

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

May 18, 2016

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Vice-chair Ann Nielson, Menié Bell, Rose Cantrell, Sam Champion, Richard Fletcher, Aaron Kaalberg, 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: Michael Price and Ron Smrek, Dan Diefenderfer, Brad Daniel, and Erica Garrison, Barry Brechak and Rocco DiLeo, Chad Gore

Public: Richard Audet, Sharon Smith, Dianna Sullivan, Jean Marie [last name unknown], Sonya Link, Tandy Wilson

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

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

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Chairman Tibbs recognized Claudette Stager and Jane-Coleman Harbison from the Tennessee Historical Commission and MTSU intern Jenna Stout. There were no councilmembers in attendance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 20, 2016

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Champion 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.

b. 611 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New construction—outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

c. 1622 FATHERLAND 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: MELISSA BALDOCK

d. 218 MOCKINGBIRD RD

Application: New construction-addition; Setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

e. 312 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

f. 1618 LILLIAN ST

Application: New construction-outbuilding, Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

g. 1018 NORTH 16TH ST

Application: New construction--Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

h. 1209 ASHWOOD AVE

Application: New construction – addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

i. 1417 ROBERTS AVE

Application: New construction – outbuilding (DADU)
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

j. 2708 FAIRFAX AVE

Application: New construction – outbuilding, Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

k. 917 CARUTHERS AVE

Application: New construction - Addition; Setback determination; Partial demolition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

l. 901 GILMORE AVE

Application: New construction-addition and detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determinations;
Partial demolition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

m. 1514 PARIS AVE

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

There were no requests to remove items from the consent agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with all applicable guidelines. 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.

n. 304 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for a new sign at 304 Broadway. Applicant proposes to replace an existing wall sign with a neon wall sign of the same design and size in the same location, but that exceeds the size allotment.

There currently is a wall sign above the transom and a projecting 3D sign with a hanging shingle sign. All of the existing signage was added before the adoption of the current signage guidelines in 2013.

The application is to replace the existing wall sign with a new sign, matching the height, width, and shape of the existing wall sign. Whereas the existing sign is flat, the new sign will have a cabinet depth of 11” to house wiring and electronics for neon illumination.

The current guidelines determine the amount of signage allowed based on the width of the building, and with a projecting sign the 28’ wide building is allowed a maximum of 56 sf of signage. Together the signage on the building now comprises 98 sf. As this exceeds the allotment, it does not meet the design guidelines. Additionally, staff finds that the existing wall sign would not meet the design guidelines because it extends below the signboard and partially obscures the transom.

The Design Guidelines state that “a sign shall be brought into compliance with the provisions of these design guidelines if a sign permit is required to rebuild the sign.” Staff finds that the new sign would not be in compliance because it partially obscures the transom and because it exceeds the allotment.

Staff recommends approval to replace the sign with the conditions that:

- The signage be altered in size so that it does not exceed the signage allotment of 56 sf, either reducing or removing other signs.
- It does not cover the transom; and,
- It does not have any moving parts or lights that blink, flash, chase or that are sequential.

With these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Bell asked for clarification of the square footage.

Michael Price with Joslin Signs informed the Commission that he is available for any technical questions. Ron

Smrek with Boot Country said that they have two stores. He explained that a lot has changed over the years in terms of signage and that all that they are asking for is to replace the existing sign with a neon sign that will allow them to compete with their competitors on an even playing field.

Commissioner Bell asked if there any recommendations that they do not agree with. Mr. Smrek said the he is not in agreement with the size and the location conditions.

Commissioner asked for some clarifications of the size of the sign and the recommended conditions.

Commissioner Champion said that he thinks the design guidelines are more than generous in terms of signage and they have held other businesses to these standards. He understands the applicant's plight but he believes that they can obtain a second sign in a manner that meets the design guidelines.

Motion:

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

- **The sign be altered in size so that it does not exceed four square feet (4 sq. ft.);**
- **It does not cover the transom; and,**
- **It does not have any moving parts or lights that blink, flash, chase or that are sequential.**

Vice-chairman Nielson seconded, finding the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. The motion passed unanimously.

V. MHZC ACTIONS

o. 1104 HALCYON AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Item was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant, prior to the meeting.

p. 1322 SIXTH AVE N

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

Commissioner Kaalberg arrived at 2:22 pm at the beginning of the staff presentation.

Staff member Sean Alexander, presented the case for infill construction at 1322 6th Avenue North. He noted that public comment was sent to the Commissioners via email and hard copy provided at the beginning of the meeting. The applicant is proposing to construct a new one-story commercial building on vacant land between two historic buildings. 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.

The additions and rehabilitations to the existing buildings are proceeding, but the scope has otherwise been altered so that the only new construction to be done now is a one-story commercial building.

In April of 2016, the MHZC disapproved a proposed design for that one-story commercial building, finding that garage doors on the sides of the proposed building were not compatible with the rhythm and proportion of windows on buildings in the area historically and because additional information was needed on structures and appurtenances shown on the site plan.

The applicant has revised the application, now instead of garage doors on the side facades there will be sets of French doors. The doors will be aluminum and glass, not unlike a storefront entrance.

The rear façade is still proposed to have garage doors. Because the rear is alley facing and not visible from the right of way, staff does not consider that to be a public façade and it would not be as greatly scrutinized as the front or sides.

Outdoor cabanas shown on the previous proposal have been eliminated, but there remain fixtures and appurtenances for which sufficient details are not known. These include a fountain, hardscapes, and fencing. Normally those types of smaller and/or routine items would be administratively approved, but if it would please the Commission we would certainly bring them back for review at subsequent meeting.

Unchanged from the previous application - 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. Staff finds the flat roof and parapet to be appropriate for a commercial form, and that this is compatible within the character of the surrounding area, a very diverse area in architecture, use, and forms.

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 maximum reveal of 5".

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

- Clapboard siding shall be smooth with a five inch (5") reveal,
- Cornerboards shall be added at the exposed intersection of clapboard walls
- Staff shall approve the masonry selections prior to purchase and installation,
- Window and door selections are approved by Staff prior to purchase and installation,
- A walkway shall be added from the front stoop to the sidewalk,
- The materials of site features including the walkway, paving, stairs, railings, fences, and a fountain are approved,
- HVAC mechanicals shall be located behind the mid-point of the building,
- Electrical transformer box shall be located at the rear of the lot,
- The driveway curb-cut shall be limited to twelve feet (12') in width.

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

Erica Garrison, legal counsel for the applicant, handed out a map and photographs of the neighborhood. She made several rebuttals of the neighborhood's comments submitted via email stating that the project meets the design guidelines. The project has been revised since the last meeting and the applicants met with the neighborhood. They removed the cabanas and changed the side roll-up doors to double doors. The neighbors are primarily concerned with the use and the noise possibly associated with the use; however, those issues are not appropriate for this body to consider. The other concerns are addressed in writing, which was provided to the Commission via email and hard copy at the beginning of the meeting.

Richard Audet, representing the neighborhood, summarized the letter that was sent to the Commission via email. Dan Diefenderfer met with the neighborhood but it was telling them what the plan was and not to gather input. This may be one of the most significant historic streets in the neighborhood and one is that the most intact. The building across the street has a flat roof but it is a non-contributing building. Most of the buildings have stone foundations. The rear of the proposed design includes 58' of its 60' as a stretch of windows. This is not a public façade but more and more buildings are being made to face the alleys and the alleys are becoming more public facades. The large expanse of rollup doors is unprecedented. On this street are gabled and hipped roof forms. Some creative architectural solutions could help the project fit in. All of the details that were not provided last month are still unavailable. The patio is approximately 6000 square feet will not be used for anything other than a few tables, according to the applicant. Mr. Audet stated that the project does not meet the design guidelines or their core values.

Sharon Smith, 1325 5th Avenue North, said their concerns are not addressed. She requested that the Commission not approve the project. The project falls short of meeting the standards: the design of the building is not in keeping with the historic buildings nor the original plan approved that they do support and the large patio is not in keeping with other outdoor seating areas.

Dianna Sullivan, 1325 5th Avenue North, expressed concern about parking issues, as the alley will not be able to accommodate the additional cars. She asked that there be a condition that the parking needs to be reviewed by another department. The garage doors are not typical of Germantown so please do not make them typical.

Jean Marie Karazin 1325 5th Avenue N, #11 also expressed concern about the narrowness of the alley and the project requires more than the alley can accommodate. *[She stated she had pictures of the alley on her phone and requested to pass her phone around. That request was denied because her phone cannot be submitted into the record.]*

Sonya Link said that the design does not compliment the historic context. The new building sits between historic buildings. Since nothing about the front façade has changed since last month she asked that it again be disapproved.

Erica Garrison returned to say that the majority of concerns are issues for the Codes Dept. and Public Works. They are happy to have additional discussions with the neighborhood but the applicant requests to move forward with the project. The Commission has always taken the course that the rear façade is not a primary façade and there has been more leeway in terms of design. The rear elevation will not be seen from the alley because of the proposed fencing.

Commissioner Fletcher asked Ms. Garrison to explain the photographs presented, which she did.

Commissioner Cantrell asked about the fence. Mr. Diefenderfer said it will be a 7' architectural cedar fence. They are planning to ask the BZA for it to be a 1' taller than what code allows for. Ms. Zeigler stated that staff did not know of that request and that it should be reviewed by the Commission, not the BZA. She recommended that the additional 1' be added as a condition, if the Commission agreed to additional height for the fence.

Vice-chairman Nielson asked about the house to the right and ownership of the parking behind that house. Mr. Alexander said that yes, that the existing parking would also serve the proposed project.

Commissioner Fletcher noted that they see more non-traditional designs in the neighborhood.

Vice-chairman Nielson and Commissioner Cantrell expressed concern with the amount of traffic dumping onto a narrow alley. Commissioner Cantrell stressed that the historic buildings on this street make a strong statement and she is concerned with the design fitting into the context. It would dilute the historical impact of the two bookend buildings and the rest of the street. If the roof could meet the form of other buildings in the immediate area, that would be more appropriate.

Vice-chairman Nielson expressed concern with replicating the two buildings, which would be inappropriate. She asked about moving the back and Mr. Alexander said that it would not likely meet the design guidelines. Chairman Tibbs reopened the public hearing for the applicant to explain the previously approved project. Brad Daniel, owner of the project, explained that the previously project included residential and commercial. The currently proposed building is half the size of the previous building.

Commissioner Kaalberg stated that he appreciates that curb cut was narrow as it assists with walkability but overall he did not see an issue with a parking. He expressed concern about the width of the entrance on the alley but that is a Public Works issue. The building is a modern design; however, that is consistent with the design guidelines. The massing and materials are appropriate. The previously approved building has a great impact and has much more massing than what is now being reviewed. The current proposal is more appropriate than that one. Commissioner Fletcher agreed that the previous design almost negated or minimized the historic buildings and the new design will highlight the historic buildings.

Commissioner Cantrell stated that she liked the brick, French doors, walkway and massing of the building but does not believe that the flat roof meets the historic context.

Commissioner Champion said that the historic neighborhoods should be given the freedom to evolve. He got some good advice from a designer that if you are trying to make something look like something it is not, then it should not be done.

Commissioner Bell said that the landscaping will assist the two buildings with interacting together that is a key point for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Stewart clarified that they do not review use. Mr. Alexander responded that they do not review use but that the form should be appropriate for the particular type of use. He said that he felt that the building meets the historic context and contrasts with the historic buildings without overwhelming them. He clarified that the parking issue is more of a Public Works issue than their issue.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the new construction with the conditions that:

- **Clapboard siding shall be smooth with a five inch (5") reveal,**
- **Cornerboards shall be added at the exposed intersection of clapboard walls**
- **Staff shall approve the masonry selections prior to purchase and installation,**
- **Window and door selections are approved by Staff prior to purchase and installation,**
- **A walkway shall be added from the front stoop to the sidewalk,**
- **The materials of site features including the walkway, paving, stairs, railings, fences, and a fountain are approved,**
- **HVAC mechanicals shall be located behind the mid-point of the building,**
- **Electrical transformer box shall be located at the rear of the lot,**
- **The driveway curb cut shall be limited to twelve feet (12') in width.**
- **7'-8' tall fence.**

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded finding that the proposed infill will meet the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. He also moved to add the condition that the fence be a minimum of 7' tall. Commissioner Champion seconded the amendment. Both motions passed unanimously.

q. 1226 FOURTH AVE N

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Sean Alexander presented the case for 1226 4th Avenue North. The applicant proposes to construct two new buildings on a vacant lot, with a walkway leading to a courtyard between them. Both buildings will be one-story tall with gabled roofs, peaks at 18' tall with eaves at 9', the heights will be compatible with the adjacent buildings.

The existing building to the left is built up to the sidewalk and the historic house to the right has a 9' setback.

The proposed new building on the left (top) building will sit twenty feet (20') back from the sidewalk. The building to the right will sit eighteen feet (18') back from the sidewalk, double the setback of the historic house to the right.

Staff finds that the new buildings' setbacks are not appropriate for the surrounding context. The project does not meet section 3.1.1 and 3.1.4 of "general principles" which states that buildings should be sited in a way that is appropriate for their context and the context they create, and that commercial buildings generally should be built to the sidewalk.

In front of each building there will be front patio areas, with an open stacked stone fireplace in front of the building on the left. There are no other instances of feature like that in the neighborhood. The patios have a hedgerow separating them from the sidewalk, and do not engage directly with the right of way in the manner typical of a front setback in a commercial context. In fact, the primary entrances to the building would be from the interior courtyard.

The design guidelines encourage front seating and landscaping for commercial buildings to enliven the streetscape but it also states that it is important to avoid arbitrary establishment of setbacks resulting in “haphazard building placement and a resulting interruption or absence of visual order within the District.” Staff finds that that this does not meet this standard or guideline 3.2.3, which requires buildings to have primary entrances oriented toward the street.

The front facades of the buildings are primarily glass without a balance of solid and open surface typical of historic buildings. The design guidelines call for design techniques that avoid large expanses of unbroken façade planes and/or materials. Staff finds that the glass front facades without breaks by solid features do not meet section 3.3.2 for materials and 3.2.4.2 for façade articulation in the design guidelines.

The primary materials, glass and metal storefront materials are appropriate. Walls and patio fireplace will be stacked stone, exposed framing will be reclaimed wood, depicted as being rough or heavy timber.

While some types of wood and masonry cladding can be appropriate for new construction, Staff finds that the details and texture of stacked stone and rough wood are not compatible with the finishes on surrounding buildings which are more typically brick with milled and painted wood and so do not meet guideline 3.3.1. Furthermore, as these materials are not typical of an urban commercial building, they do not meet guideline 3.1 (Secretary of Interior Standard #3) as it gives the building “a false sense of being in an alternate time and place.”

Staff recommends disapproval of the infill construction, finding that the proposal does not meet sections 3.1 General Principles, 3.2 Site, Building Planning and Setbacks, 3.2.3 orientation, 3.2.4.2 façade articulation, 3.3 materials, 3.5 windows and 3.7 utilities/mechanicals in the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Barry Brechak, applicant and project architect, introduced himself and Rocco DiLeo with Bar Taco. He began with explaining the amount of work that has been put in from working with the business owners and property owners in the district and staff with the MHZC, how they changed the design in response to staff comments and researched the neighborhood. They are trying to establish what already exists in Germantown patios: patios, safe environment, and pedestrian activity. They do not define entrances by the door but rather the entrance of the development, which is the central corridor between the two buildings. They did not want to mimic what is in the neighborhood but rather put a modern twist on historic elements. They are using a basement to keep the massing down. They have leased a property on 5th Avenue to provide parking.

Tandy Wilson, 122 4th Avenue North, said he is the direct neighbor and he is in opposition based on the fact that the materials do not meet the historic context. His HVAC is on the side of the property and he worries about the building being so close to it. In general, the look of the building is more rural and not of the downtown area.

Commissioner Fletcher applauded the effort that went into the design as it is remarkable; however, it is not compatible with Germantown architecture. The patio, materials and fireplace are inappropriate.

Commissioner Cantrell had visited the property and stated that she is not concerned about the setback because of the patio and shrubbery. It exposes the wonderful corner of the City House restaurant. The contemporary design and organic materials are beautiful but do not fit into the historic context.

Commissioner Champion said that he liked the site plan and applauded the architect but he agreed that the aesthetic is misplaced and it might be as simple as rethinking some material choices.

Commissioner Kaalberg agreed with all other comments and reiterated that although a beautiful design, it does not meet the design guidelines. At issue are the materials and setback. The setback may be appropriate since the setbacks differ greatly throughout the neighborhood but the setback on this street, is what is more important. A prominent patio is disruptive and incompatible with the historic context of the street. The scale and massing is spot on. Wide openings without a break-up are also compatible, as stated in the staff recommendation.

Motion:

Commissioner Kaalberg moved to disapprove the infill construction, finding that the proposal does not meet sections 3.1 General Principles, 3.2 Site, Building Planning and Setbacks, 3.2.3 orientation, 3.2.4.2 façade articulation, 3.3 materials, 3.5 windows and 3.7 utilities/mechanicals in the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Vice-chairman Nielson seconded and the motion to disapprove passed unanimously.

r. 3649 RICHLAND AVE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 17
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Melissa Baldock, staff member, presented the case for infill at 3649 Richland Avenue. 3649 Richland Avenue is a vacant lot that until recently was part of the Welch College campus. In June 2015, the Metro Historic Zoning Commission approved a preliminary site plan for 22 new infill houses on the former Welch College campus, all located within the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The Commission's approval of the site plan was contingent on the applicant returning to the Commission for approval of all infill design and site layout. In December, the Commission approved infill designs for Lots 1 & 2 of the development, and those are currently under construction.

Today, the Commission will be considering the infill and outbuilding design for Lot 3. As part of the development, a new private alley will be created at the rear of the properties. The alley will be accessed via Craighead. Both the infill and the outbuilding require a change to the left side setback. On the left side, base zoning requires a five foot (5') side setback for both the infill and the outbuilding, but the applicant is proposing to set the two structures just three feet (3') from the side property line. Staff finds this reduced side setback to be appropriate because there are other two-story homes in the immediate vicinity that do not meet the required five foot (5') side setback. In addition, the infill is part of a larger development, and the reduced setback will affect the parcel next door at 3643 Richland Avenue, which is also part of the larger development and will be offset so that there is at least 10' in between the two structures. The reduced side setback will therefore not affect overall rhythm of spacing on the street.

The proposed infill will be two stories with a ridge height of approximately 39'6" from grade. Staff finds that this meets the overall historic context, as there are several two-story houses with similar heights across the street. The primary cladding material will be brick, and staff recommends approval of a brick sample prior to purchase and installation. All the other known materials have been approved by the Commission in the past.

The proposed outbuilding will be 890 sq. ft. in footprint, and staff finds that its overall height, scale, and design meet the design guidelines. It will be connected to the primary structure with a covered walkway that is 4' wide and open on both sides. The Commission has approved similar covered walkways in the past.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

- The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of neighboring historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
- Staff approve the brick and stone samples prior to purchase and installation;
- All lap siding be smooth face, with a maximum reveal of five inches;
- Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture; and
- Staff approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Sections II.B. of the *Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Chad Gore, representing the owner, stated that they agreed with all conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

- **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of neighboring historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- **Staff approve the brick and stone samples prior to purchase and installation;**
- **All lap siding be smooth face, with a maximum reveal of five inches;**
- **Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture; and**
- **Staff approves all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded finding the project meets Sections II.B. of the *Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

- s. Administrative Permits Issued for Prior month**

Meeting adjourned at 3:49 pm.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMISSION ON 6/15/16