

MEGAN BARRY  
MAYOR



# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission  
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

## METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

September 21, 2016

**Commissioners Present:** Brian Tibbs (chairman), Ann Nielson, Jim Hoobler (alternate for Menié Bell as MHC representative), Aaron Kaalberg, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart

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

**Council Member:** Councilmember Nancy VanReece

**Applicants:** Emma and Todd Mayo, Navary Moore, Barry White and Erica Garrison, Steven Navyac, Seab Tuck, John Root, Tyler LeMarinel

**Public:** Shawn Henry, Claudette Stager spoke as an expert witness for the Tennessee Historical Commission.

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m., and welcomed new member Elizabeth Mayhall.

### I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember VanReece requested to speak when her case came up.

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. August 17, 2016

**Motion:**

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

### III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTION

**b. 1020 GIBSON DRIVE, SMITH-CARTER HOUSE**

Application: Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay

Council District: 08

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented a request for a recommendation to Council regarding a Historic Landmark. The property is an important piece of Nashville's musical history because of its association with music legends Carl Smith and the Carter family, specifically three generations of Carter women, Maybelle, June and Carlene Carter. Because of this association, the property meets the requirements of the ordinance. Staff suggests the Commission recommend to City Council that the Smith-Carter house be adopted as a Historic Landmark District and that the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines be used to guide future alterations.

Councilmember Nancy VanReece spoke in favor of the project. She is pleased that the new owner respects the history of the building. She anticipates some exciting things happening at this property.

Emma and Todd Mayo stated that they appreciated everyone's help. They are honored to live there and look forward to preserving it in the future.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to recommend the Historic Landmark and adopt the existing design guidelines to guide future change. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**c. 2614 JEFFERSON STREET, BARONS CLUB**

Application: Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay

Council District: 21

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented a request for a recommendation to Council regarding a Historic Landmark. Club Baron is significant for its connection to Nashville's African-American music scene from the 1950s and 60s. It hosted many of the musicians who had a strong influence on today's American music and is the only one left of a collection of clubs that were located in this area on and near Jefferson Street. For these reasons the building meets standard 1 and 2 of section 17.36.120.

Navery Moore, Exalted Ruler of the Elks Lodge, representing the owners of the property stated their support for designation.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to recommend to council a Historic Landmark for the property and to adopt the existing design guidelines to guide future change. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

*Commissioner Hoobler arrived at 2:13 p.m.*

**d. 712 NEELYS BEND, IDLEWILD**

Application: Historic Bed and Breakfast Homestay

Council District: 09

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented a request for a recommendation to Council regarding a Historic Bed & Breakfast Homestay. The 1874 property was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as an excellent example of Italianate period architecture. It is also a local Historic Landmark.

Because the property is listed in the National Register, the property meets the requirements of the ordinance for a B&B Homestay.

The ordinance states that alterations for a Bed & Breakfast Homestay should follow the design guidelines for neighborhood conservation zoning overlays; however, the property is already a Historic Landmark. Staff recommends approval of the overlay with the condition that alterations continue to follow the design guidelines for Historic Landmarks rather than neighborhood conservation zoning design guidelines.

Staff suggests the Commission recommend to City Council that 712 Neelys Bend be adopted as Historic Bed & Breakfast Homestay with the condition that the design guidelines for Historic Landmarks continue to be used to guide exterior alterations, finding that the project meets section 17.26.120.C of the ordinance for a Historic Bed & Breakfast Homestay.

Commissioner VanReece spoke in support of the project stating that Councilmember Pridemore and the neighborhood were in support.

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

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Stewart moved to recommend to council a Historic Bed and Breakfast Homestay for the property with the condition that the design guidelines for Historic Landmarks continue to be used to guide exterior alterations. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**IV. CONSENT AGENDA**

**e. 208 MAYFAIR ROAD**

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

**f. 122 WINDSOR DRIVE**

Application: New construction—addition  
Council District: 23  
Overlay: Belle Meade Links Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

**g. 1825 FOURTH AVENUE NORTH**

Application: New construction—addition  
Council District: 19  
Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

**h. 1202 GARTLAND AVENUE**

Application: New construction—detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

**i. 2410 OAKLAND AVENUE**

Application: New construction – setback determination  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

**j. 1429 GREENWOOD AVENUE**

Application: New construction – detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

**k. 1207 GARTLAND AVENUE**

Application: Demolition, New construction – detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

**l. 312 BROADWAY**

Application: Signage  
Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

**m. 1919 19<sup>th</sup> AVENUE SOUTH**

Application: New construction – detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont - Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

**n. 1820 FOURTH AVENUE NORTH**

Application: New construction – outbuilding; Setback determination  
Council District: 19  
Overlay: Salemton Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member, Melissa Sajid read the items on consent with the exception of 1919 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, 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 Kaalberg moved to approve all consent agenda items with their applicable conditions with the exception of 1919 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, finding them to meet the applicable design guidelines. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS**

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

**o. 201 BROADWAY**

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

This is a case that was deferred from last month. Multiple alterations took place without a Preservation Permit. Since last month, the applicant has agreed to change the trailers into motorized vehicles, which do not require MHZC review, leaving only the flagpoles and the ATM for review. Each have different legal counsel and so were broken up into two different staff recommendations. The one for the flagpoles has been deferred for additional research by Metro Legal. Therefore, today, we will just be discussing the ATM.

The design guidelines require that new construction be “consistent with existing buildings along a street in terms of height, scale, setback, and rhythm; relationship of materials, texture, details, and color; roof shape; orientation; and proportion and rhythm of openings.” The historic streetscape includes a minimum of two-story buildings with walls that extend the full width of the lot, store-front windows and upper-level punched-openings. The ATM does not create the solid rhythm established by the historic buildings.

In addition to not meeting the design guidelines for new construction, the ATM does not meet the policy the Commission established in 2004 that only allows for ATMs inside a building, where it would not have to be reviewed, or “in an alcove not on the primary facade.” Since there is no building, there is no alcove in which to place the ATM. In addition, free-standing ATMs would not likely be approved by other departments.

The improvements all include signage; however, signage, not associated with a building, does not meet the design guidelines. The size allotment for any sign, whether or not it is attached to a building, is based on the width of the building.

The applicant requested that staff consider a policy that would allow for the ATM, similar as to what was done in 2004 for attached ATMs. Staff did not feel that such a policy would be consistent with the design guidelines for the historic overlay and therefore would be akin to changing the design guidelines without notice and public comment. In addition to being within a historic overlay, the property is in an MDHA design review district and such a policy would be inconsistent with their design guidelines. Currently the two overlays are consistent, making it easier for applicants to navigate.

Staff recommends disapproval of the ATM finding the project does not meet Section III of the design guidelines for new construction or Section IV for Signage.

Barry White, with First Farmer's Bank, provided information on how the violation came to be. The bank helped the Trolley Company to purchase the lot and offered a location on the lot for ATM. They knew it was a historic district but they received an email from Mr. Henry stating that no historic review was required. They spent a great deal of time of designing the structure. The façade is a vinyl wrap that is similar to murals everywhere. They would like to have a different artist place a mural on it each month. It is not a huge profit center, but rather, an advertisement for the bank. They are willing to talk about how to change it.

Erica Garrison, legal counsel for the bank, noted the letter sent to the Commission in advance. She explained several issues: the design guidelines are vague in terms of ATMs, the design guidelines are specific to buildings and do not reference ATMs, the ATM policy was only for Second Avenue Historic District, the proposal meets the discussion of the policy in the minutes, and the commission should not review use.

Shawn Henry, representative of the owner of the property, passed out a letter explaining how the violation came to be and what they were doing to move forward. The photograph on the last page of the letter provides a perspective of how the structure fits in to the property.

There were no comments from the public.

Commissioner Mayhall disclosed that she received a call from Mr. Henry last month but they did not discuss the project.

Chairman Tibbs asked why they were told they would not need a permit. Ms. Zeigler explained that the Codes Administration said that they would not need a building permit; however, three different representatives of the property were told that a Preservation Permit would be needed. The two permits are not tied together.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the ATM was a building or not. Macy Amos, legal counsel stated that it is a structure and the only structure that would be appropriate on this lot would be a building. Because it is a structure in a historic preservation district, the commission has the authority to review it.

Kaalberg asked if staff's analysis would be any different if the structure did not have an ATM, but instead had a person in it selling tickets. Ms. Zeigler said it would not. It is not the use but the structure itself that does not meet the design guidelines.

Commissioner Stewart commended the bank for their community support; however, to assure that changes meet the expectations of the public who requested the overlay he supports staff's recommendation. Commissioner Nielson expressed concern over other vending type uses that would come up, if this were approved. Kaalberg said the 2004 ATM policy is not relevant but the issue is that it is an appurtenance. How can it be an appurtenance if it is not associated with anything, such as a building; however, the definition of appurtenance talks about appurtenances to streetscapes as well. That is what we have here. It is a structure, it is an appurtenance and it does have to meet the design guidelines.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to disapprove the project based on the fact that it does not meet Section III of the design guidelines. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

## VI. MHZC ACTIONS

### m. 1919 19<sup>th</sup> AVENUE SOUTH

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

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont - Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for 1919 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, removed from the consent agenda. The new building will be a one and one-half story outbuilding with a two-car garage on the first story and living space above.

Staff finds the height of the building to be appropriate and to meet the design guidelines, and that the materials are also appropriate and compatible with those of the house. Staff asks to approve window and door selections.

The footprint of the building will be 740 square feet; while the footprint size meets the design guidelines, at this size the bulk zoning regulations would require a 20 foot rear setback and 5 foot side setback.

The applicant is requesting a setback determination for the building to be located twenty feet (20') from the rear of the property and three feet (3') from the right side.

The Commission has the ability to set setbacks that are appropriate for the lot and the district;

Rear setback determinations have been routinely approved for DADUs because outbuildings were historically built closer to the rear, and because the neighboring properties that would be affected are typically buffered by an alley in between.

However, the Commission has never deviated from the DADU ordinance's side setback requirement, which would be directly impacted by the new dwelling.

Kaalberg asked if the side setbacks have been reduced in the past. Mr. Alexander explained that rear setbacks are routinely reduced for both outbuildings and DADUs and the Commission has reduced side setbacks for outbuildings; however, the Commission has not reduced side setbacks for DADUs.

Steven Navyac, homeowner, explained that the upstairs set will actually be a home office. The request for the 3' is so that the vehicles will be able to have the most direct path into the garage. The neighbors are aware of their plans and support the request.

Commissioner Stewart asked why the 2' is needed. Mr. Navyac showed that the driveway is narrow and they want to be able to pull straight into the garage rather than making a turn.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

#### **Motion:**

**Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve with the following conditions:**

- 1. The right side setback shall be a minimum of five feet (5');**
  - 2. Staff shall approve the window and door selections prior to installation; and**
  - 3. A restrictive covenant for the detached accessory dwelling unit shall be filed with the Register of Deeds prior to issuance of a permit,**
- finding that the project meets section 17.16.030. G. of the ordinance and Section II.B.i of the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

### p. 120 THIRD AVENUE SOUTH

Application: New construction and alterations (completed without a permit)

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

The case for 120 Third Avenue South was removed from the agenda.

**q. 300 BROADWAY**

Application: New construction—addition; Storefront alterations  
Council District: 19  
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for 300 Broadway. She explained that a similar proposal was approved last month with conditions. The applicant has worked with staff on the alterations and a permit has been issued so the current request is just for the roof top addition.

Section III.H.2 of the design guidelines requires that rooftop additions be stepped-back at least thirty feet (30') from the main façade and twenty feet (20') from the secondary façade.

The bulk of the addition is stepped-back the required amount from the street-side façades with three exceptions:

1. A canopy/coping around the addition extends into the step-back area by approximately four feet (4').
2. A covered bar that is eight feet (8') wide protrudes sixteen (16') into the required front step-back area.
3. On the Third Avenue North side is a stairwell that protrudes into the step-back area by thirteen feet (13'). The stairwell is four feet (4') tall above the parapet wall and seven feet (7') wide.

Staff finds that approval of the stairwell is appropriate as it is similar to other approvals that have been made to accommodate a stairwell.

In the past, the Commission has not allowed for an intrusion into the required step-back area beyond small-scale, minimal enclosures for stairs. This proposal is for three different intrusions rather than just one.

Staff recommends that the bar awning be removed; however, the bar itself may remain. In 2012 a similar request to cover a rooftop bar located within the step-back area was denied. No other such requests have been approved.

Staff recommends that the coping surrounding the addition protrude no more than two feet (2') into the stepped-back area. The Commission should be aware that this approval could set a precedent as no other such requests have been approved.

The design guidelines require that a rooftop addition be no taller than fifteen feet (15') above the front parapet wall; however, the proposal is for seventeen feet (17') above the parapet wall, including the mechanical screen. Additional height has not been approved in the past, in like situations. Staff recommends disapproval since the proposal does not meet the design guidelines and similar requests have not been approved.

Staff recommends approval of the addition with the conditions that:

1. The awning over the bar is removed, allowing the bar itself to remain in the step-back area;
2. The four foot (4') canopy/coping overhang be reduced to be no more than two feet (2');
3. Applicant submit detail drawings showing the design of the addition; and
4. Staff provide final review of window, doors and metal color.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the application will meet Sections III. H for rooftop additions in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Seab Tuck showed drawings illustrating the project and showing how it is different from last month's proposal. It will not be seen from the opposite side of the street. This building is one of the tallest buildings on Broadway and the regulations are the same for all buildings, no matter the height. The mechanical screen is what places them over the height requirement. The height should be occupied space rather than a screen, as that will mean that the screen should be removed. The bar canopy is important as health code requires cover for mixing drinks.

Claudette Stager and Jane Coleman-Harbison, Tennessee Historical Commission, stated their concern that if too many alterations are made to a building it can be removed from the National Register. Their goal is to keep properties listed in the National Register. Any time there is a federally funded or licensed project agencies can also have properties delisted by the Keeper of the National Register, without consulting the state historic preservation office. There have been many changes to the district and they encouraged the Commission to consider how much is too much.

Commissioner Stewart asked if there is any direct implication for this particular project. Ms. Stager explained that it is a cumulative effect for the full district. If they were using the tax credits, the addition would not be approved and it would likely make it a non-contributing building.

Mr. Tuck rebutted that the firm is very supportive of the district. Somewhere along the line, the step back determination was set at a specific number. To have the exact same criteria for this building as a two-story building does not make sense and that is the exception they are requesting. The mechanical screen is important for the client to screen and the mechanicals will be seen as you are coming down the street.

Commissioner Kaalberg explored different options for reducing the impact of the mechanical screen. Commissioner Mosley agreed that mechanicals should be screened; however, the screening is not the issue, it's the fact that the mechanicals fill the addition and therefore has a mass to it, a mass which exceeds the mass for which the design guidelines allow. Commissioner Mosley also expressed concern that if the design guidelines were changed, they would not want to treat applicants differently.

In answer to Commissioner Kaalberg's question about precedent, Ms. Zeigler reiterated that the State is telling them what the design guidelines allow for is already too much so she cautioned the Commission about allowing for even more. She reminded them that if they allow more here, everyone else will come in and ask for more.

Commissioner Kaalberg said that he is not sure there is an issue in terms of too many alterations on lower Broadway, and suggested that they consider a study.

Commissioner Nielson voted to approve recommendation. Commissioner Hoobler seconded. Commissioner Mosley asked if the motion could be rescinded so that he could ask the applicant a question. Commissioner Nielson rescinded the motion.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked if the screen could be pushed back. Mr. Tuck said that it could not be pushed back without making everything taller. The screen has an effect on massing because it is on the edge of the building.

Commissioner Stewart asked if it would be beneficial for the screen only to come up a foot or two. Mr. Tuck said he did not think that would help with the noise or aesthetics.

Commissioner Mayhall disclosed that she was not present last month but she did watch the hearing.

Commissioner Mosley asked Staff why they requested a 2' overhang, is that a standard. Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission it was not standard, it was another request that would be going beyond the design guidelines.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the addition with the conditions that:**

- 1. The awning over the bar is removed, allowing the bar itself to remain in the step-back area;**
- 2. The four foot (4') canopy/coping overhang be reduced to no more than two feet (2');**
- 3. Applicant submit detail drawings showing the design of the addition; and**
- 4. Staff provide final review of window, doors and metal color,**

**finding the project meets Sections III. H for rooftop additions in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Hoobler seconded. The motion passed with four concurring votes and Commissioner Kaalberg and Stewart voting against the motion.**

**r. 1104 FATHERLAND STREET**

Application: New construction—addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA SAJID

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for an addition at 1104 Fatherland Street.

This request is to construct a rear addition. The single-story building at 1104 Fatherland Street was built c. 1914 and contributes to the character of the Lockeland Springs – East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

The proposed rear addition will add 24' to the depth and 624 SF to the overall footprint. The addition does not meet the design guideline that requires new construction to be inset at least 1' per story from the rear corners of the historic building. As proposed, the addition sets in 3'-4" from the right corner and 5" from the left. The applicant contends that the proposed insets are sufficient since the rear corners are obscured by existing bump outs located closer to the front of the historic structure. The 1914 Sanborn map, however, shows that the existing rear corners are likely original to the structure. Setting in the addition 1' per story helps to ensure that the new construction is distinguished from the existing historic structure, allows the full form of the original building to be kept intact and would allow for original conditions to be restored, if desired in the future. As proposed, the addition does not meet this requirement.

As proposed, the addition is significantly taller than the historic structure. From the front the addition scales out to be approximately 9'-6" taller than the historic structure. The design guidelines require that ridge and eave heights of an addition be similar to or lower than the existing building in order for the addition to be compatible in scale to the historic building.

The italicized portion of the design guidelines also allows additions to be up to 4' taller than a historic structure when the additional height is located at least 40' from the front edge of the existing building and "when a taller addition is the only option." In this case, the grade drops significantly from the front of the lot to the rear, allowing the possibility of a basement level, or two-story addition behind this one-story building. Staff does not find that additional height is necessary, in this instance. The proposed addition includes the basement and two additional stories, which altogether overwhelms the existing historic structure.

In conclusion, Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed rear addition, finding that the application does not meet Section II.B of the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs – East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The proposed height and scale of the addition are incompatible with the existing single-story historic structure, and the addition is not easily removable, allowing for a full restoration if desired in the future. For these reasons, staff finds that the addition does not meet Section II.B.10.a and d of the design guidelines.

John Root, architect for the project, provided a revised front elevation. The rear of the house is not original to the house. Because of the insets, the addition will not be seen from Fatherland. Lowering the pitch of the roof would make it look awkward.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mayhall stated that she noted that the houses around it are all 1-story and she is concerned that the 2-story addition will be out of character with the neighborhood.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the rear addition, finding that the application does not meet Section II.B of the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs – East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The proposed height and scale of the addition are incompatible with the existing single-story historic structure, and the addition is not easily removable, allowing for a full restoration if desired in the future. Commission seconded and the motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**s. 2715 BRIGHTWOOD AVENUE**

Application: New construction—infill and outbuilding  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

2715 Brightwood Avenue is an application to construct infill on a vacant lot. The outbuilding that was originally part of the project will be reviewed in October. The site is at the corner of Brightwood Avenue and Wildwood Avenue. The lot was recently subdivided from the property next door at 2711 Brightwood Avenue.

The proposed infill will be one and a half stories with a maximum height of twenty-nine feet, six inches (29'6"). However, the bulk of the house will be twenty-eight, six inches (28'6") tall. The height is in keeping with the historic context, where the historic houses are one and one-and-a-half stories with heights ranging from twenty-three to twenty-nine (23'-29'). The house will be brick, and all of the known materials have been approved by the Commission in the past. Staff asks that four to six inch mullions be included between all multiple window openings.

Staff recommends approval of the infill with conditions.

The applicant was not present and there was no public comment.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that:**

- 1. 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;**
  - 2. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
  - 3. Staff approve masonry;**
  - 4. Staff approve the roof color;**
  - 5. A front walkway be added leading from the sidewalk to the front entry, and staff approve the walkway material;**
  - 6. All multiple window openings have a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion in between them; and**
  - 7. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house**
- Finding the project to meet Section II.B. of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**t. 1702 SWEETBRIAR AVENUE**

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

Sean Alexander, staff, presented the case for infill at 1702 Sweetbriar, an application for infill construction.

The lot is vacant, the non-contributing house there previously has been demolished.

The new building will be a two-story single family house.

The form of the building will be similar to that of an American Foursquare house with a thirty-six foot wide primary mass with a porte cochere adding sixteen feet on the right side.

The porte cochere will be accessed from an alley running along the right side of the property.

The lot is sixty-seven feet wide, roughly 50% wider than most lots in the area so this additional width is appropriate.

The overall height of thirty-five feet is also in keeping with the heights on nearby houses, which includes many two-story houses. The foundation height will be consistent with the adjacent house, with the front lot will be graded with a rise similar as well.

The side elevations show that as the building extends to the rear, the massing of the building will be broken up with sections of wall that set in and bump-out, by shorter sections of roof, and by the porte cochere.

Considering all of these factors, Staff finds the scale of the proposed building to be appropriate for the context.

The building will have a brick veneer exterior, a stone foundation, and an asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal secondary roofs.

Staff asks to approve specific masonry selections, roof colors, and the window and door selections.

Architect for the project, Tyler LeMarinel, said he agreed with the conditions and was available for questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

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

- 1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
  - 2. All unknown materials, including brick, stone, roof colors, and window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase and installation;**
  - 3. Paving material, including colors and textures, shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase and installation; and,**
  - 4. The HVAC shall be located behind the midpoint of the building or at the rear**
- finding the proposed infill meets the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**V. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW**

There are no requests for a preliminary SP review.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS**

**u. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH**

**REMINDER THAT THE NEXT MEETING IS AT THE  
Midtown Precinct, 1443 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South**

**RATIFIED BY COMMISSION**