

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

August 17, 2016

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Menié Bell, Rose Cantrell, Aaron Kaalberg, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Macy Forrest Amos (city attorney), Ava Dinella, Ryan Jarles and Jenna Stout (interns)

Council Member: None attending

Applicants: Gary Louden, Daniel Harris, Daniel Fell, Seab Tuck, Chad Gore, John TeSelle, Peggy Newman, Nick Dryden, Architect

Public: There were no requests from the public to speak. Jane-Coleman Harbison spoke as an expert witness for the Tennessee Historical Commission.

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m., recognized, and thanked the interns Ava Dinella, Ryan Jarles and Jenna Stout.

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

There were no councilmembers present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. July 20, 2016

Motion:

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

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

III. CONSENT AGENDA

b. 904 BRADFORD AVENUE

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

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

c. 2007 EASTLAND AVENUE

Application: Setback determination for previously approved DADU

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

d. 1007 CLEARVIEW AVENUE

Application: New construction—addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

e. 150 SECOND AVENUE N

Application: New construction—addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Second Ave Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

f. 916 BOSCOBEL STREET

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

g. 1909 BEECHWOOD AVENUE

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

h. 4204 PARK AVENUE

Application: New construction—addition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Park & Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

i. 2125 BELMONT BOULEVARD

Application: New construction—detached accessory dwelling unit (DADU); Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

j. 421 BROADWAY

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

k. 404 SOUTH 11TH STREET

Application: New construction – addition; Setback determination; Partial demolition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

l. 2811 OAKLAND AVENUE

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

m. 2507 BELMONT BOULEVARD

Application: New construction – addition; Partial demolition

Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont - Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

n. 1915 BLAIR AVENUE

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

o. 2116 PONTOTOC AVENUE

Application: New construction – addition; Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Intern, Ava Dinella, read the items on consent with the exception of 404 South 11th Street, which will be presented under “MHZC Actions,” at the request of the applicant. There were no requests from the public to remove any additional items from consent.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve all consent agenda items with their applicable conditions with the exception of 404 South 11th Street, finding them to meet the applicable design guidelines. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

There were no previously deferred items.

V. MHZC ACTIONS

k. 404 SOUTH 11TH STREET

Application: New construction – addition; Setback determination; Partial demolition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for a carport at 404 South 11th Street.

This request is to construct a rear addition that includes a left side setback determination. The request includes covering the existing concrete block foundation with a stone or brick veneer. Staff recommends approval of the request with the condition that the foundation not be covered with veneer as proposed.

The proposed rear addition will add 6’ to the depth and 215 SF to the overall footprint. The addition connects to an existing non-contributing addition that is 2’ from the left side property line and proposes to also be located 2’ from the left property line. Staff finds that the setback determination is appropriate in this case since the addition lines up with an existing non-contributing addition. The addition meets all other setbacks. The addition has a ridge height that is 12’ less than the maximum ridge height of the house. In addition, the plan incorporates a garage on the rear that has access from the alley. While attached garages are not permitted except at basement level, there is already an existing attached garage on this site that was part of a previous, non-contributing addition. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition and setback determination.

The plan also proposes to cover the existing concrete block foundation with a brick or stone veneer on the front and right side. The house at 404 S. 11th St was constructed c. 1914 and contributes to the character of Lockeland Springs-East End. The cladding on the front of the house is vinyl siding and there is ship-lap siding beneath that. The siding on the right façade has been replaced with Hardie board siding. Staff finds that it would be inappropriate

to cover the existing foundation with veneer as the exhibit provided by the applicant demonstrates that it would be nearly flush with or slightly protrude from the vinyl siding. On houses with siding as the primary cladding, it is typical for the siding to protrude somewhat over the foundation.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the rear addition and setback determination with conditions, including the condition that the foundation shall not be covered in veneer.

The applicant for the project, Gary Loudon, said he was representing the property owner. They have made several interior improvements. The existing foundation is ugly. The proposed veneer is a true antique brick that has been cut in half. Earlier homes have a 2 x 4 or 2 x 8 border that separates the siding. All have brick, limestone or painted brick. Their request would add value to the home and be aesthetically appropriate. All other homes with similar foundation are ugly. The siding is vinyl on the front and the addition is cement fiberboard. The point is to make it aesthetically valuable to the neighborhood. The applicant handed out multiple photographs of foundations seen in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Mosley asked if staff asked the applicant about parging the foundation. Even though the thin veneer is thin, it may still extend beyond the siding. Commissioner Cantrell said that what the applicant wants to do is reasonable because the brick enhances the value of the home. She was impressed by the photographs handed out.

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, explained that the veneer would slightly extend beyond the siding, which means that water will get behind any veneer.

Commissioner Stewart said that adding a water table at the bottom and a parge coating would be appropriate to the building. Commissioner Cantrell agreed.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed addition and setback determination with the following conditions:

- 1. The existing foundation shall not be covered with stone veneer but may be parge coated with a trim board added;**
- 2. Staff approve the final details, dimensions, and materials of the garage doors, trim, and roof material and color prior to purchase and installation; and**
- 3. Staff approve the masonry color, dimensions and texture.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded finding that with the condition, the project meets Section II.B of the *Lockeland Springs – East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. The motion passed unanimously.

p. 1420 CALVIN AVENUE

Application: New construction- outbuilding; Setback determination (completed without a permit)
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for 1420 Calvin Avenue.

This request is to permit a carport that includes rear and right side setback determinations. The carport was built without permits. Staff recommends disapproval of the carport and setback determinations, finding that the project does not meet Section II.B.8 of the design guidelines for outbuildings.

The carport is located at the rear of the lot, next to an existing outbuilding. The carport is located approximately 6” from the rear property line and 2’ from the right property line. Since the footprint of the outbuilding and carport exceed 700 SF, base zoning requires a 20’ rear setback and 5’ side setback.

Setback determinations take into account historic conditions and while outbuildings were frequently located closer to the side and rear property lines, the setbacks proposed in this case are much closer to the property lines than have been typically approved by the Commission. In addition, the proximity of the carport to the alley may present safety concerns for personal vehicles as well as those used for trash pick-up. Therefore, staff recommends disapproval of

the setback determinations, finding that the project does not meet Section II.B.8. of the design guidelines for setbacks.

While the project does not exceed the maximum ridge height, eave height, and area, the carport does not meet the design guidelines for setbacks and materials. The Hardie board siding used in the gable fields on the sides of the carport is embossed rather than smooth as required. Therefore, staff recommends disapproval of the carport and setback determinations as the project does not meet Section II.B.8 of the design guidelines for outbuildings.

Danny Harris, contractor for the project, apologized for not following the process and based the plan on other carports in the neighborhood. He understands that the embossing has to change if other aspects of the project are approved.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley expressed concern over the setback determinations requested. He asked about the setback of the existing garage, which Ms. Sajid said was approved at 10’.

Commissioner Stewart said he understands how it could happen but he drove the dead-end alley and it is extremely tight and all others have respected the setback requirements. To approve this would set a dangerous precedent. Commission Cantrell agreed.

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to disapprove the carport and setback determinations finding that the project does not meet Section II.B.8 for outbuildings of the *Lockeland Springs – East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

q. 201 BROADWAY

Application: New construction (completed without a permit)
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Deferred at the request of the applicants.

r. 1107 BOSCOBEL STREET

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

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for demolition of 1107 Boscobel Street, an application for demolition by argument of economic hardship. At the time Staff recommendations were finalized, the recommendation was for disapproval of the demolition, based on more information being required. This was staff’s error, in terms of timeliness. Since that time, Staff met with the applicant, the engineer and an independent consultant. Those discussions clarified some areas that were in question, and have led Staff to revise our recommendation to an approval of the demolition request.

The building is in poor condition. Each system of the structure has suffered from deferred maintenance, to say the least. Staff’s inspections however, led us to believe that perhaps it was not so far gone as it appeared. The foundation requires significant work, for example, but portions of it are in decent shape. There is water intrusion evident throughout the building. A few of the windows could potentially be repaired. Approximately the front half of the building’s floor system we felt could be worked with, in spite of its current state. What is visible of the roofing structure is dry and intact. The interior walls were unclear as to their integrity.

In the estimates that were provided, Staff found individual line items that could be revised, in the areas of roofing, siding, flooring and painting, potentially lowering the estimates approximately \$30,000, but overall our review was not able to identify enough savings to make rehabilitation viable.

Staff's analysis of 15 comps within one mile of the subject property that sold this year resulted in a value of \$238.40 per square foot. At the square footage of the rehabbed structure of 1,667 square feet, that results in a potential sales price of \$396,746, which compares with the average sales price, of \$404,276.

Using the lowest estimate added to the purchase price, shows a loss of more than \$103,000. Adjusting this estimate based on our review of potential savings still shows a loss of more than \$61,000. Therefore, Staff concludes that the argument for economic hardship is valid, and recommends approval of the application, finding that the proposed demolition meets section II.B of the Lockeland Springs-East End design guidelines.

Daniel Fell, applicant for the project, thanked staff for working with him and he donated any salvageable features to the MHC Foundation.

Commissioner Stewart stated that he agreed with the staff's recommendation based on the condition and the limited square feet.

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve demolition of the principle building, finding the project met the design guidelines for demolition, based on the facts provided in the presentation. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

s. 300 BROADWAY

Application: New construction—addition; Storefront alterations

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for alterations and addition to 300 Broadway, an application for alterations to the building, replacement of existing windows on the first and second stories, and construction of a rooftop addition.

The project includes the removal of the central entrance and aluminum canopy, as well as the existing canopy above the secondary entrance on Broadway, removal of a secondary entrance on Third Avenue and removal of a door on the rear façade.

At the corner of Broadway and Third Avenue, the applicant is returning the corner entry to the configuration seen in historic photographs and removing the central entrance. Staff finds that restoring the original entrance configuration is appropriate, as it will return the rhythm and spacing of the original design. Staff recommends obtaining additional information about how the newly exposed corner entryway will be treated, such as ceiling and floor materials, doors and walls, steps and railing, and the pillars. Removal of the aluminum canopies also is appropriate since they are not original elements.

On the Third Avenue side, the central entrance is proposed to be enclosed with stone and window to match the existing window configurations on either side. The central entrance is an original entrance; however, having a window in its place will continue the same rhythm of openings as the original design.

The door of the secondary entrance is not original and the original configuration will be retained. The project also requires the removal of divisions between windows on the Third Avenue side that do not appear to be historic. The removal is appropriate, as it will return this side closer to its original design.

The secondary façade on Third Avenue will also be reconfigured. Presently it has two separate entrances. The intent is to turn the two separate doors into one central door. The new entrance is proposed to be further recessed, creating a recessed area that was not a part of the original design or the later Keeble re-design and is not a typical feature of

historic buildings in the district. Staff recommends that the new entrance recess no more than it currently is in order to meet section II.B.6 of the design guidelines for new entrances.

The application includes replacement of the first and the majority of second story windows with new operable windows with divided lights. Historical imagery as well as the 1946 drawings show the windows as single panes in the upper and lower sections, and in each transom section between floors. Staff has found no evidence to indicate divided light windows were ever installed on this building. Section II.D of the guidelines for windows states “If replacement windows or window surrounds are necessary, replacements should replicate originals.”

Last month the Commission disapproved windows on another Broadway building that were proposed to operate in a manner differently than they were historically. Based on past decisions and the historic documentation, staff recommends disapproval of the replacement of the windows, finding that the proposed does not meet section II.D of the design guidelines. Two bricked-in window openings on the rear façade are proposed to be replaced with windows matching the existing ones; staff finds this appropriate.

Section III.H.2 of the design guidelines requires that rooftop additions be set back at least thirty feet (30’) from the main façade and twenty feet (20’) from the secondary façade. The applicant has submitted revised drawings that reduce the addition to meet these requirements, with three (3) exceptions:

- The canopy around the addition extends into the setback area by approximately four feet (4’).
- A bar service area with canopy that is eight feet (8’) wide protrudes into the setback area.
- On the Third Avenue side, a stairwell protrudes into the setback area.

The stairwell rises eight feet (8’) above the parapet wall and ten feet (10’) into the setback area. On previous cases, the Commission has allowed for small intrusions into the step-back area that are minimal in width and height but not multiple intrusions on one building. Staff recommends that the bar awning be removed.

Staff recommends the addition’s overhang be reduced to two feet (2’) or less. Since the stairwell is leading down to the next floor, there may be a possibility of altering the roof form and reducing the height. Furthermore, removal of the closet by the stairwell would lessen the width. The result will be a full awning that protrudes two feet (2’) into the step-backed area and a narrower stairwell with a roofline that falls between the bulk of the addition and the outer wall.

The design guidelines require that a rooftop addition be no taller than fifteen feet (15’) above the parapet wall. The height of the addition is twelve feet (12’) above the parapet. Mechanicals on the roof are not included in the height. The addition’s materials include metal panels and operable windows. Details on windows and doors were not specified. Staff recommends having final approval of the windows and doors and color of the metal, and that a detail drawing be submitted to further explain the design details of the addition. With these conditions, Staff finds that the addition’s materials meet Section III.H of the design guidelines.

The drawings submitted show a projecting sign at the front right corner, an aluminum sign over the existing Broadway National Bank sign, a wall sign by the Broadway entryway, and painted signs on the left and rear sides of the building. Since there is no specific information on the signage size, design or materials, signage and murals are not part of this review. No information on the illumination of the building was indicated on the plans. All illumination must be reviewed and approved by the Commission to ensure that it meets the design guidelines.

Seab Tuck, architect for the project, introduced others involved in the project, in case there were questions. They would like to keep the windows as proposed. When Keeble renovated the building, it was a single pane on the first floor. The windows across the street, from the same era, have divided lights. It is not important to them whether or not they are divided. The important thing to them is that the windows are operable.

From a design perspective, the awning and signage should not be separated into three different components.

Historically, rooftops were not supposed to be seen. Initially they were over the step back requirements because they had three full kitchens. It is unfair that the step back is the same for all buildings, no matter how tall they are. This building would be four stories, and they felt they could infringe on the step back area. They eliminated the mechanical screen because it was too tall. They are 12’ above the parapet and they are allowed 15’ so therefore they should be allowed to be in the step-back area with the overhang and the bar cover. The storage area attached to the

stair is needed for cushion storage. If they cannot have that, they will simply have some piece of furniture in the same location. They are requesting to keep the overhang, the bar cover and the storage area. He said he did not understand why the mechanical screen was not allowed.

Commissioner Stewart asked for the height of the mechanical screen wall, which was 8'. Mr. Tuck explained that by pushing the walls for the addition back it required taller mechanicals. What they could do, which was 2'-3', was not worth it based on hiding the smells or sound. Commissioner Mosley asked about the screen that was proposed. Mr. Tuck said it would be a frosted glass or frosted acrylic screen that was 8'.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart and Bell asked for some clarification of staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Mosley said that to go back to 1914 and guess what the windows might have been is a bigger stretch than following the Keeble design, which is historic and it would not follow the secretary of interior's standards to alter the design. He understands the architectural intent but he does not find that it meets the design guidelines, as it is a strong conjectural element. He thinks the canopy on its own is strong enough to note the entrance of the building without it being connected to signage.

Commissioner Stewart stated that he thinks the oldest version of the building would dictate operable windows, which is what the applicant wants. It is clear that the Secretary of interior standards require later alterations to be retained, but he is not convinced that the Keeble design is a historic alteration.

The Commission and staff discussed if the Keeble design was historic or if the façade should go back to the original design. Ms. Zeigler explained that the Commission was required to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehab, according to state law, and those state that later alterations are often historic in their own right. Since the current façade was designed by a well-known architect, Edwin Keeble, who designed the L&C Tower, the façade is historic. She provided another example of a later storefront that an applicant was required to retain.

Jane Coleman-Harbison, Certified Local Government representative for the Tennessee Historical Commission, stated that the Keeble design contributes to the historic character of the building but that issue has not been resurveyed. Ms. Harbison stated that if one were following the secretary of interior standard's you would not want to follow an earlier design than the historic Keeble design. Other designs of Keeble are listed in the National Register of Historic Places and it was his design that was used when the National Register district was created.

The applicant requested to rebut and Chairman Tibbs stated Ms. Harbison was an expert witness, there being no public comment to rebut. Mr. Tuck was invited back to discuss the applicant's desire in terms of windows.

Commissioner Stewart asked staff if there is a possibility to come to a design that is operable. Ms. Zeigler said there is. Mr. Tuck agreed.

Commissioner Stewart stated that there is merit in the addition in that the building is taller. He does not have issue with the bar roof overhang and the stairwell can be reduced.

Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission that if the step backs for rooftop additions are not followed, the Commission will not be following the precedent already set and will open the door for rooftops additions that could jeopardize the National Register listing of the district. Commissioner Mosley noted that they should not be arbitrary and they have not allowed for another bar cover on 5th Avenue to remain.

Motion:

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

- 1. The awning over the bar is removed;**
- 2. The closet is removed from the stairwell, lessening its width and that the roof height be minimized as much as allowable by code;**
- 3. The four foot (4') canopy overhang be reduced to no more than two feet (2');**

4. **Applicant submit detail drawings showing the design of the addition; Staff provide final review of window, doors and metal color.**
5. **The applicant submit details and material information for the newly formed corner entrance for final review;**
6. **The applicant submit details of the canopies for final review;**
7. **The wrap around canopy be split into two different canopies that are the width of their respective entrances;**
8. **The Third Avenue side/rear entrance be recessed no more than it is currently and material information and details be provided for the recessed portion;**
9. **The first and second story windows not be altered as proposed; and,**
10. **the applicant return to the Commission with a signage application, lighting and any other alterations planned;**

finding the project to meet the design guidelines for the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

t. 3641 RICHLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding; Setback determination

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for infill at 3641 Richland Avenue, 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 campus, all located within the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The Commission's approval was contingent on the applicant returning to the Commission for approval of all infill design and site layout. MHZC so far has approved infill and outbuildings for Lots 1, 2 and 3 of the development.

This application is to construct a new single family infill and an outbuilding on lot 4 of the development. Both the infill and the outbuilding are to be located three feet (3') from the interior property line. Since base zoning requires a five foot (5') side setback for both structures, the project requires a setback determination. Staff finds this reduced side setback to be appropriate because there are other homes and outbuildings 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 3637 Richland Avenue, which is also part of the larger development. Staff has yet to review the site plan for 3637 Richland Avenue, but has directed the applicant that the right side of 3637 needs to be set more than seven feet (7') from the side property line. This will ensure there is at least ten feet (10') in between nos. 3641 and 3637 Richland Avenue and that the reduced side setback will not affect overall rhythm of spacing on the street. For Lots 1, 2, and 3 of this development, the Commission has approved similar setback determinations.

Vehicular access for the site will be via a new private alley created at the back of the site. The Commission typically requests at least twenty feet (20') between the primary structure and the outbuilding. The applicant is proposing just ten feet (10') in between the structures. The Commission has approved the distance of ten feet (10') in between the primary structures and the outbuildings for Lots 1, 2, and 3 of this development, and staff recommends that it be approved for Lot 4. The overall development is creating a new alley at the rear of the lots, which will make the back portion of the lot unavailable for building. Approximately the back thirty feet (30') of the lot is used for the alley. In addition, there is a utility easement in between the alley and the outbuilding. The outbuilding cannot be pushed any further to the rear because of the new alley and the easements on the property. Therefore staff finds the distance in between the primary house and the outbuilding to be sufficient.

The house's two-story form, height of 39', and width of 39' meets the historic context and is in keeping with what has been approved for Lots 1, 2, and 3 of this development. The primary cladding material is stucco over brick, which is found within the historic district. All other known materials have been approved by the Commission in the past.

The decorative parapet at the front bay is not typical of the district, but a similar form can be found a few blocks over on Mockingbird Road, in the neighboring Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. If this type of parapet were to be proposed for an infill site with flanking historic houses on both sides, it may not be appropriate. However, staff finds it to be appropriate in this instance, for this site, because the infill will be in the middle of a line of nine new adjacent infill houses. This development will overall include twenty-two (22) infill houses in the Richland-West End Overlay, all located on Richland Avenue. Allowing for a variation in design that may be atypical of the district, but which can be found on a nearby historic house, will help diversify the development and distinguish the individual houses.

On the left elevation are four small window openings that are approximately one foot by one foot (1' X 1'). The design guidelines state that window openings should be a minimum of four square feet (4 sq. ft.). Staff therefore recommends that these window openings be enlarged to be a minimum of four square feet (4 sq.ft.).

The proposed outbuilding has wall dormers on the two side elevations. Staff typically discourages wall dormers, but staff finds them to be appropriate on this structure for several reasons. The wall dormers will at most be minimally visible because they will be so far back from the front of the street. In addition, the dormers have widths that are modestly scaled so they are less than half the width of the wall below. Lastly, the dormers are set well off the ridge of the roof, which will help to reduce their scale.

Chad Gore, architect, stated that he 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:

- 1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of neighboring historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Staff approve the masonry samples prior to purchase and installation;**
- 3. Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture;**
- 4. Staff approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation; and**
- 5. The one foot by one-foot (1' X 1') window openings on the left elevation be a minimum of four square feet (4 sq. ft.);**

finding that the proposal met the design guidelines for new construction in the Richland-West End Neighborhood. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

u. 1820 FOURTH AVENUE NORTH

Application: Demolition; New construction - infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 1820 4th Ave N. The infill will be two and one-half stories tall with a gable-L form, with a primarily brick exterior and half-timber siding in the gables. The foundation will also be brick, but typically, a foundation is a different material than the main walls.

At the rear is a three-story deck, uncovered on the top level, which will not be greatly visible because of its location. The form is similar to a house built nearby in Germantown with MHZC approval.

That house is two stories, this one is two and one-half stories because of the front dormer. Staff recommends eliminating the dormer as there are no buildings with more than two stories in the neighborhood.

The front window pattern is appropriate, but there need to be more windows on the sides and windows should be larger and vertically oriented.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the porch posts rested on narrow pedestals that were the same width as the porch posts. He stated that it may be appropriate for new construction but is not a historic characteristic.

Applicant for the project, Peggy Newman, stated she was fine with changing whatever needed to make it work.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

- 1. Columns on the right/front be placed on a masonry base that is wider than the column itself;**
 - 2. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of neighboring historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
 - 3. The foundation shall be a different material than the primary exterior wall cladding;**
 - 4. The dormers that give the house an additional upper half story are eliminated;**
 - 5. Staff approve the masonry samples prior to purchase and installation;**
 - 6. Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture;**
 - 7. Staff approve the concrete walkway and parking pad and texture;**
 - 8. Staff approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation;**
 - 9. The one foot by one foot (1'x1') window openings on the side elevation be a minimum of four square feet (4 sq.ft.);**
 - 10. Additional windows are added on the side elevations, with no expanse greater than thirteen feet (13') between any opening; and**
 - 11. The carport is deleted from any site plans used for permitting and constructing the principal building until such time as it is approved at a later date;**
- finding the project to meet the design guidelines for the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

v. 2403 BARTON AVENUE

Application: Demolition; New construction – infill and outbuilding
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for new construction at 2403 Barton. The applicant is proposing to demolish a non-contributing house and outbuildings and to construct a new house and outbuilding. The new house will be one story tall, brick, with a side gabled roof. The outbuilding will not be used as a detached accessory dwelling unit.

The context is made of one and one and one-half story houses, mainly mid-century Colonial and Tudor Revivals. The new house will be one story, side gabled, similar to the existing and many surrounding houses.

It will be primarily brick on the exterior walls and foundation, with a different color and texture at the foundation to distinguish it from the walls.

There will be a gable projecting to the rear, clad with cement-fiber or a composite siding. The cement-fiber is common, but Staff would need to approve samples of the composite siding.

The setbacks, height, are all compatible with the surrounding context.

John TeSelle, applicant for the project, stated that the owners currently live on the site and want to build a new house that is of its own-time. He agreed with all staff recommendations. In response to Commissioner Mosley's comments, Mr. TeSelle said that the mechanicals have already been "nudged back" from the drawings they were currently reviewing.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the demolition and new construction with the following conditions:

- **The floor level shall be constructed at height consistent with adjacent houses, to be verified by Staff;**
- **Brick color and texture shall be approved by staff;**
- **Window and door selections on the house and outbuilding shall be approved by staff;**
- **Front porch railings shall be approved by Staff;**
- **The right side driveway shall extend at least to the mid-point of the house; and**
- **The HVAC shall be located at or behind the midpoint of the building;**

finding that the project meets the design guidelines for new construction. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

w. 1214, 1216, 1220 ROSA L. PARKS BOULEVARD

Application: New construction—infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member Sean Alexander, presented the case of Rosa L. Parks Blvd. A similar application was reviewed and approved at this lot in February 2016. It included a two-story gabled roof building at the south end of the lot for a restaurant and a four story flat-roofed building at the north end, mixture or retail, office, and residential.

The applicant is returning with additional detail on the materials, and they have revised the north building, reducing it from four-stories to two-stories. The scale of the southern building has not been changed.

The North Building will have a flat roof at 34' tall, with a 150' "front" façade along Rosa L Parks Boulevard, divided into 4 smaller distinct components. The primary materials will be as in the previous concept: primarily brick with flush metal panel siding, with aluminum, steel, and glass integrated into the storefronts and upperstory windows.

These materials carry around the corners, and the back is lighter by moving away from the brick and utilizing primarily the metal siding and glass.

The recommendation includes conditions on approving the materials, as well as a utility screen and lighting fixtures, Staff found them appropriate. The signage, signboard, and signage illumination on the plans are for illustrative representation only, they still need to be submitted for review.

Returning to the front, on the right side of the building is a projecting or cantilevered balcony. This is not a typical feature of historic commercial buildings in the area, so staff recommends that it be eliminated.

On the South building, the scale is the same, and the materials are largely the same. While the form is two stories, the upperstory is a terrace or open seating and the windows are open, and to enclose them with glass, plastic, curtains, etc., would be a change that needs to be approved by MHZC.

Architect, Nick Dryden, stated they are asking for a smaller building based on feedback from the neighborhood. The residential component has been removed and there is now office space on the second level and retail on the first level. The general site plan has not changed. Another concern of the neighborhood was the impact of the rear design; however, that is no longer an issue since it is only 2-stories. They also liked the second floor balcony, despite staff's recommendation; therefore, they are requesting to keep that element of the design. He believes that it will work within zoning and public work's recommendations.

Commissioner Mosley asked if they had done balconies on other commercial projects. Mr. Dryden, said not like this one, which extends into the right-of-way. Commissioner Mosley expressed concern with the fact that the balcony is projecting rather than recessed.

Commissioners discussed other balconies in the district and their specific conditions and context.

Motion:

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

- 1. The projecting balcony is removed from the front façade of the northern building;**
- 2. Additional information is provided for the rooftop utility screens and integral signage;**
- 3. Material selections for both buildings, including colors and textures, are approved by Staff prior to permitting and construction;**
- 4. Any projections over the sidewalk or other public right-of-ways would require approval of Metro Council;**
- 5. The terrace “window” openings should not be enclosed later, either with windows, plastic or any other type of covering, without a Preservation Permit or a revision of the existing permit, and**
- 6. Signage, lighting, fences, and other appurtenances shall be administratively approved prior to permit and construction;**

finding the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

There were no requests for preliminary or final SP reviews.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

x. CLG TRAINING: Jenna Stout

Intern, Jenna Stout, presented an overview of her research on local post-war housing.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

y. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

Meeting adjourned at 4:27

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2016