

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

April 20, 2016

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Menié Bell, Rose Cantrell, Richard Fletcher, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart

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

Council Member: None attending

Applicants: Kayla and Bobby Joslin and Michael Price, Michael Kenner, Jamie Pfeffer, Julie Davis and Justin Duntin, Sandi Adams, Michael Ward, Preston Quirk, John Root, Patrick Bales and Brad Daniels, John Pirtle, Rachel Reedy, Joni Priest and William Hastings

Public: Kay Kinnard, Richard Audet, Vicki Metzger, Dianna Sullivan, Drew [unknown last name]

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Chairman Tibbs read the instructions for the meeting, appeals process, and the consent agenda.

Prior to beginning with the agenda, Chairman Tibbs welcomed new commissioner, Cyril Stewart.

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 16, 2016

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. 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. 1506 ELMWOOD AVE

Application: New construction—outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2113672

b. 1109 GREENWOOD AVE

Application: Addition—outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2113680

c. 1507 DALLAS AVE

Application: Addition— outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2113675

d. 4105 ABERDEEN RD

Application: New construction—addition and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2113715, 2113719

e. 1407 EASTLAND AVE

Application: Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2114273

f. 2216 GRANTLAND AVE

Application: New construction--addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Woodland in Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2113728

g. 1418 FRANKLIN AVE

Application: New construction— outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2113739

h. 613 17TH AVENUE NORTH

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 2115097

i. 108 2ND AVENUE NORTH

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Second Avenue and Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlays
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID
Permit ID #: 2113326

j. 853 A BRADFORD

Application: New construction – addition and outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling
Unit; Setback determination

Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID
Permit ID #: 2113329, 2113332

k. 2607 NATCHEZ TR

Application: New construction – addition; Partial demolition; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro – West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID
Permit ID #: 2113333

l. 1211 SHELBY 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 SAJID
Permit ID #: 2113322

m. 305 KENT RD

Application: New construction – addition; Partial demolition; Alterations
Council District: 14
Overlay: Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID
Permit ID #: 2113320

n. 1911 ASHWOOD AVE

Application: New construction—addition; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2113683

o. 121 SOUTH 17TH ST

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 #: 2113920

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the cases for the consent agenda, noting that 4105 Aberdeen Rd and 108 2nd Avenue North have been moved to “MHZC Actions.”

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with all applicable additions, with the exception of 4105 Aberdeen Rd and 108 2nd Ave N. Commissioner Cantrell seconded finding the projects to meet their applicable design guidelines with the applicable conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

None

V. MHZC ACTIONS

d. 4105 ABERDEEN RD

Application: New construction—addition and outbuilding; Setback determination

Council District: 24

Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2113715, 2113719

Ms. Zeigler explained that the Rules of Order and Procedure be suspended in regards to notice requirements for setback determinations. The sign was posted 7 days prior, as required; however, the mailed notice was only completed approximately 3 days prior. Staff recommends suspending the rules since the property owner who is most affected received notice in time to attend the meeting.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to suspend the Rules of Order and Procedure since notice was provided in time for the property owners to attend the meeting. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented this application for a rear addition to the house, and a new carport at the rear of the lot. The house is offset on the lot and sits one foot and one inch from the property line. The project requires a setback determination from five feet (5') to one foot and one inch (1'1"), which is the distance of the existing house from the property line on this side. Houses in the neighborhood, and on the same block, are frequently inside the required setbacks. The lots here are slightly irregular. This one narrows from 60 feet at the front to 50 feet at the rear. Staff's review is that the setback is appropriate, as the addition will be no closer to the property line than the house is currently. Additionally, visibility of this side of the lot is minimal. The project meets the design guidelines in all other respects. Staff requests final approval of the roofing, masonry, and windows and doors, as normal conditions of approval.

In summary, Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition and outbuilding, finding that the project meets the design guidelines and that the setback determination is appropriate based on the setback of contributing buildings in the district.

Preston Quirk, architect for the project, explained that the lot is oddly shaped and the one to the right that will be most affected is a wider lot. The portion of the addition that faces the property on the right is only one story with a dormer. The setback requirements were established after the development of the neighborhood. They cannot slide the addition over because of restricted access to the existing garage. He noted that he received the notice about noon seven days prior so there wasn't opportunity for them to get it out in the time required.

Ms. Kay Kinnard, 4107 Aberdeen, stated that she opposed the setback determination because of the narrowness of the lot and the existing rhythm of spacing between buildings. The addition will be just 13" from the side property line which places the burden of maintaining the spacing between buildings solely on her property. They cannot build a 2-story fence on the property line and this equates. The HVAC already sits over the property line. The owners did not meet the notice requirement. She asked that setback not be approved and that the HVAC be removed within 60 days.

In answer to Commissioner Mosley's question, legal counsel, Ms. Amos, explained that the Commission could not rule on the existing condition of the HVAC location.

Preston Quirk was invited back to explain that the addition is set in 2' as required. Only the rear corner is 13" from the setback line, not the entire side.. There is a two-car garage that will replace the existing carport and if the addition has to slide over, access to the garage will be impeded. He said that they may be able to move it over 1' to 2'.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the house to the left. Mr. Quirk explained that the house to the left is very close to this property's driveway. Commissioner Mosley noted that there seems to be a pattern of the rear of the homes being close to the side property line, for at least two or three homes.

Commissioner Bell asked if the addition could be at least 3' from the side property line. Mr. Quirk thought that was a possibility. Chairman Tibbs and Commissioner Cantrell stated that that would be a good compromise.

[Public comment was received via email and forwarded to the Commission prior to the meeting.]

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve the project with the conditions

- **that Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **the addition sit no closer than 3' from the right side property line, and**
- **Staff approve the roof color and masonry color, dimensions and texture.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the project was unanimously approved, finding it met the applicable design guidelines.

i. 108 2ND AVENUE NORTH

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Second Avenue and Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlays

Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

Permit ID #: 2113326

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for 108 2nd Avenue North. The request is to install a projecting sign on the Second Avenue façade of a contributing building located at the corner of Broadway and Second Avenue North. The proposed sign meets the design guidelines for location, size and design, material, and allotment. The sign is internally illuminated and is similar to what has already been approved by staff except that it incorporates push-through acrylic for the lettering and individual bulbs. Staff finds that this meets the design guidelines as bare bulbs are no longer proposed.

Staff researched the intent of the standard that prohibits the use of bare bulbs. It appears to be based on the fact that the bulbs can easily be broken, which makes the sign and surrounding area look blighted. Also, bare bulb illumination contributes to light pollution. Staff finds that the proposed sign incorporates lighting technology that would protect the bulbs from easy breakage. In addition, the internal push-through acrylic bulbs would not create an adverse impact with regard to light pollution as the surrounding area is already heavily lighted.

Staff has included a memo on your desk that includes a proposed policy for individual bulbs to help provide clarity and direction to applicants. The policy provides standards for individual bulbs without allowing bare bulbs which do not meet the design guidelines.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the proposed sign with a condition, finding that it is consistent with the design guidelines. This condition was not included in the staff recommendation but is proposed now to meet the proposed policy which was drafted following further research.

Commissioner Bell asked if they were also voting on the policy recommendation. Ms. Zeigler explained that a vote on the draft policy was not required.

Kayla Joslin explained that they would like to propose push through acrylic without bulbs behind it, just LED lighting. Bobby Joslin showed examples to explain the project. Ms. Zeigler explained that staff had misunderstood the request and therefore had no issue with the acrylic having a color, since it would be no different than rimming a sign in neon.

Commissioner Bell asked if it was the first time they have seen this type construction and Ms. Zeigler said it was not.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the proposed projecting sign as presented. Commissioner Bell seconded, finding that the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlays. The motion passed unanimously.

p. 304 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 2106299

[The project was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.]

q. 1701 5TH AVENUE NORTH

Application: Alteration to previously approved infill
Council District: 19
Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2094566

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 304 Broadway. The applicant is proposing a revision to plans that have been approved for a duplex, with a deeper front setback and with less distance between the garage and the house than is typically approved. No other changes to the design of the building, or to the design or location of the outbuilding are proposed.

The project approved in January 2016 is a two story infill duplex with a detached garage. Mr. Alexander showed that site plan and the left side elevation along Garfield Street, shown with a 20' front setback and 20' separation between the principal and accessory buildings. It was approved with a condition that the front setback aligns with the adjacent historic house to the right (blue house in previous photo).

Mr. Alexander showed the elevations of the house and garage.

A subsequent survey determined that the adjacent setback is approximately 26', and excavation revealed that there is a storm sewer easement in the front of the property. With this, it would not be possible to match the adjacent setback, therefore staff finds a deeper setback to be necessary. That would be approximately 39' feet.

However, the deeper setback on the approved plan further exaggerates the scale along Garfield because the separation between them is reduced to only 6'. Staff finds that this would not be appropriate.

Staff recommends approval for the previously approved development to be constructed with a deeper front setback with the conditions that:

- The outbuilding be omitted, or
- The scale of the principal building be reduced enough for there to be at least twenty feet (20') separating it from the outbuilding.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposal would meet the applicable design guidelines for the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Bell recused herself.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the house could be pushed up closer so as not to create a wonky corner in the district.

Michael Kenner, applicant, explained that the elevation is not what was originally presented. They originally wanted an entrance on both sides of the building. The Commission decided that the entrances were appropriate. The easement was not recorded for the pipe, so they didn't find it until they started the foundation. It is the fault of the

Metro Government for not keeping good maintenance records. They would like to still build the garages. They have already framed the house so changing the massing isn't possible.

Commissioner Mosley asked where they were in construction. Mr. Kenner said that they have in the footers, floor system and wall panels for the first floor so it would be very expensive to change the massing of the house and they still want the ability to construct a garage.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if the garages could be moved back closer to the alley. Mr. Kenner returned to let them know that it would contradict the 10' requirement of Code.

Commissioner Mosley clarified that the issue is based on factors that could not be anticipated or changed, namely the easement location and the applicant is too far along in the process for the Commission to do much about it at this point anyway.

Mr. Kenner explained that after the MHZC signs off on a project, it doesn't come back to Historic if there is a change. Ms. Zeigler explained that it is the applicant's responsibility to come back to the MHZC at any point a change is anticipated.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the applicant was open to relocate the rear porch so that more of it is oriented to the street rather than rear. Mr. Kenner said he was open to that. Commissioner Mosley agreed that the building should turn the corner. Commissioner Cantrell agreed.

Commissioner Mosley acknowledged that there might be a notice issue if the porch is closer to the street and that the applicant could return next month for that approval.

Commissioner Fletcher temporarily left the meeting at 2:59 pm.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project, acknowledging the hardship discovered after initial application and reminding the applicant it is his responsibility to return to the commission with any changes rather than continuing work, and with the condition that the left-facing elevation, the wrap-around porch, be removed, footing and foundation remain and granting additional reduced setback on Garfield no less than 3'. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously with Chairman Tibbs voting in favor and without a vote from Commissioner Fletcher.

r. 3726 RICHLAND AVENUE

Application: Demolition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2113733

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 3726 Richland, an application for demolition and reconstruction of a non-contributing structure in the Richland-West End district. The Commission approved an addition here in November. During the rehabilitation, it was discovered that the foundation walls were caving in. An attempt was made in the past, at an unknown time, to shore up the stone wall in the basement with a concrete block wall. The engineer wrote in her report that "we discovered that the wall hidden by the block wall was crumbling. The portion of the front wall not hidden by the block bowed inward during excavation and cracked considerably. The excavator noticed that the wall moved during his work." So the foundation needs to be rebuilt or replaced. Compounding the problem is the method used for the exterior walls, in which the stone veneer was laid in between the studs. So there's no cladding really, the stone goes fully through the stud pockets.

Staff has worked with the applicant to try to find a way to stabilize and isolate the structure to permit the foundation repair. The applicants, the engineer, architect and contractors have argued that it is not advisable, and Staff believes

that it would be difficult, dangerous and perhaps not even possible to do this work without a collapse. Consequently the applicant has submitted drawings to rebuild to the same dimensions as the historic building, excepting the rear wall which had already been planned to be removed for the addition. The applicant has proposed to remove and reuse as much of the stone veneer as possible. Because the stone was laid in a way that cannot be recreated, Staff recommends that at least the front façade and as much of the side facades as possible incorporate the original stone. In the event that new stone has to be used, Staff requests approval of additional new masonry.

In conclusion, with the conditions that Staff approve additional new masonry, windows, doors, trim materials, the color of roofing, and the location of HVAC and new utilities, and that Staff verify that the finished floor height is consistent with that of the historic structure, Staff recommends approval of the demolition and reconstruction of 3726 Richland Avenue.

Jamie Pfeffer, representing the applicant, explained that the applicant wants to reconstruct the house as close as possible but did not expect the level of decay. He noted that he worked on another house in the area with a similar condition with the veneer and were worked with several experts to try and save it, and were just not able to.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart noted that the information provided was compelling.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the demolition and reconstruction of the structure, with the conditions:

- **The finished floor height is consistent with the current finished floor height, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- **Staff approve the windows and doors and trim materials;**
- **Staff approve the color of roofing;**
- **Staff verify that the masonry is reused for the reconstruction and approves new masonry, if needed;**
- **HVAC be placed at the side of the home, beyond the mid-point or at the rear.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded, finding the project met the design guidelines for demolition in the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Bell commended the applicant for going to great lengths to try and save the building.

s. 2402 9TH AVENUE SOUTH

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 2115100

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for 2402 9th Avenue South.

This is a request is to demolish an existing stoop and portions of the front wall on a contributing house and to construct a front porch and side lights flanking the main entrance. The contributing house is a minimal traditional style that was constructed around 1939. The house has undergone some minor changes over time, but the building retains its original form and character. A small rear addition was permitted administratively earlier this month.

The plan proposes removing the existing covered front stoop and creating a partial width craftsman style porch and adding side lights to the primary entrance. The drawings also show alteration to the front paired windows and the removal of the chimney. However, the applicant states that no changes are proposed to those features.

This is the earliest known photo of the house and is from 1969. It shows the existing covered stoop configuration, but with a different post. No physical evidence exists of a different porch configuration or an entrance with side

lights. The porch seen here is typical of the era of construction, which is 1939. Also, here are some images from early plans books that show that the Minimal Traditional style favored small covered stoops over large porches that were more typical of turn-of-the-century styles.

Porches and primary entrances are character defining features, and the Secretary of the Interior's standards require that character defining features be preserved. Therefore, staff recommends disapproval as the demolition of the existing porch and a portion of the front wall to accommodate the side lights does not meet Sec. V.B.1.a. of the design guidelines for demolition and the proposed front addition does not meet Sec. IV of the design guidelines for additions as it will alter the design of the front of the historic house.

Commissioner Cantrell observed that the affect is to change a minimal traditional house to a craftsman style. Ms. Sajid responded that yes, the proposal would change the character of the home.

Commissioner Mosley agreed that the stoop appears to be framed to the house and no other conditions existed previously.

Justin Duntin, applicant, handed out photographs and copies of Sanborn maps. He explained that the front stoop may not be historic since photograph evidence shows the door is not centered under the stoop, which means one may have been added later. The 1969 photograph falls outside of the period of significance. The downtown library has a 1943 Sanborn that does not show a stoop. He read a notice from his architect, from Dallas TX. He claimed the brick bases proposed are consistent with the neighborhood and the side lights will improve the look of the house. In order to address that there was not enough information about materials: asphalt shingle, concrete wood, half-light door. The proposed shed roof form is typical of the neighborhood. They found other minimal traditional buildings with a shed roof porch. The door opening needs to be reconstructed so they would like the molding to be more substantial by 4". It would be within the design guidelines for new construction. The front porch will enhance civic life by improving walkability and safety. It will contribute to the articulation of the street, as noted by environmental psychologists.

Chairman Tibbs asked about the door. Julie Jenkins explained that the door is not centered under the stoop covering so they believe the stoop was added later.

Commissioner Mosley stated that he appreciates the effort and time put into the research. He asked about the plans for the existing windows since they have been altered. Ms. Jenkins said that they would leave the existing vinyl windows as they are. If there is no porch shown on the historic house during the period of significance, than what is being asked for is a conjectural element to the historic house. Ms. Jenkins agreed. Commissioner Mosley explained that the request is going even further afield of the design guidelines by adding something there of which there was no evidence. He asked how the details of the porch construction would work as it appeared that some brick or the proposed porch rack would have to change to meet what is proposed. He is not sure it can be constructed as proposed. Ms. Jenkins said that they would have to look at it again.

Commissioner Fletcher returned at 3:27 pm.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Vice-chairman Tibbs and Commissioner Mosley expressed concern with adding a front porch that did not exist previously, whether or not the stoop was original.

Commissioner Cantrell asked if the stoop were removed would the house no longer be a minimal traditional home. Commissioner Mosley said no, that with or without a stoop the building would be minimal traditional.

Commissioner Mosley said the research is compelling with the Sanborn in terms of proving that the stoop is not original; however, adding a new porch would not be supported by the design guidelines. The stoop may have gained historic significance in its own right.

Commissioner Cantrell expressed concern with adding the porch as it would change the design of the house.

Commissioner Stewart says the applicants have done a lot of work and it is admirable that they want to improve their home; however, design guidelines all over the country do not support a change that would change the design and look of the house.

Commissioner Mosley asked if Staff had received the supporting evidence prior to today. Ms. Zeigler said they had not.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to disapprove demolition of the existing porch does not meet section V.B.1.a for demolition and the proposed porch and side lights do not meet section IV for additions. Commissioner Cantrell seconded. Commissioner Fletcher did not vote since he was not present for the discussion and presentation. Motion passed with four concurring votes.

t. 1000 S DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New construction--infill

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2113676

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for infill at 1000 S. Douglas Avenue, an application for new single family infill on a vacant lot at the corner of S. Douglas Avenue and 10th Avenue South. The infill will be one-and-a-half stories and 27'6" tall. Staff finds that the infill's height, scale, materials, roof form, proportion and rhythm of openings, orientation, and setback meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

- 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;
- Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
- Staff approve the foundation material;
- Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture; and
- The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side facade, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III. of the *Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, stated he was available for questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

- **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;**
- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve the foundation material;**
- **Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture; and**
- **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side facade, beyond the mid-point of the house.**

Commissioner Bell seconded, finding the project met Section III. of the *Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. The motion passed unanimously.

u. 2215 10th AVE SOUTH

Application: New construction – infill and outbuilding
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID
Permit ID #: 2113327, 2113328

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for infill and an outbuilding at 2215 10th Avenue South. This is a request to construct a new single-family residence and detached garage at 2215 10th Ave S. A permit was issued in March to demolish the existing non-contributing structure that was built in 1984. The plan before you meets the design guidelines for height, scale, setbacks and rhythm of spacing, materials, roof shape, orientation, and rhythm and proportions of openings. As proposed, the infill is oriented to 10th Ave S with parking off the alley located to the rear of the site.

The structure is 1.5 stories at the front with a maximum height of 27' 1" and an eave height of 13' 3" at the front. The historic context in the surrounding area ranges from 20' to 32' and includes one and 1.5 story historic homes. The plan also proposed a one and one-half story detached garage that is not a DADU. The outbuilding is consistent with the design guidelines. In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill and outbuilding with conditions, as set forth in the staff recommendation, as the request is consistent with the design guidelines.

The applicant, Sandi Adams, stated that she agreed with all conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell to approve the project with the following conditions that:

- **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 trim board be incorporated between the siding and foundation;**
- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of the exterior trim, including cornerboards, window casings, and porch posts and columns prior to purchase and installation; porch steps, masonry, walkway, and driveways;**
- **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- **Staff approve the roof material, color, dimensions and texture; and**
- **Staff approves the final selection of doors, windows, garage doors, and roofing material for the outbuildings prior to purchase and installation.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded finding that the project Section II.B. of the *Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

v. 1403 ELMWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2114266

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 1403 Elmwood Ave, a proposed outbuilding located behind this non-contributing house in Belmont-Hillsboro. The footprint of the proposed building is 750 square feet, which is permitted on a lot this size. A setback determination is requested from 20 feet to 10 feet. Staff finds the reduced setback to be appropriate, as this is a normal condition in the district, and there are several garages on the same block that sit 10 feet or closer, to the alley. The proposed height is 27 feet. The ridge height is restricted to 25 feet in the design guidelines, so Staff recommends the ridge height be lowered to 25 feet. The outbuilding meets the design guidelines in all other respects. Staff recommends having final approval of windows, doors garage doors and the

color of roofing. Meeting the conditions of approval of materials, and that the ridge height is reduced to be no taller than 25 feet, Staff recommends approval of the outbuilding at 1403 Elmwood Avenue.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, stated that the owner is willing to lower the overall height to meet the recommended condition but it will change the roof pitch and possibly the windows.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve with the conditions:

- **The ridge height is reduced to be no taller than twenty-five feet (25’);**
- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows, doors and garage doors prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- **Staff approve the roof color.**
- **Meeting these conditions, staff finds that the application meets the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.**

Commissioner Stewart seconded, finding the project met the design guidelines for outbuildings. The motion passed unanimously.

w. 1405 ELMWOOD AVE

Application: New construction—outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2114267

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 1405 Elmwood Ave, an outbuilding proposed to be built behind a new house that has not yet been constructed. 1405 is currently a vacant lot; new construction of a residence was approved in September of last year. The footprint of the proposed building is 750 square feet, which is permitted on a lot this size. A setback determination is requested from 20 feet to 10 feet. Staff finds the reduced setback to be appropriate, as this is a normal condition in the district, and there are several garages on the same block that sit 10 feet or closer, to the alley. The proposed height is 27 feet. The ridge height is restricted to 25 feet in the design guidelines, so Staff recommends the ridge height be lowered to 25 feet. The outbuilding meets the design guidelines in all other respects. Staff recommends having final approval of windows, doors garage doors and the color of roofing. Meeting the conditions of approval of materials, and that the ridge height is reduced to be no taller than 25 feet, Staff recommends approval of the outbuilding at 1405 Elmwood.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, explained that the house is about 60% complete, in answer to Commissioner Mosley’s question, and said that the owner is willing to lower the overall height of the outbuilding.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The ridge height is reduced to be no taller than twenty-five feet (25’);**
- **Staff approve masonry prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows, doors and garage doors; and,**
- **Staff approve the roof color;**
- **The outbuilding may not be constructed prior to the principal structure.**

Commissioner Bell seconded, finding the project meets the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The motion passed unanimously.

x. 2212 GRANTLAND AVE

Application: New construction – infill and outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination
Council District: 17
Overlay: Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2104934, 210937

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for new construction at 2212 Grantland Ave. The applicant is proposing to demolish a noncontributing building, shown here, and to construct a new one and one-half story house with a detached accessory dwelling unit at the rear. The lot is approximately one and one-half times wider than a typical lot size for the area.

The new house will have a hipped primary roof, with hipped dormers on the front and sides, as well as a shorter hipped projecting wing on the left side. The buildings will have commonly approved exterior materials, including smooth-faced cement-fiberboard, asphalt shingle roof.

The application includes a DADU which meets all the standards, but requires a determination of the setback. Staff recommends approval of the application to demolish a non-contributing building and to construct a new house and outbuilding with a reduced setback with the following conditions:

- Staff shall verify the construction height of the foundation and floor system in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new infill is compatible with the finished floor line of the historic house to the north;
- Staff shall approve the window and door selections prior to purchase and installation;
- The HVAC unit and other utilities shall be placed on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.
- The property owner shall file a restrictive covenant for a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit prior to issuance of a permit;
- Any appurtenances, including fences, paving, and other permanent landscape features, shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to construction.

With these conditions, staff finds that the infill meets Section III.B.2 of the *Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Chairman Tibbs asked if the scale is appropriate. Mr. Alexander explained that it is on the upper end, in terms of height in the immediate context; however, this is a wider lot than typical (75') lot and there are other homes as tall as the proposed in the neighborhood.

Applicant, Preston Quirk, stated that he agreed with the conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley noted that this is a lot and a half and the additional width proposed sits back and so he finds the home to be compatible in this location, where it may not be in another location.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the application to demolish a non-contributing building and to construct a new house and outbuilding with a reduced setback with the following conditions:

- **Staff shall verify the construction height of the foundation and floor system in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new infill is compatible with the finished floor line of the historic house to the north;**
- **Staff shall approve the window and door selections prior to purchase and installation;**
- **The HVAC unit and other utilities shall be placed on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.**
- **The property owner shall file a restrictive covenant for a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit prior to issuance of a permit;**

- **Any appurtenances, including fences, paving, and other permanent landscape features, shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to construction.**

Commissioner Mosley seconded, finding the project to meet Section III.B.2 of the *Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Bell left the meeting at 3:52 pm and returned at 3:54 pm, prior to completion of the staff presentation.

y. 1206 6TH AVE NORTH

Application: New construction--infill; Setback determination
 Council District: 19
 Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
 Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
 Permit ID #: 2105638

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented new construction at 1206 6th Avenue North, a vacant lot. The lot is zoned MUN. The Metro Map shows that behind the lot is the parking area for the townhouse development at the corner of Madison Street and 6th Avenue North.

The applicant proposes to construct five townhouses on the lot. Three of the townhouses will be at the front of the lot, along 6th Avenue North. The two other townhouses will be located at the rear of the lot. The project requires a change to both the front and rear setbacks. Base zoning requires a ten foot (10') front setback and a twenty foot (20') rear setback. Base zoning does not mandate minimum side setbacks, and allows multi-family developments to sit on the side property lines.

The applicant is proposing to step the front setbacks of the three 6th Avenue North townhouses so that the southernmost townhouse is three feet (3') from the front property line, the middle townhouse is five feet (5') from the front property line, and the northernmost townhouse is seven feet (7') from the front property line. These front setbacks make the transition from the c. 2007 multifamily infill at the corner of 6th Avenue North and Madison Street, which is two feet (2') from the front property line, to the c. 1999 single family house at 1212 6th Avenue North, which is ten feet (10') from the front property line. Staff finds that the proposed front setbacks are appropriate to the context, and recommend approval of the front setback determination.

The applicant is proposing to construct the two rear townhouses three feet (3') from the rear property line. This would require changing the rear setback from twenty feet (20') to three feet (3'). Staff finds the proposed setback determination appropriate for several reasons. The lot is unusual in that it is shorter than other lots around it and it does not meet the rear alley. In addition, the rear of the lot abuts the parking for the adjacent development. The reduced rear setback will not significantly impact the neighboring properties. In addition, reducing the rear setback allows for space for an interior driveway and vehicular access to each of the five units. Staff recommends approval of the project's setbacks.

Vehicular access to the site will be from the rear, via a side alley.

The townhouse on the right will be three stories in height, but the other two townhouses will be two stories tall, with a recessed third story. All three townhouses will have a maximum height of thirty-five feet (35'). Staff finds the three story townhouse to be appropriate because the c. 2007 infill next door is three and a half stories in height and approximately forty feet (40') tall. The step-backed upper levels will help the development transition from the taller infill on the corner to the smaller-scale historic houses on the interior of the block.

The materials have all been approved by the Commission in the past, and include brick, fiber cement siding, and a rain screen as an accent material.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

- Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;

- Staff approve masonry;
- Staff approve the materials of the pathways and the interior courtyard pavers;
- The HVAC for the front three townhouses be located at their rear, or on their roofs, hidden by the parapet walls; and
- Staff approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to, paving, driveways, fencing, railings, etc.

With these conditions, staff finds that the development meets Sections 2.0 and 5.0 of the *Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Commissioner Bell asked questions about the side window fenestration. Commissioner Mosley noted that unit 3 is on the property line and so openings are not possible because of fire code; however, the façade will be visible because of the side yard next to it. There are other examples of this in the neighborhood. He would like to ask for more of a setback in order to be able to add windows; however the site constraints do not allow for that. Ms. Baldock confirmed that the project met bulk zoning standards.

John Root, architect for the project, confirmed that the windows also were not planned for the side elevation in consideration of the neighbor to the other side, which has a tremendous amount of side windows, which would create a situation where people were looking directly into each other's units. He considered the scale and the transitions within the neighborhood in the proposed design. They considered multiple scenarios and feel this is the best option. He stated that he agrees with all conditions.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the hardi panel, that will outline the Cypress rain screen, would be a standard 3" trim. Mr. Root stated that they hoped to achieve a mitered corner rather than "picture-windowing" that element. Commissioner Mosley commended him for the attention to those details, which are important for a contemporary design.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve with the conditions that;

- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve masonry;**
- **Staff approve the materials of the pathways and the interior courtyard pavers;**
- **The HVAC for the front three townhouses be located at the rear, or on their roofs, hidden by the parapet walls; and**
- **Staff approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to, paving, driveways, fencing, railings, etc.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded, finding the project meets Sections 2.0 and 5.0 of the *Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. The motion passed unanimously.

z. 1322 6TH AVE NORTH

Application: New construction -infill
 Council District: 19
 Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
 Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
 Permit ID #: 2113944

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for new construction between two historic buildings. This is an application to construct a one-story commercial building in a vacant lot between two historic houses. Photos of the two historic buildings, as well as photos of the recent renovations of a non-contributing commercial building directly across the street, were shown.

This parcel was the site of a development that was approved in 2014 to construct a new 3-unit two-story townhouse in the same location between the two historic houses, as well as an 8-unit three-story townhouse at the rear of the lot, along with additions and rehabilitation to the two existing buildings for them to be used as restaurants. That plan was approved unanimously and without opposition.

The additions and rehabilitations are proceeding, but the scope has otherwise been altered dramatically, the only new construction to be done now is a one-story commercial building. The site plan depicts certain fixtures and appurtenances behind the proposed building such as a fountain and cabanas, the details of which are not known so they are not being considered for approval at this time. Normally those types of smaller and/or routine items would be staff approved, but we could certainly bring them back if the Commission would prefer.

The new building would be one story with a flat roof, 20 feet tall from grade to the top of the parapet. This matches the height of the two adjacent historic buildings. The building will have brick on the front façade, wrapping the corner about 1/3 of the depth, then switching to cement fiber. Staff asks that the siding be smooth with a max reveal of 5”.

The sides and rear will have overhead doors. Staff finds that these doors are appropriate because they’re on a non-primary façade with a different exterior material, and because they are not uncommon on commercial buildings.

Staff recommends approval of the new construction with the conditions that:

- Staff shall approve the masonry and siding selections prior to purchase and installation,
- Cornerboards shall be added at the exposed intersection of clapboard walls
- Window and door selections are approved by Staff prior to purchase and installation
- Utilities shall be located behind the mid-point of the building

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposed infill will meet the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Including any outbuildings i.e. cabanas, as well as permanent landscape features like walls and fountains, as well as appurtenances like fences.

Mr. Alexander noted that public comment was received via email and forwarded to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Bell asked if the new design was due to new owners and Mr. Alexander said that he believed that to be the case.

Patrick Bales noted that staff approval has been given for the two historic structures on either side and they are proposing to downsize the previous approval for the central infill so that they can add a courtyard and additional parking spaces. It will be less overpowering to the historic buildings and will be a greater asset to the neighborhood with additional parking.

Richard Audet, 413 Van Buren Street, is current president of the Germantown Neighborhood Association stated that they distributed a letter via email. The applicant has declined over a 3-month period to meet with the board. As more buildings turn towards the alleyways, the non-public facades actually become public facades. The rear of the lot slopes downwards so the rear of the building will be a public façade. The main concern is the five massive overhead doors. They are a feature of the neighborhood but they tend to be service oriented. The combined number of existing roll up doors in the neighborhood is just 10-12 or a total of approximately 120’ of combined width. This project calls for 104’ in this one building alone. It is out of character with the rest of the neighborhood. The design is lacking in a number of details and those are spelled out in the design guidelines. It is not compatible with the neighborhood’s core values, which is to support new development that complements the old, nor the design guidelines. The neighborhood association requests the project be denied.

Vicki Metzger, 1325 5th Ave N, read a letter she then submitted for the record. She requested denial of approval until the applicant agrees to work with the neighborhood to address the issues resulting from a lack of communication. The issues include: design is not in keeping with the historic buildings, roll up doors should not be a dominate feature, the large patio, noise of the bar, parking area will not be enough to accommodate the patrons,

traffic will be more than the alley is designed to carry, it will interfere with pedestrian traffic, a wooden fence should be added to the alley.

Dianna Sullivan is a commercial real estate broker who lives in the co-housing development. The bar is 50' from her bedroom window and the garage doors are facing her bedroom window so she has concern about the noise. She asked that the commission reject the proposal until issues can be resolved.

Drew [unknown last name] 1325 5th Ave N #11, stated that he typically speaks on behalf of developers; however, in this case there has been a lack of communication. He believes that many of the issues could be worked out if the developer will talk with the neighborhood. He heard that the parking was paved. He wasn't sure what was within the purview of the Commission. They have done parking lot work and removed trees. Fencing will not sufficiently shield neighbors on the downward sloped area.

Brad Daniel returned to present the applicant's rebuttal. He thought the neighborhood would appreciate more parking spaces and less residential and commercial area as was previously approved. He spoke with a representative of the neighborhood association and provided all details, so he finds it unfair of the neighborhood to report things that are untrue.

Commissioner Fletcher asked for a clarification of what is within their purview. Ms. Zeigler stated that use, noise, number of parking spaces and traffic circulation is not within their purview, but they can review all proposed exterior physical changes and their materials.

Commission Mosley stated that he is a member of the development community within the neighborhood so he is somewhat aware of the project but has not attended any neighborhood meetings. He does not believe that role will affect his judgment of the case. Commissioner Bell stated that she lives in the neighborhood and believes she can also be unbiased.

Commissioner Bell stated that neighborhood associations are a way for neighbors to express their concerns about a project. It seems to me that communication with the neighborhood association might resolve many of the issues. She says that the project looks like a good project but the perception from the neighborhood appears to be due to a lack of communication. Chairman Tibbs agreed.

Commissioner Fletcher asked for staff's review of the garage doors. Mr. Alexander stated that their reason for support was because there are rollup doors on industrial buildings and the proposed are behind a material change for the building so, it reads as a secondary element of the building.

Commissioner Bell expressed concern for rollup doors on the side elevations because, where they exist, they are not as dominate as the proposed side locations. She is not compelled to approve the current design. Commissioner Mosley stated that the proportions of the proposed garage doors, especially for the side elevations, may be incompatible for the building. Since there is a courtyard element, the building is more of a building with multiple public facades, rather than just one.

Commissioner Stewart agreed that the the proposal is lacking information. There is nothing they can do about the use or the noise; however, the garage doors are not a significant presence on the street and screening could diminish their impact. But he does not have enough information to determine how dominant they will actually be.

Commissioner Cantrell stated that she visited the property, and she was impressed with the two historic buildings on either side and they make quite a historical statement, just by themselves. She fears that a building between them, which doesn't look like them in any way, will be detrimental. Commissioner Fletcher agreed. The proposal is not physically in compliance with the historic context.

Chairman Tibbs offered a deferral; however, the applicants motioned from the audience that they were not interested in a deferral. The applicants were invited back to explain the garage doors. The point of the garage doors is to keep them open all the time and for that to be part of the courtyard, tying the entire open space together. The thought that they will be visible garage doors at all times is not the way it will be. They will be very expensive and attractive, not service type doors.

Commissioner Bell agreed that the two historic buildings make a statement; however, in an overlay a lot of the designs are an ebb-and-flow and not an exact historic replica. They have also reviewed projects that are complimentary to a historic structure. Not to say that the project is not appropriate but it may be that it would benefit from some tweaking of the design. The size of the garage doors may be an issue and she said that bringing the scale of the openings down to a size that is more proportional to the building, could be the answer.

Commissioner Mosley acknowledged that the zoning allows for a commercial use but the form could be improved, in terms of fitting into the neighborhood. In terms of height it is compatible. This is a commercial building and that the guidelines state that the rhythm of openings and voids should be compatible with historic buildings in the neighborhoods and in terms of what can be seen from the street, he has concerns with the design meeting that design guideline.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that it appeared that the two side elevations are of the greatest concern. Commissioner Mosley also expressed concern over the unknown elements such as the cabanas noted on the plans.

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to disapprove the project based on the fact that it is not consistent with the historic context. Commissioner Mosley seconded. Commissioners Cantrell, Bell and Mosley moved to approve, with Chairman Tibbs voted in favor of the motion, resulting in the required four concurring votes. Commissioners Stewart and Fletcher voted against the motion.

Commissioner Fletcher left the meeting at 4:49pm.

aa. 1508 BOSCOBEL ST

Application: Demolition; New construction - infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs – East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2113925

Sean Alexander, staff member, presented the case for infill at 1508 Boscobel. This is an application to demolish a non-historic house and to construct a new duplex infill on the lot.

This lot is in an area that was recently added to the overlay, and any historic integrity it had has already been lost and the character is now defined by modern-influenced infill. As such the guidelines were written to be very specific in saying infill can be two-stories, 40 wide, and have a flat roof. Additionally worth noting this block is very steep with the lots dropping more than 20 feet from the rear to the front.

As there is not a consistent setback building edge or standard building width on the block, Staff finds that the new proposed duplex will be compatible by not contrasting greatly. However the submitted site plan does not indicate a location for parking, therefore staff asks that the parking/paving be submitted for approval prior to permitting.

The new duplex will have two full stories, with a partial walk-out basement in the front. This matches the configuration of several buildings on this block-face, while they're not historic; they are representative of the character of the area. The foundation and basement level walls will be split faced CMU, with cedar plank accentuating recessed front vestibules.

The primary wall siding will be cement-fiberboard – panels with battens on the sides and wrapping around to 1/3 of the depth, then switching to clapboard. The windows and doors are not known, and would need to be approved by Staff.

Staff recommends approval of the application to demolish a non-contributing house and to construct a new two-family dwelling at 1508 Boscobel Street, with the conditions that:

- Window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase and installation;
- Front walkways are added to connect the entrances to the street or sidewalk; and,

- HVAC be located on the rear façade, on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house or on the roof, beyond the midpoint of the house.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposal meets the design guidelines for infill construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

In answer to a question from Commissioner Stewart, Mr. Alexander stated that no garages were requested and parking will be on the rear of the lot, off the alley.

Mr. Alexander noted that public comment had been received via email and printed copies were handed out at the beginning of the meeting.

John Pirtle, applicant for the project, confirmed that there will be parking pads for each unit at the rear of the lot, approximately 15' behind the house. On the front, walkways to the street are planned. After the grade work is done, they may be able to add a front retaining wall to add another parking space in the front yard.

Ms. Zeigler said that they were not aware of the plan for a front-yard parking pad and so she would request a condition be added that there is no front-yard parking, as that is not typical of the neighborhood. The applicant agreed not to add a front parking pad.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve the application to demolish a non-contributing house and to construct a new two-family dwelling at 1508 Boscobel Street, with the conditions that:

- **Window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase and installation;**
- **No front yard parking;**
- **New site plan be submitted showing the location of rear parking;**
- **Front walkways are added to connect the entrances to the street or sidewalk; and,**
- **HVAC be located on the rear façade, on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house or on the roof, beyond the midpoint of the house.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded finding that the proposal meets the design guidelines for infill construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Cantrell left at 4:59pm and returned at 5:01pm, prior to the completion of the staff presentation for 813 Boscobel Street.

bb. 813 BOSCOBEL ST

Application: New construction – addition; Partial demolition
 Council District: 06
 Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
 Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID
 Permit ID #: 2098971

Melissa Sajid, staff member, presented the case for an addition at 813 Boscobel St. This is a request to permit a rear addition and side dormer additions and also includes alterations to the historic house, many of which are to address recent fire damage. Proposed alterations include

- Repairing/replacing asphalt shingle siding and trim as necessary
- Retaining and repairing existing windows
- Cleaning and repointing brick and foundation as necessary
- Removing existing driveway; relocating vehicular access to alley.

As proposed, the addition is located at the rear of the historic house and is inset 2' from the existing rear corners. The addition goes back 5'6" before coming out 10' wider than the historic house on the right side. The portion of the addition at the rear is 3'6" taller than the historic house, and the additional height is located about 50' from the front

of the house, which meets the design guidelines and the additional height that is seen is minimal. The portion of the addition that is wider on the right side is single-story.

The plan also proposes side shed dormers on both sides of the existing house. The dormers are located on the secondary roof form. The design guidelines for the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay state that dormers generally should not be introduced where none existed originally. Side dormer additions are routinely permitted in conservation overlays provided that the dormers are of an appropriate scale. Staff finds that the proposed dormers can meet the design guidelines in this case as they are appropriately scaled and do not tie into the primary roof form.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the additions and alterations with conditions as set forth in the staff recommendation, as the request meets the design guidelines.

Commissioner Mosley asked if it was reasonable to presume a ridge raise might be appropriate. Ms. Zeigler explained that they have not allowed for ridge raises on clipped, side-gable homes.

Commissioner Bell expressed concern with allowing for side dormers on the secondary roof elevation since the design guidelines state that new dormers should not be introduced where none existed. Commissioner Mosley stated that the scale of the house is quite small and they have seen much larger additions. The sensitive treatment of the addition and the small scale of the dormers minimizes the need for a large addition. In summary, the size and shape of the dormers, the fact that they will not likely be seen from the street, and the small size of the home and the proposed addition combined are a reason for allowing them on a secondary roof form.

Rachel Reedy, assistant to the architect, stated that they were in agreement with all conditions and the architect was available via phone if they had any questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the proposed additions with the condition that staff approves the final selection of the foundation material and door selections prior to purchase and installation, noting that the proposed dormer additions on the existing roof form are towards the rear and small in scale and allow for a small addition. Commissioner Bell seconded, finding the project meets the design guidelines for additions in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. The motion passed unanimously.

V. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW

cc. 900, 901, 902, 903, 908, MERIDIAN STREET, 206 VAUGHN STREET, 219 CLEVELAND STREET

Application: Planning Commission Recommendation for SP that includes a Historic Landmark

Council District: 05

Overlay: McGavock House Historic Landmark

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Staff member, Robin Zeigler presented the case for infill, explaining that since the project includes National Register eligible projects they are only making a recommendation to the Planning Commission for the project. Alterations to the Historic Landmark, which is also included in the project, will come back to them for review at a later time.

Joni Priest, applicant for the project gave an overview of the full project. She explained that they tried not to disrupt the historic wall with curb cuts. The existing parking lot north of the church will sit back from the historic church. To the south of the church is an existing parking lot but that will be removed for a public park, creating a civic area next to the nearby school and fire station. The building to the north of the historic home on Vaughn Street is new construction to support the rehabilitation of the historic home with a secondary use. There will be a driveway off Vaughn that will be behind the house but well off the setting of the historic home.

William Hastings, applicant for the project, explained that they have worked with the community, councilmember and the church for about 8 months. The SP protects the church that would otherwise be available for demolition and protects the McGavock House. They have been working with staff on the scale of the new mixed-use construction. He thought it was important not to turn the projects back to the McGavock House so by aligning the south side of the project shelters the house. It is 82' away from the McGavock House. The few units that are facing the McGavock House are proposed at 2.5 stories and although staff recommends 2 stories, he hopes they will approve the half story.

Commissioner Stewart asked the applicants to explain the historic structures. Joni Priest provided the information requested. Mr. Hastings explained that the eave is 24' tall and the proposal is for townhomes that are 24' with a stepped-back portion that continues to 36'.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley asked if there was a possibility to allow for more height/density at the corner so that there can be less on the units closest to the historic building.

Commissioner Cantrell stated that she was not offended by the additional half, stepped-back story, considering everything that the developers have done to preserve the area.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved approve a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission of the proposed SP with the conditions that:

- **The portion of the development closest to the historic buildings be reduced in height and the applicant work with MHZC to finalize appropriate height.**
- **The three homes at the corner of Cleveland and Meridian Streets be documented following MHC's documentation standards. Salvage of architectural features of the three dwellings is encouraged.**
- **Construction fencing be utilized during construction to protect the historic stone wall.**
- **Exterior alterations to the Ray of Hope Community Church are reviewed by MHZC Staff.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded, finding the project met the design guidelines for Historic Landmarks and the Secretary of Interior's standards for new construction near historic buildings.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

dd. 105 BROADWAY

Application: Request for rehearing
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander
Permit ID #: 2106295

Commissioner Mosley stated that the issue of rail vs. parapet has been tied to existing façade and the appearance of the massing. The height of the existing addition wasn't relevant to the parapet condition. Chairman Tibbs agreed.

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to deny the request for a rehearing because the information presented were all available at the time of the original hearing. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

ee. Revision to Rules of Order and Procedure.

Ms. Zeigler presented an explanation for the revisions to the Rules of Order and Procedure proposed. Commissioners expressed concern with diminishing the amount of notice currently provided for the setback determinations. Ms. Zeigler argued that there was no official notice requirement, adjoining property owners will still be noticed directly by the applicant and that the sign is of limited use since people generally do not know what is meant by a “setback determination” but a letter and site plan is better able to explain the proposal and request. Setback determinations will also still be noticed on the agenda. She explained that there was no funding to meet the costs of signage, no easy way to pass the expense along to the applicant due to the limited turn-around time, and there was also the indirect expense of a staff member driving the county each month to place the signs and to retrieve them for re-use.

Commissioner Cantrell noted that if they found the revision didn’t work well, they could return it back to the original language.

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve the revisions to the Rules of Order and procedure, as proposed. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

ff. Administrative Permits Issued for Prior month

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 5/18/16.