to, the HVAC units and dumpsters, prior to their installation.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

n. 309 MANCHESTER AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2067883

Staff member Paul Hoffman, presented the case for construction of a new residence on the site of a noncontributing building, which is to be demolished. The proposed new structure meets the design guidelines, with the exception of a large expanse of wall space without an opening on the right side, of about 30 feet. Staff's recommendation is that a window opening is added in this area to meet the design guidelines for proportion and rhythm of openings.

In summary, the application meets the design guidelines, and Staff recommends approval, with the conditions:

- The window opening added to the right side;
- The finished floor height is consistent with the floor heights of adjacent historic houses;
- Staff approves the windows, doors;
- The location of HVAC and other utilities meets the guidelines for minimal visibility.

With these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

John Root, architect for the project, stated that they agreed with all conditions.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve the project with the conditions:

- **that the window opening added to the right side;**
- **the finished floor height is consistent with the floor heights of adjacent historic houses;**
- **staff approves the windows, doors;**
- **the location of HVAC and other utilities meets the guidelines for minimal visibility.**

Vice-chair Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

o. 315 S 17TH ST

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2067886

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for demolition of a non-contributing building and new construction of a house and outbuilding at 315 South 17th Street.

Staff was concerned that the true foundation height might be higher than what the drawings show. Therefore, staff recommends the drawings be resubmitted to show the accurate height based on grade, as a condition of approval. There is an area of wall space without an opening toward the front of each side. Staff recommends that a window opening be added in this area to meet the design guidelines for proportion and rhythm of openings.

In summary, the application meets the design guidelines and Staff recommends approval, with the conditions:

- That the drawings be resubmitted to show the true height based on grade, and that the building does not exceed 34 feet from grade at the front;
- A window opening be added to each side;
- The finished floor height is consistent with the floor heights of adjacent historic houses;
- Staff approves the windows and doors;
- The location of HVAC and other utilities meets the guidelines for minimal visibility;
- Staff approves the roof and masonry colors.

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

Commissioner Gee expressed concern about the low roof slope of the garage and Mr. Hoffman explained it was the minimum slope allowed by the design guidelines.

Motion:

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

- **That the drawings be resubmitted to show the true height based on grade, and that the building does not exceed 34 feet from grade at the front;**
- **A window opening be added to each side;**
- **The finished floor height is consistent with the floor heights of adjacent historic houses;**
- **Staff approves the windows and doors;**
- **The location of HVAC and other utilities meets the guidelines for minimal visibility; and,**
- **6. Staff approves the roof and masonry colors.**

Vice-chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

p. 918 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2068123

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case to demolish a non-contributing building and construct a new two-family dwelling.

The new building will be a two-story duplex with side-by-side units with offset front-facades. The building will be 27' tall at the front, rising to a peak of 31', and then stepping down to 26' tall at the rear. The materials will be primarily cement-fiber siding with brick on a section of the first story at the front.

Staff finds the height and scale of the building to be compatible with the surrounding context and the materials to be appropriate. Staff asks to approve brick color and texture, roof color, and the window and door selections.

The window proportions are generally appropriate, and, with the exception of a section on each side, the rhythm of openings is compatible with historic context. Historic houses nearby generally have a window or door opening roughly every 10-12 feet.

The plans show the lot as flat, but it does appear to slope down left-to-right, and may slope down to the rear as well. Staff asks to verify that the foundation is constructed to be consistent with the heights of surrounding buildings. Staff also asks that walkways are added from the fronts to the sidewalk.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

- Walkways are added to connect the front porches to the sidewalk;
- The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
- An additional window is added on the first story on the right and left side;
- Staff approve a brick sample, the asphalt shingle color, that the primary siding exposure be five inches (5"), and staff approves all of the materials of the porch floors, stairs, windows, and doors;
- The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;
- Staff approve all appurtenances, including but not limited to, fencing, walkways, exterior lighting fixtures, and parking pads.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III.B.2. of the *Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Commissioner Fletcher left the meeting at 3:46 p.m.

Jeremy Bockman stated that he agreed with the conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **Walkways are added to connect the front porches to the sidewalk;**
- **The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- **An additional window is added on the first story on the right and left side;**
- **Staff approve a brick sample, the asphalt shingle color, that the primary siding exposure be five inches (5”), and that staff approves of the materials of the porch floors, stairs, windows, and doors;**
- **The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- **Staff approve all appurtenances, including but not limited to, fencing, walkways, exterior lighting fixtures, and parking pads.**

Vice-chairman Nielson seconded and the motion passed with all in favor, with the exception of Commissioner Fletcher who was not present.

q. 1405 ELMWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2068126

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case to construct a two-story single family dwelling on a vacant lot.

The house will be two stories tall with a 31’ ridge height and a 22’ eave height, including an 18” tall foundation. The house will be 34’ wide at the front, widening to 36’ in the center, with portions of the side walls sitting in an additional one or two feet.

The exterior materials will be brick and stucco, with an asphalt shingle roof.

Staff finds the height and scale of the building to be compatible with the surrounding context, and the materials to be appropriate. Staff asks to approve brick color and texture, roof color, and the window and door selections.

The roof will be side-gabled with a shed-roofed dormer on the front slope. As proposed, the front wall of the dormer would stack directly over the two-story wall below. Stacked or wall dormers are not common in the area. Staff asks that as a condition of approval that the dormer should set back two feet (2’) from the wall below, as is more commonly found on historic houses nearby.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed infill with the conditions that:

- The front dormer shall sit back two feet (2’) from the wall below; and
- The roof color is approved by Staff; and
- The window and doors selections, and a brick sample, are approved by staff; and
- There is a walkway leading from the front porch to the sidewalk; and
- The HVAC be located behind the midpoint of the house

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the application would meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Bell stated for the record that there was a typo on page 5, stating that the project was on Essex.

Michael Ward architect for the project explained the reason for the dormer was to mass the house so there were no large sections. If the dormer is pushed back 2’ it will be a flat roof dormer, which is inappropriate or they could change the pitch to 8/12 and push the dormer back.

Commissioner Gee asked for clarification of the results of the two proposed options. Mr. Ward said that the roof pitch change proposed would keep the house at under 34’ feet tall.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the project with staff recommendations with the conditions that:

- **The front dormer shall sit back two feet (2') from the wall below; and**
- **The roof color is approved by Staff;**
- **The window and doors selections, and a brick sample, are approved by staff;**
- **There is a walkway leading from the front porch to the sidewalk;**
- **The HVAC be located behind the midpoint of the house; and,**
- **The applicant work with staff to increase the pitch of the roof in order to appropriately meet the condition that the dormer be set back 2'.**

Vice-chairman Nielson seconded and the motion passed with all in favor , with the exception of Commissioner Fletcher who was not present.

r. 3111 OVERLOOK DR

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2067897

3111 Overlook Drive was removed from the agenda due to lack of a complete application.

s. 101 RANSOM

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Elmington Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2062498

Staff member Melissa Baldock, presented the case to to construct one of the eleven single-family homes that are part of the Ransom Avenue/Byron Close SP development. The Commission approved the development plan in July of 2012. Since that time, MHZC has approved the design of nine of the houses. In August (2015), the Commission disapproved a design for infill on this lot. This application represents a new design.

The site plan shows that the lot under consideration, Lot 1, faces both Byron Avenue and Ransom Avenue. The Commission has determined in the past that lots that face either Byron or Richardson Avenue should have side street facades that look like the front. The infill's height, scale, materials, roof form, and setbacks are similar to what the Commission has approved in the past at the Ransom Development. The design for Lot 1 successfully addresses both Ransom and Byron Avenues with a wrap-around porch and entries on both facades that have the look of a primary residential entry. In addition, the fenestration and roof pattern of the Byron Avenue façade give it the appearance of a primary façade.

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

- Staff verify the construction height of the foundation and floor systems in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new construction is compatible with the historic context;
- Staff provide final review of the windows and doors, roof color, railing design and material, brick and stone samples, and the material for the entryway and porch floors;
- All siding have a maximum reveal of five inches (5"); and
- The HVAC units be placed on the rear façades, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the houses.

With these conditions, staff finds that infill houses meet the design guidelines for the Elmington Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

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

Commissioners Gee and Bell asked for clarification of drawings.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **Staff verify the construction height of the foundation and floor systems in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new construction is compatible with the historic context;**
- **Staff provide final review of the windows and doors, roof color, railing design and material, brick and stone samples, and the material for the entryway and porch floors;**
- **All siding have a maximum reveal of five inches (5"); and**
- **The HVAC units be placed on the rear façades, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the houses.**

Vice-chairman Nielson seconded and the motion passed unimously, with the exception of no vote from Commissioner Fletcher who was not present..

Commissioner Fletcher returned at 4:11 p.m. in time to rehear the case for 110 Second Avenue.

p. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW

None

q. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Administrative Permits Issued for Prior month**

Chairman Tibbs made an announcement about Historic Nashville, Inc.'s *Nashville 9 Most Endangered Buildings* announcement.

The meeting concluded at 4:38p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 21, 2015