

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

June 15, 2016

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Menié Bell, Sam Champion, Richard Fletcher, 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, Manuel Zeitlin, Michael Moen, Blaine Bonadies and Scott Dismukes, Sandi Adams, Rocco DiLeo, John Werne, Harold Johnson

Public: There were no requests to speak

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

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

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

There were no councilmembers present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. May 18, 2016

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Stewart 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. 1101 SIXTH AVENUE N

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

c. 2007 EASTLAND AVE

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

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

d. 429 BROADWAY

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

e. 3603 MEADOWBROOK AVE

Application: New construction-addition; Partial demolition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

f. 322 HARVARD AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

g. 1406 FIFTH AVE N

Application: New construction -addition and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

h. 1900 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New construction –outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

i. 2216 BELMONT BLVD

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding; Partial demolition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

j. 2206 18th AVENUE SOUTH

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

Chairman Tibbs noted that 2216 Belmont and 429 Broadway were moved to new business. There were no other requests to remove items from the consent agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with all applicable guidelines with the exception of 429 Broadway and 2216 Belmont which will be heard as a part of “MHZC Actions.” Commissioner Stewart 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.

There were no previously deferred items.

V. MHZC ACTIONS

d. 429 BROADWAY

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

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for new signage at 429 Broadway. The applicant is requesting a modification from the Commission to permit the rotating element in the middle of the sign. Staff recommends approval of the modification, but at its current size the Broadway sign would put the building 9 square feet over the allotted sign area. With the condition that Staff approve the materials, and the Broadway sign is reduced by 9 square feet, Staff recommends approval of the new projecting signs.

Kayla Joslin and Bobby Joslin requested that the additional square footage be allowed because it is a corner lot and paired signs on corner lots are always of the same size. Mr. Joslin used a poster board to show how much is 9 square feet.

Commissioner Fletcher asked why they could not just lower the square footage of both signs. Ms. Joslin said that they could but it would require new drawings and they thought it was a better use of their time to ask for the additional square footage rather than change the design. Mr. Fletcher asked if they could remove the signage on the awning, and they said they could.

Commissioner Champion said that it is up to the applicant to meet the size requirements. Commissioner Fletcher agreed and said the simplest solution is just to remove the signage from the canopy.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with the modification for a spinning element with the conditions that the total signage is reduced by 9 square feet to meet the allocation and for staff to review materials prior to installation. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

i. 2216 BELMONT BLVD

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding; Partial demolition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

2216 Belmont was moved from the consent agenda at the request of the applicant.

This request is to demolish a non-contributing rear addition, construct a new rear addition, and construct a new structure in the rear yard. Staff recommends approval with conditions, including the condition that the detached building shall not be wider than the historic house.

The proposed rear addition to the historic house is shown here in purple. It is neither taller nor wider than the house and is inset 2'2" from the rear corners of the house. The design is contemporary but does not affect any character defining features of the home. As proposed, the rear addition meets the design guidelines.

The plan also proposes a detached structure containing two dwelling units, which is shown here in red. It is neither a garage nor a DADU. The zoning for this property permits up to four dwelling units on the site. Staff finds that the detached structure meets all design guidelines with the exception of height & scale. As proposed, the structure is both taller and wider than the historic house. The additional height is approximately 1'4" and is located 110' behind the front of the historic house. Staff finds that the proposed additional height could be appropriate in this location given the minimal additional height and its location, the zoning of the property, and the surrounding context. While the proposed additional height could be appropriate for this location, staff finds that the additional width is not appropriate, especially when combined with the additional height. The plans show the detached structure

extending approximately 7' wider than the historic house on the left side. Historically, outbuildings were subordinate to principle structures in terms of height, width, and area. Even with the zoning and surrounding context, staff finds that the massing is too large. Since the building is both taller and wider than the principle building, it is not compatible with surrounding outbuildings in terms of height and scale. Staff recommends reducing the width of the structure to match the width of the historic house.

Here are some images that illustrate the surrounding context. The houses located to the right and left of the subject property are contributing structures, with either a non-contributing addition or outbuilding. The house to the right includes a deep, rear two-story addition that is closer to the alley than the proposed detached structure and will likely obscure the additional height of the proposed building from Linden Ave. The addition on that house was permitted prior to the overlay. The house to the left is also contributing and a detached building was permitted in 2006. The preservation permit indicates that the structure is neither taller nor wider than the historic house.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of this request with conditions, including the condition that the detached building shall not be wider than the historic house.

Manuel Zeitlin, architect for the project, explained that the zoning allows for a taller building on the site as well as the 5' setbacks. He explained that it would not be visible from the street. He read a letter from Lindsey Moffatt, zoning chairman for the Belmont Hillsboro Neighbors, Inc, that had been submitted to the Commission via email. He explained that he met with Tim Walker, the Councilmember and Lindsey Moffatt as well as the neighbor next door.

Commissioners discussed possible solutions with the applicant and asked for clarifications about the project.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Fletcher said it is appropriate as presented because of the unusual setting and because the neighborhood association is for it. Commissioner Stewart said that rear homes should be subservient in most cases, but due to the landscaping and existing conditions, the design as proposed is appropriate.

Motion:

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

- 1. Staff approve the final foundation, roof, windows, doors, and railing selections as well as the color and texture of the masonry prior to purchase and installation;**
- 2. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house; and**
- 3. Staff approve the roof color, dimensions and texture.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

k. 903 WALDKIRCH AVE

Application: New construction-addition (constructed without a permit); Setback determination

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

Staff member Melissa Sajid, presented the case for an addition that was constructed without permits.

This request is to permit a side addition to a non-contributing house. The addition was constructed without obtaining permits. The request includes a setback determination. Staff recommends disapproval of the side addition and setback determination as the request does not meet the design guidelines for height & scale, design & location, setback, materials, and roof form.

The covered deck is located on the left side of the house near the front corner. The addition is currently 167 sq. ft. and extends to the left side property line with a 0' setback. As part of this application, the applicant proposes to reduce the width of the unpermitted side addition by converting a portion of the covering to a trellis. The request requires a setback determination to reduce the left side setback from 5' to 0'.

Per the design guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the house. Side additions may be appropriate when the width of the lot exceeds 60' or the standard width on the block. This lot is 50' wide, which is the typical lot width on this block of Waldkirch Ave. In addition, when side additions are appropriate, they are required to be stepped back from the front wall, which this addition is not.

With regard to the setback, setback determinations take into account historic conditions; however, this proposal does not meet any of the conditions where setbacks less than those required by zoning have been approved. Furthermore, the wider side addition disrupts the rhythm of spacing along the street.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the side addition and the setback determination, finding that the addition does not meet Section III for new construction and Section IV for additions, of the *Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Michael Moen, representing the owner, conceded that the deck was constructed without a permit. He did not know that the contractor did not obtain a permit. Several years ago, they received a notice of violation saying that the neighbor was complaining but they spoke to their neighbor and he had not complained. Three years later, they added the roof to the deck. To remove it would cost them \$9,000-\$10,000.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Champion noted that the contractor should be liable. The Commission discussed the process, which body made which decisions and some potential solutions.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to disapprove the addition and the setback determination finding the addition does not meet Sections III for new construction and IV for additions of the *Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed with four concurring votes. Commissioner Champion voted against the motion and Chairman Tibbs voted in favor of the motion.

I. 737 BENTON AVE

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding (Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit); Setback determination
Council District: 17
Overlay: Woodland-in-Waverly Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for an addition and DADU at 737 Benton.

The applicant proposes to enlarge a two-story historic house with a rear addition and a side porte cochere addition, and to construct a two-story outbuilding containing a detached accessory dwelling unit.

The two-story addition will sit in appropriately from the left side and continue back, with a one-story component stepping back out beyond the sidewall of the house. Staff finds the addition wider than the house to be appropriate because the lot is 134' wide, and because it does not impact the historic structure or cause the destruction of any original features. The eave heights will match the eaves on the house, and materials will be appropriate including cement-fiber siding, stone foundation and asphalt shingle roof.

Added on to the right side of the building, it will extend 21 feet, with columns and a wing wall reducing the opening to 16'. The Commission has approved side porch additions to houses on lots wider than 60', but while this lot is 134' wide, staff finds that this addition is not appropriate because the house is situated far to the right and the addition would be in the narrower side yard, and because, together with the rear addition, it would widen the house on both sides. Additionally, the width is greater than would be typical or appropriate for a porte cochere.

A two-story outbuilding containing a garage with a detached accessory dwelling unit - A bathroom and porch are in the first story, with the remainder of the living space above.

The building does not meet the design guidelines or the applicable Metro Zoning for DADUs: The 1067 square feet proposed footprint exceeds the 1000 square feet permitted; the 1300 square feet of living space exceeds the 700 square feet permitted; the eave heights are 18' and 20' which exceeds the maximum of 17' permitted; and the roof height is 28'-10" which exceeds the maximum 25' permitted in the guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed rear addition to the house, with the conditions that the roof color, stone, window and door selections, and paving and appurtenances are approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase and installation.

Staff recommends disapproval of the porte cochere addition finding that it does not meet sections III.B.1.a, III.1.B.b, and III.B.1.d of the design guidelines for additions.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed outbuilding finding that it does not meet section III.2.h of the design guidelines and the standards for detached accessory dwelling units outlined in 17.16.030.G of the Metro Code.

Blaine Bonadies, architect for the project, presented a slide show explaining that the left side addition is no wider than the silhouette of the house. The porte cochere is beyond the 50% line of the original structure, it will be transparent, it is easily removable, and allows for the reopening of a side porch. He argued for the additional square footage of the DADU and the height, saying that an 8' garage door is more appropriate than a 7' garage door and so a 9' ceiling is required to accommodate the taller garage. The original building has a dormer so a dormer on the garage is appropriate.

Commissioner Stewart noted that the porte cochere seems to be oversized. Mr. Bonadies said that by right, you could build to the 5' setback. He would be amenable to lessening the width of the porte cochere by 2'.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Bell noted that porte cocheres are not typical of the neighborhood and this style of home.

Commissioner Fletcher expressed concern about the width of the porte cochere and suggested that they simply take up the applicant's offer to lessen the width. Commissioner Stewart agreed that because of the size and balance of the house, the width should be diminished.

Chairman Tibbs noted that they have kept everyone accountable for the design standards of the ordinance for detached accessory dwelling units. He asked Ms. Zeigler about the inclusion of porches in the calculation of square footage. Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission that they have included porches in the footprint calculation to prevent very large porches that are then undermining the purpose of keeping these structures small and subordinate to the primary house.

Scott Dismukes, landscape architect, talked about the appropriateness of the proposal from a landscape perspective. They are well within the lot coverage. The porte cochere aligns with the new garage at the rear. They are pulling the driveway in a slightly, which increases the buffer between the houses and preserves open space on the eastern side of the lot and existing trees. If the driveway is narrowed, the garage will need to move, which could mean removal of trees.

Commissioner Bell noted that porte cocheres are not typical of this style in this area but if they did find it appropriate, it should be narrowed in width.

Commissioner Champion stated that historic properties should evolve, the porte cochere is appropriate for a lot of this size and the rear addition is appropriate because it does not extend beyond the porch, even if it does extend beyond the sidewall.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that the porte cochere is out-of-scale, but the applicant has offered to lessen the width by 2'. Commissioner Stewart agreed that the size of the porte cochere is insensitive to the historic home and it is within their purview to ask for a reduction in width, even if that means a slight move for the garage and driveway.

In answer to a question from Commissioner Champion, Mr. Alexander explained how the calculations of the detached dwelling unit were determined and the commissioner discussed the calculations. Commissioner Stewart stated that they should continue to follow the regulations of the ordinance and they can always look at the regulations themselves at another time.

Commissioner Stewart thought the proposed eave height might be appropriate based on the eave height of the home. Legal counsel, Macy Amos, reminded the Commission that the eave height is noted in the code and she encouraged the Commission to follow the code. Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission that the code was written with the support of the neighborhoods to allow for a use that would not otherwise be allowed and so the expectation is that the Commission will follow the regulations.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed rear addition to 737 Benton Ave, the porte cochere with the condition that be reduced in width by 2' and the DADU with the condition that it meets the standards of the ordinance and with the conditions that all materials and appurtenances are approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase and installation. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

m. 1111 LILLIAN ST

Application: Demolition; New construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

Commissioner Champion left the meeting at 3:39 and returned at 3:44.

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for new construction at 1111 Lillian Street.

This request is to demolish a non-contributing duplex and to construct a new duplex in its place. 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 Lillian Street with parking behind the house that is accessed by an existing curb cut off Lillian Street.

The structure is one and one-half stories with a maximum height of 29' and an eave height of 11' 8" at the front. The context in the immediate area ranges from 24' to 32' and includes primarily one and one-half-story homes.

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

Sandi Adams, architect for the project, said she was available for questions and that she agreed with all staff recommendations. There were no requestes from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve 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 masonry, trim, porch floor, windows, and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house; and**
- **Staff approve the roof color, dimensions and texture.**

Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously with Chairman Tibbs voting in favor. (Commissioner Champion was not present.)

n. 1107 BOSCOBEL ST

Application: Demolition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Removed from the agenda because the application was incomplete.

o. 1226-1228 FOURTH AVE N

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

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for new construction at 1226-1228 Fourth Avenue North. The proposal is infill on a vacant lot between two one-story buildings, the Barista Parlor on the left and the City House restaurant on the right. In May 2016, the MHZC disapproved an application to construct two buildings on the lot, finding the materials, setbacks, and general character of the proposal to be incompatible with the surrounding historic context.

The applicant has revised the plans submitted in May, and is again proposing to construct two new buildings on the vacant lot.

Massing

With the new proposal, the form and scale of the buildings has not changed - both buildings will be one-story tall with gabled roofs, peaks at 18' tall with eaves at 9', the height of each will be compatible with the adjacent buildings. Staff finds this height to be compatible with the historic context.

The roof forms, a side gable and a front gable, are both appropriate. However— there would be skylights along the ridge of the side gabled building- the elevations do not show it but the renderings do. Section 3.6.1 of the design guidelines states that skylights should be located behind the midpoint of a building so as to minimize their visibility.

Setbacks

The proposed new building on the left (top) will sit twenty feet (19') back from the sidewalk. The building to the right will sit eighteen feet (17') back from the sidewalk, double the setback of the historic house to the right. These setbacks are only one foot shorter than the previous proposal. Staff finds the setbacks are incompatible with the adjacent context, 0' to the left and 9' to the right. The guidelines stress the importance of a consistent building edge to avoid interrupting the rhythm and order of the street.

Orientation

As with the previous proposal, there are doors and windows on the front facades, but not clearly identifiable as a typical prominent front entrance, and there are no walkways that would directly engage the right of way. In fact, both front “yards” are encircled by patios, effectively disconnecting them from the street. Again, both buildings are accessed primarily from side doors facing the interior walkway or courtyard.

The proposal marks the opening of the walkway with two large stone bollards. This feature is not something you would find at the front of a commercial building in an urban setting.

Staff finds the orientations and front yard features are not appropriate for commercial forms and are not compatible with the historic context.

Façade articulation and window proportions.

This aspect of the proposal has changed. There is now an appropriate balance of wall to window, however – the fronts do not have the basic elements of a typical storefront “bulkhead window”, and transom.

Materials

The roof will be galvanized standing seam metal. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and to meet guideline 3.3.1.

Staff recommends disapproval of the infill construction, finding that the proposal does not meet sections 3.1 General Principles, 3.1.6 Window Proportions, 3.2 Site, Building Planning and Setbacks, 3.2.3 Orientation, and 3.6.1 Roofs for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Rocco DiLeo, bar owner, explained how they redesigned the project to address façade articulation and materials and thereby gained the support of the neighborhood and the next-door business owner. He explained that they would like to keep the proposed setback to keep from dwarfing the adjacent buildings and to comply with the design guidelines. The orientation of the building is appropriate because it is clearly defined as the space between the buildings, which is reinforced by the stone pillars and canopies above the side entrances. The window orientation he does not understand because it has been seen on other projects. He does not deny that the skylights do not meet the design guidelines but he does think it is a cool feature.

Commissioner Champion noted that he believes the setback needs to be met. The side entrances do not bother him because the City House has a side entrance. They can easily move the skylights and they have made improvements to the materials and windows.

Commissioners asked for clarifications of the proposed conditions, the design guidelines to which they relate and existing conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak. The applicant was invited back to speak to the Commission and he reiterated a case for the proposed setback. Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission that in the past, setbacks have been determined based on the historic buildings on either side or the average of the block-face. Commissioner Bell noted the purpose of that was to be consistent with the established rhythm.

Commissioner Fletcher said that the setback should match City House, the skylights need to be moved, the orientation is appropriate, and the window proportions need to be modified to meet historic proportion. He noted that the sidewalk in between the buildings is clearly identifying the entrance.

Commissioner Bell said the orientation is quirky because one building faces the front and one building faces the side. She thinks that the project is close enough that the issues can be worked out with the bar owner. Commissioner Stewart stated that the first design did not meet the design guidelines and he appreciates what the developer has done. It is appropriate to match the setback of City House. The orientation is appropriate because the uniqueness of these two buildings makes it clear where the entrance is and the awnings help to identify the doors.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the new construction with the conditions that

- **the front setback meet the front setback of the City House;**
- **the skylights be located towards the rear of the building so they cannot be seen from the street;**
- **the center glass section of the right building be modified so that it is more consistent with the historic window proportions;**
- **and that the applicant work with staff on final approval of materials.**

Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

p. 400 BROADWAY

Application: New construction-addition, Alterations
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Removed from agenda at the request of the applicant.

q. 1430 INGLEWOOD CIRCLE N

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 07
Overlay: Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for infill at 1430 Inglewood Circle N. MHZC staff issued a permit to demolish the non-contributing house on the site in March 2016. The proposed single-family infill will meet all base zoning requirements. The application calls for a double width driveway that is 20' wide. The site plan shows the driveway as ending just beyond the line of the house's porch. This property does not have alley access, so a driveway from the street is appropriate. However, Staff recommends that the driveway be a single-lane driveway that extends all the way to the rear of the house for parking, as is common in the immediate historic context.

The infill house will be one and one-half stories, with a height of approximately 28'. Staff finds that the infill's height, scale, materials, roof form, fenestration pattern, and orientation all meet the design guidelines.

In conclusion, 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;
- The driveway be a single-width driveway that extends to the rear for parking;
- Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
- Staff approve a shingle and metal roof sample; and
- Staff approve masonry.

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

The applicant, John Werne, asked if the driveway could widen once it got past the front wall of the house. Ms. Baldock said that it could.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve 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;**
- **The driveway be a single-width driveway that extends to the rear for parking;**
- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve a shingle and metal roof sample; and**
- **Staff approve masonry.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

r. 1201, 1205, 1207 SIXTH AVENUE N; 1200, 1204, and 1206 SEVENTH AVENUE N; 604 MADISON ST

Application: New construction—infill, Final SP
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for final review of the Elliott School SP. The application is to construct a mixed-use development on what are currently seven parcels along Sixth and Seventh Avenues North and Madison Street, shaded here in blue. The lots are all vacant. In May 2015, the Commission approved the bulk, height, massing, roof form, and site layout for the project as part of a preliminary SP review. The SP was approved by Council in August 2015, and the applicant is now seeking approval of the final materials, design details, appurtenances, and landscape features.

The development is connected to the alterations and additions to the Elliott School site across the street, shown in blue, which will be converted to apartments. The Commission approved the plans for the Elliott School site as part of the consent agenda earlier in the hearing. The entry to the commercial section of the development will be at the corner of Sixth Avenue North and Madison Street, addressing both streets, which is appropriate. There are several private entries to the residential units along Sixth Avenue North, Madison Street, and Seventh Avenue North. These entries will be located behind stoops, which is appropriate.

The development will retain the brick sidewalks on Sixth and Seventh Avenues North. It will use an existing curb cut on Madison Street to access the underground parking. The fenestration pattern for the proposed development ensures that there is an appropriate proportion of solid-to-void in the design. The development's facades on Sixth Avenue North, Seventh Avenue North, and Madison Street have window patterns that address the street and do not result in large expanses of walls without a window or door opening.

The known materials are appropriate for multi-family infill in Germantown. The primary cladding material will be brick, with metal wall assembly used as an accent material. The windows will be aluminum. Limestone or cast stone terraces and planters with a metal cable rail will be installed. Decorative concrete will be used for architectural accents, and the windowsills will be concrete. The balconies will be painted steel with mesh panel rails. Staff recommends approval of all final material choices prior to purchase and installation.

In conclusion, Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- Staff approve brick and stone samples;
- Staff approve the metal cladding color and texture;
- Staff approve the final selection of windows and doors;
- All mechanical systems be located on the roof, or in the interior of the development to reduce visibility from the street;
- Staff approve the fence design;
- The applicant submit more information regarding the boardwalk; and
- Staff approve all exterior lighting.

With these conditions, Staff finds the massing of the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Manuel Zeitlin, architect for the project, stated that he agreed with the recommendation. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **Staff approve brick and stone samples;**
- **Staff approve the metal cladding color and texture;**
- **Staff approve the final selection of windows and doors;**
- **All mechanical systems be located on the roof, or in the interior of the development to reduce visibility from the street;**
- **Staff approve the fence design;**
- **The applicant submit more information regarding the boardwalk; and**
- **Staff approve all exterior lighting.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Champion left the meeting at 4:22p.m. and returned at 4:24 p.m.

s. 1023 PETWAY AVE

Application: New construction-infill, Final SP
Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 1023 Petway Ave., an application for final SP review to construct a duplex infill. The lot was previously zoned as single family, but the SP zoning enacted in May 2016 now allows for a duplex on the lot. The Commission approved the overall site plan and massing of the duplex at the February 2016 public hearing. At that time, MHZC found that the project's height, scale, setback, rhythm of spacing, roof form, and orientation met the design guidelines. This application and review is for the project's final design details, including materials, proportion and rhythm of openings, and appurtenances.

The known materials have all been approved by the Commission in the past and include a split-faced concrete block foundation, smooth-faced cement-fiber siding, an asphalt single primary roof, and a metal porch. The dormers on the side facades contain horizontal windows that do not adequately fill the dormer, as was typical historically and as the Commission has required on past projects. Staff recommends that the side dormer windows be either vertically oriented or square so that they better fill the dormer space and meet historic proportions.

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

- Staff approve the asphalt shingle and metal roof color;
- Staff approve the final window and door selections;
- The side dormer windows be either vertically oriented or square so that they better fill the dormer area; and
- Walkways be added from the sidewalk to the front porch;

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

Harold Johnson, applicant, stated that he agreed with staff recommendations. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve with the conditions:

- **Staff approve the asphalt shingle and metal roof color;**
- **Staff approve the final window and door selections;**
- **The side dormer windows be either vertically oriented or square so that they better fill the dormer area; and**
- **Walkways be added from the sidewalk to the front porch;**

Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

s. Administrative Permits Issued for Prior month

Chairman Tibbs reminded the Commission that the next meeting will be at a different location- the Midtown Hills Police Precinct, and also that next month they would be voting on a new chair and vice-chair.

Meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 7/20/2016