

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

December 21, 2016

Commissioners Present: Brian Tibbs, Chair, Vice-chair Rose Cantrell, Menié Bell, Samuel Champion, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Ann Nielson, Cyril Stewart,

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

Applicants: Jim O'Shea, Kyle Boswell, Amy Gill, Aaron Vermeulen, Dennis Payne, Preston Quirk, Patrick Chisholm, DeRon Jenkins, Manuel Zeitlin

Public: Council Members Robert Swope and Colby Sledge

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

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. October 19, 2016 and November 16, 2016

Motion:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve the minutes for November 16, 2016. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the minutes for October 19, 2016. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Tibbs recognized out-going commissioner Rose Cantrell with a certificate. Ms. Cantrell said she has enjoyed serving on the commission and getting to know all the Commissioners, staff and applicants.

Chairman Tibbs requested that they move the consent agenda to be heard prior to new overlays.

Motion:

Chairman Bell moved to address the consent agenda items prior to the new overlays. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chairman read information regarding the meeting and appeal processes.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

The Chairman explained the consent agenda process and noted that 118 Lauderdale was removed from the consent agenda. Staff member, Paul Hoffman read the items on the consent agenda noting that the applicant requested deferral of 2115 Westwood.

- b. 211 MANCHESTER AVENUE**
Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock
- c. 1004 ACKLEN AVENUE**
Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock
- d. 409 BROADWAY**
Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock
- e. 400 BROADWAY**
Application: New construction-addition (alteration to previously approved addition)
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock
- f. 118 LAUDERDALE AVENUE**
Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit); setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock
- g. 1011 CHICAMAUGA AVENUE**
Application: New construction-addition; Outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman
- h. 1702 SWEETBRIAR AVENUE**
Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman
- i. 1404 BENJAMIN STREET**
Application: New construction-addition (detached accessory dwelling unit)
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid
- j. 901 GILMORE AVENUE**
Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid
- k. 2809 OAKLAND AVENUE**

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

l. 2115 WESTWOOD AVENUE

Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro – West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

m. 2308 BELMONT BOULEVARD

Application: New construction-outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit); Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

n. 2040 ELLIOTT AVENUE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

o. 1626 SHELBY AVENUE

Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 6
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

p. 423 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

q. 126 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

r. 4119 ABERDEEN ROAD

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 24
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

s. 1806 LAKEHURST

Application: New construction-outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit)
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

t. 1610 SUMNER AVENUE

Application: New construction-outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit)
Council District: 06

Overlay: Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Motion

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve all consent agenda items with their applicable conditions with the exception of 2115 Westwood and 118 Lauderdale. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Tibbs recognized Councilman Colby Sledge. The Councilman noted that he has been working with the applicant on 2314 9th Avenue South on revising their application and will reserve his comments for Hillview Heights-Inverness when that case comes up on the agenda.

III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTION

u. 10604 CONCORD ROAD/ CONCORD BAPTIST CHURCH

Application: Historic Landmark
Council District: 04
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Ms. Zeigler introduced the case for a Historic Landmark at 10605 Concord Road. The building is significant for its important association with the Baptist Church and an influential battle during the Civil War. According to the Tennessee Historical Commission, the building is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and so meets standard 17.36.120.5 of the ordinance.

Staff suggests the Commission recommend to City Council that the Concord Baptist Church be adopted as an Historic Landmark and that the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines be used to guide future alterations.

Margaret Castro, representative of the church, explained the history of the building.

Allen Dooley, is the architect for master planning of the project. He has 25 years' experience in designing Baptist churches. Dooley stated that this one has all the parts of the evolution of the Baptist church, which most churches have lost. Many are located by rivers, as this one is. It is unique and may be the earliest one in existence. It is eligible for listing in the National Register and also has Civil War history and architectural features. It will be open to the public for use, perhaps as a greenways trailhead.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to recommend designation of 10604 Concord Road as a Historic Landmark and to adopt the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines to apply to the property. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

v. HILLVIEW HEIGHTS-INVERNESS

Application: Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Council District: 17
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Ms. Zeigler explained that public comment was forwarded to the Commissioners via email and that 9 surveys were given to her at the beginning of the meeting from people in opposition. The staff report goes into detail as to why this neighborhood is important and eligible for this type of zoning, and Ms. Zeigler provided a brief summary.

The Hillview Heights-Inverness district is historically and architecturally significant as a part of Nashville's early to mid-century residential growth and development. It is characterized by a clear integrity of location, design, setting, materials, feeling, workmanship, and association. There are few modern intrusions. There is only one historic building that has undergone significant changes which undermine its historic integrity. Approximately 68% of the area is contributing.

The architectural forms and styles within the Hillview Heights-Inverness district clearly reflect both the local and national trends of residential design, house construction and development in its period of significance (c.1900-1965).

The Hillview Heights-Inverness district survives as an excellent representation of the evolving movements in suburban development, from development associated with streetcar to the automobile. The proposed district meets section 17.36.120.3 as it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction.

Councilman Sledge explained that the possibility of an overlay came up a year ago when the neighborhood was working on an overlay for Waverly-Belmont, but the process was too far down the road for this section to be included at that time. The map was determined based on surveys done at that time. Owners of the one property that would have linked the two districts and created an extension to the existing overlay were not interested in being included in the overlay, so that property was removed. This left the area to become a stand-alone district rather than an extension of an existing district. The homes are the same type and style as in the Waverly-Belmont neighborhood. For the most part, this area represents the only pocket in the immediate area that qualifies.

James Gilbert, 2400 9th Ave S, stated that he does not support the overlay. He expressed concern about a ditch in front of his home, which is not regularly cleaned out and therefore causes his basement to flood.

William Smallman, 1512 Paris Avenue, expressed concern that the process happened too fast. He handed out surveys in opposition and a map showing the locations of those property owners who are in opposition.

Andrew Carroll, 801 Inverness, stated that the process has been rushed and not transparent. Any overlay should be done in consultation with the current property owners.

Irvin Kilcrease, 945 Inverness, said the neighborhood has been deconstructed. There is much new construction around them that has been given free reign and it is too late to impose restrictions. Originally he was in favor of it but now he is against it.

Irene Simmons, 949 Inverness, has lived in the neighborhood for years. She was for it but after all the new construction she believes it is too little too late. Looking at the design guidelines, she finds them to be too restrictive. She feels that she will be held hostage as to what she can do with her property. She plans to live there for the rest of her life.

William Douglas, 943 Inverness, has lived in the neighborhood for 46 years. Five years ago new construction began around his property and no one said anything about an overlay. There is not a house left in the area that is historical.

Bob Dickman, 820 Inverness, has lived there since 1987. He loves his old house but is realistic enough to know that Inverness road is not quaint, historic or family-friendly, so it should be excluded. Traffic will be terrible.

Andrea Woodard, 921 Hillview Heights, stated that they have repeatedly asked for a list of contributing properties and have not received it. Legal counsel, Ms. Amos, informed Ms. Woodard that the list was included in the report posted online and provided her with a printed copy.

Mr. Smallman attempted to come back to speak but was informed that the rebuttal period is for the applicant to respond to public comment, not for the public to rebut each other.

Chuck Vehorn, a block captain regarding the overlay, has lived in Nashville for 2.5 years. He explained that he tried to get included in the Waverly-Belmont overlay but it was decided there was not enough time to gain support. The benefits for the neighbors are in line with NashvilleNext. He strongly supported the overlay. He informed the Commission that 22 homeowners said yes to the overlay, 5 said no, a few others wanted more information, some received surveys and expressed general support but wanted to turn in the survey at a later date. Some of those were returned and others were not. Every time Mr. Smallman contacted him, he referred him to Ms. Zeigler. He handed out a copy of the survey.

David Dean, 809 Hillview Heights, said the overlay provides a good opportunity to preserve what is left. More infill and more construction is not something he is interested in. Some of the opponents may own property in the neighborhood but they don't necessarily live in the neighborhood.

Mary Horn, 811 Hillview Heights, is in favor of the overlay to protect the character and charm of the neighborhood. They looked at many homes in many neighborhoods several years ago before buying their cottage. They would like to help maintain the charm and personality. They have received nine emails from people in support who could not attend.

Bill Compton, 828 Inverness, said he is in favor of the overlay as there was a front-end loader next door to him this morning demolishing a historic home. He used to live in Germantown and so is familiar with the overlays and has seen the advantages of having one. Some talked about lack of transparency; however, he and his wife talked to neighbors and provided information.

Lisa Easterwood, 813 Hillview Heights, is in favor of the overlay. She is sorry they didn't start years earlier but that is not a reason not to move forward with preserving the charm of the neighborhood. New construction currently does not fit in with the neighborhood. She was part of the team reaching out to neighbors on her street.

Wayne Easterwood, 813 Hillview Height, said he never planned on living in an older house but he is proud to be able to support it. He supports a planned progress with preservation, not restricting. Current work is often driven by profit. Although it is great design it isn't always contextual. The comments about lack of transparency are unfounded. The restrictions are modest and reasonable.

Ms. Zeigler explained that the process is for the Commission to consider whether or not the proposed district qualifies for the overlay and to make a recommendation to Council. Planning Commission will also look at it in terms of neighborhood plan and Nashville Next and will make a recommendation to Council.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the process is not a popularity contest and their role is to determine whether or not the neighborhood qualifies.

Champion said he is glad they (the commission) are not deciding for or against. Those who feel that they have not received enough information should take this opportunity to educate themselves before the next public hearing.

Commissioner Nielson said she has seen people before who were against an overlay in the beginning and then afterwards come to appreciate it.

Commissioner Cantrell said she is uncomfortable with the lack of support and it is not ready to be considered. Commissioner Champion agreed and agreed that it sounds like the neighborhood qualifies.

Chairman Tibbs invited the Councilman back to speak. Councilman Sledge said the process began several months ago when he discussed the possibility of the overlay with staff. They had a neighborhood meeting in November. The opposition has come to them in the past 5 days. They can always continue to work on design guidelines and the boundaries. A couple of buildings have already come down. Commissioner Champion suggested the Councilman make sure that everyone has complete information.

Commissioner Stewart stated that they have a request from the Councilman and looking through the materials, the neighborhood does qualify. He hopes discussions continue throughout the process.

Motions:

Chairman Champion moved to approve a recommendation to Council and adoption of the design guidelines. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Cantrell moved to adopt the design guidelines. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

VI. MHZC ACTIONS

h. 118 LAUDERDALE AVENUE

Application: New Construction—Addition and DADU; setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Chairman Tibbs noted that Commissioner Mosley recused himself for this case. 118 Lauderdale was pulled from the consent agenda because of public comment forwarded to the Commission via email on 12/20/16. Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the project, which is an application for an addition and a DADU, with a setback determination. 118 Lauderdale Road is a c. 1930 house that contributes to the historic character of the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. It is located at the corner of Lauderdale and Valley Road. In November 2016, the Historic Zoning Commission approved the demolition of an attached garage shown here. It also approved the construction of a side and rear addition. This application represents a new design for the addition and for a new detached accessory dwelling unit.

The proposed side addition is the same size as that which was approved last month – the only change is that it was previously clad in siding and now brick is proposed. The rear additions are modest in size. The applicant is proposing to add a dormer to a secondary roof plane, which is appropriate. The applicant also proposes to remove a window opening on the Valley Road face. The window opening is highly visible because it faces the side street, and staff finds that it contributes to the overall rhythm of openings on this façade. Staff therefore recommends that the window opening remain, as its removal does not meet Section II.B.2. for appropriate demolition. If the interior layout of the house is such that having a window opening in that area is problematic, staff recommends that the window opening remain, but be closed off on the interior. Staff finds the rear, side, and dormer additions to meet the design guidelines.

The proposed DADU is 1,000 sq. ft., which meets the design guidelines because the lot is over 10,000 square feet. The DADU does require a change to the rear and the Valley Road side setbacks. Base zoning requires a twenty foot (20') rear setback when outbuildings are larger than seven hundred square feet (700 sq. ft.). In this case, the applicant is proposing a 5' rear setback. Staff finds the proposed rear setback to be appropriate because outbuildings historically were located near or on the rear property line. A five foot (5') rear setback is more historically appropriate than a twenty foot (20') rear setback. In addition, the five foot (5') rear setback allows for more space between the primary structure and the DADU.

Base zoning also requires a twenty foot (20') side setback when there is an outbuilding with garage doors that face a side street. The applicant is proposing to situate the outbuilding just five feet (5') from the side property line. However, in this instance, there is a large, twenty-two foot, eight inch (22'8") right of way that is currently being used as part of the yard for 118 Lauderdale Road. This will give the appearance of a larger side setback and means that the structure will be more than twenty feet (20') from the roadbed. In addition, there are no other houses that face Valley Road on this side of the street, so there is not an established Valley Road setback for the DADU to meet. The five foot (5') setback allows for the retention of a tree. Staff finds the proposed setback determinations to meet the design guidelines.

The site plan also shows that the applicant intends to create a new double-wide curb cut at the rear of the lot, off of Valley Road. There is an existing double-wide curb cut in the middle of the lot, off of Valley. Staff recommends that the existing double wide curb cut be removed prior to the construction of the DADU and relocation of the driveway. The DADU will match the height of the historic house, or be slightly lower. Its height, scale, and materials meet the design guidelines and the DADU ordinance.

Commissioner Mosley left at the beginning of the staff presentation and returned prior to its conclusion.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, explained that the property is zoned for 2-family and they have looked at several solutions and determined that a DADU would be better than a larger addition. They are placing the building in the proposed location to avoid removing an old growth tree. The building will be 27'8" from the curb cut.

John Peterson, owner of the property, explained that he and his wife love old homes and they would like the opportunity to renovate this building, as they have others. He was required to send certified letters and hand-delivered letters, which he did. He talked to two of his adjacent neighborhoods and one diagonally across the street, all of whom were in favor of the project. He did not meet the one person directly across the street.

Michael Lee, 4018 Valley Road, has a driveway across from the proposed driveway. The five-foot setback will mean that they cannot park in their driveway. He did not receive a letter. There is no parking on Valley therefore the setback means that they will hit each other as they come out of their garages. The tree has already fallen on the garage. He is a developer and his first step would have been to talk to the neighbors. There is support from the neighborhood association that opposes the driveway. He handed out photographs.

Mr. Ward stated he has a copy of the arborist report but he did not hand it out. Commissioners did not request to see it. He does not think the two driveways will compete but if anyone has a survey of the property across the street he would be happy to look at it.

Commissioner Champion discussed the location of the driveway in comparison to the neighbor's driveway.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The applicant submit drawings with all the major measurements labeled and the new construction clearly differentiated from the historic house;**
- **Staff receive a copy of the filed restrictive covenant;**
- **The window opening on the Valley Road façade remain and be closed up on the interior if necessary;**
- **Staff approve a brick sample;**
- **Staff approve the roof color and materials;**
- **Staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- **The applicant submit floor plans for the DADU; and**
- **The existing curb cut along Valley Road be removed before the new curb cut is created for the DADU,**

finding that the addition, DADU, and setback determination will meet Section II.B. of the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines and the DADU ordinance, 17.16.030., Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

w. 1102 FORREST AVENUE

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for New construction-addition at 1102 Forrest Ave.

The applicant proposes an addition to an existing out building, zoned CS. To begin, you (the commission) received public comment regarding this project via email yesterday (Dec. 20) and I've received nine surveys against.

This project is for an addition to an existing outbuilding that includes a roof deck over the original footprint of and two levels in the area where the footprint has increased as well as an enclosure over a proposed bar. The majority of the work has already taken place without a proper Building Permit or Preservation Permit.

The design guidelines allow for six hundred and eight square feet (608 sq. ft.) for the footprint of a new outbuilding, which is 50% of the principle building's footprint. The existing outbuilding already exceeds that at one thousand and thirty-six square feet (1036 sq. ft.)

An additional five hundred and sixteen square foot (516 sq. ft.) footprint is proposed, for a total of one thousand five hundred and fifty two (1552 sq. ft.) square feet, which exceeds the footprint of the historic building. Because the property is zoned CS, Staff recommends capping the total square footage for this outbuilding, and future outbuildings zoned similarly on similarly sized lots, to one thousand five-hundred square feet (1500 sq. ft). Because the allowance of additional square footage for the outbuilding could set a precedent for future projects, Staff recommends a condition that when more square footage is allowed (not to exceed 1550 sq ft) for outbuildings in CS zones, that the amount of additional square footage be removed from any potential addition to the primary structure.

With a maximum square footage of one thousand five hundred square feet (1500) for the outbuilding and because of the CS zoning, staff finds that additional square footage to be appropriate.

The location is appropriate, the setbacks meet bulk zoning, the known materials are appropriate.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- Height not exceed 16’;
- Footprint not exceed 1500 sq. ft.;
- Staff review materials;
- Exterior stairs be removed; and
- The HVAC is located at the rear of the building or on the roof.

With these conditions, staff finds the project to meet section II.B.8 of the design guidelines for outbuildings.

Andrew Mischka has lived his entire life in Nashville. The project has been a learning experience for them. They plan on following the recommendations. He offered new drawings but the Commission decided not to accept new drawings, per their rules of order and procedure. He provided a description of the business. He claimed he had a building permit. They have met with their neighbors and the concern is more related to use than design. NES has asked them to place a pole in the alley but they would like to add a 2’ tubular structure on the outbuilding for power. The architect and contractor are also present.

Kevin Wisniewski, 1108 Gartland, listened to the Hillview Heights-Inverness debate and he wanted to tell people that having the overlay doesn't provide you the protection people might think. They have design guidelines and the project doesn't meet the design guidelines that they fought hard to put in place. They will remain meaningless unless the Commission upholds them. This is a residential subdistrict of the 5-Points neighborhood. It has not always been commercial. It was a residential garage prior. The outbuilding should not be allowed to be larger than the principle structure.

Richard McCoy, representing the neighborhood association, stated that although the property is not in his neighborhood, they are concerned about the wide-reaching effects of a decision to allow it. A decision that is based on the use of the property and does not meet the design guidelines. He provided examples of projects that were historic residential homes with commercial zoning but alterations have met the design guidelines without mention of their zoning. The commission has the ability to set the appropriate setbacks based on the development of the district, rather than the bulk standards. The project began without a permit, and that is happening all too frequently.

Hans Schmidt, representing LSEE, is opposed to the project because the decision should not be based on CS zoning and to create a policy that affects other properties could have unintended consequences. Approval sends the message that work done that does not follow the rules will be retroactively approved.

Mike Loyco, 1115 Forrest, stated that the reason he moved to the neighborhood was because of the overlay. He supports the use but is concerned that the massive outbuilding doesn't meet the design guidelines and will set a precedent for inappropriate future development.

Matthew Bell, 1119 Chester Avenue, lives about a mile from the project. He has seen Five-Points change and the problems that can come with an entertainment destination. He supports the project.

Chuck Anderson, owner of a mobile food truck who will do the food for the restaurant, said that the restaurant is a great opportunity for veterans. He supports the staff recommendation. They want a calm neighborhood door that supports the aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Haley White, 823 Beth Drive, is a Nashville native who is employed in Five-Points. The developers are not big-time developers from out-of-town but live in Nashville and want to provide an asset for the community.

Rob Cochran, general contractor for the project, stated that there is a building permit for the property but it was a mistake not to obtain a Preservation Permit. Once they realized the mistake they went to staff, who worked hard to assist.

Larry Papel, represents the owners of the property, who are quite invested in the property. There were some missteps made at the beginning that were both inside and outside metro, but once discovered the applicant took steps to rectify. The opposition's case that the property shouldn't be treated differently because of it is incorrect.

Mr. Mishka handed out more emails and explained the context of their location. The outbuilding has always been commercial. They have not made any changes to the historic home. The rooftop will not be a "party deck" but a seated deck.

Councilman Withers stated that it is unfortunate that work was done without a Preservation Permit. He expressed concern about a retroactive approval and the precedent it would set. There is a business across the street that received a permit for a deck but began constructing an addition. He worked with them to get them more time to correct the violation. He listens to his neighborhood associations who work very hard reviewing recommendations. He has received a number of emails from constituents for and against the business but the Commission's decision needs to be based on the design guidelines. There may be some opportunities to negotiate but he has not had an opportunity to review new plans. He supports the neighborhood association against the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Nielson asked if the owner wanted to defer so that they could review the new plans next month. The applicant said that they were meeting all the conditions but there was otherwise nothing altered.

Councilman Withers reiterated his concern that a policy will be created without proper review and consideration.

Commissioner Bell stated that she is concerned that the outbuilding exceeds the design guidelines, whatever the use is, as the use is not in their purview. She expressed concern about setting a precedent for future projects.

Commissioner Mosley stated that it is an existing outbuilding that has been enlarged. An addition on the house is possible. They need to consider unintended consequences and consider it irrespective of the fact that work has already begun.

Commissioner Stewart said it is a unique situation in that it has a commercial use; that is not residential in nature. He does not see it as precedent-setting because of the uniqueness of the lot.

Commissioner Champion and Cantrell said they need to consider the unique situation of the lot and that they will not be setting precedent. Commissioner Bell stated that there is a concern about setting precedent. Commissioner Nielson agreed that precedent will be set and she is not comfortable with it.

Commissioner Bell stated that the use is not the issue but that they should be thoughtful about how they review these individually, especially if the decision goes against what the neighborhood associations can support.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to disapprove the project and for the violation to be corrected.

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed with four concurring votes. Commissioners Cantrell, Mosley, and Stewart voted in opposition of the motion.

Commissioner Champion left the meeting at 4:26pm.

x. 1616 DOUGLAS AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for infill at 1616 Douglas.

The house located at 1616 Douglas Ave is a single-story Minimal Traditional house constructed c. 1948 that does not contribute to the historic character of the Eastwood neighborhood. Staff issued a demolition permit for the non-contributing structure earlier this month.

The immediate historic context on Douglas Avenue is 1 to 1.5 story homes that range from 20'-23' from grade. The width of historic homes on comparable lots with 50' of frontage ranges from 26'-29'. The house on the top left here is 1624 Douglas Ave, which is located to the left of the subject property and the house on the right is 1614 Douglas Ave, which is located to the right of the site. According to GIS, both of these houses are 20' tall. The applicant has taken field measurements of both houses and says that they measure 23' from grade. The house on the bottom is 1612 Douglas Ave, which is two houses to the right of the subject property.

The proposed infill will be oriented to Douglas Ave with a 6' deep full-width front porch. The proposed front setback is approximately 33'-5" from the front property line, which is close to the average of the front setbacks of the adjacent historic houses. However, the site plan does not show the front porch. If the footprint shown on the site plan includes the front porch, then the house should be pushed up closer to the street so that the front porch of the infill will not be behind those of the historic homes to either side of the subject property. More information is needed to determine if the proposed front setback is appropriate.

In terms of width, the site plan does not match the floor plans; however, staff believes that the floor plan is the configuration that the applicant is proposing. The proposed building width is 35' at the front, according to the floor plan and narrows to 33' approximately 19' behind the front wall of the proposed infill. The site plan, however, shows a rectangular footprint without any bump ins. Historic buildings in the immediate vicinity range from twenty-six to twenty-nine feet (26'-29') wide at the front setback. The proposed infill at 35' wide is significantly wider than the historic context on similar lots.

As proposed the building is 35' wide and has a depth of 72'-10" and would meet the 5' side and 20' rear setbacks per the bulk zoning requirements. However, the building is wider and deeper than the immediate historic context. So, although the building meets the side and rear setbacks of the bulk zoning requirements, staff finds that the massing of a building that is both wider and deeper than historic buildings in the immediate area will dominate the open space between buildings and would disrupt the rhythm of the established streetscape. The proposed width translates to 7'-6" side setbacks while the immediate context ranges from nine to thirteen foot (9'-13') side setbacks. Staff finds that the side setbacks of the proposed infill do not meet section II.B.c of the design guidelines.

The proposed new house is 1.5 stories at the front with an overall height of 23'-6". The proposed overall height is slightly taller than historic homes in the immediate vicinity, which includes 1 to 1.5 story homes that range from twenty to twenty-three feet (20'-23') from grade. The building width is 35', which is wider than the historic context. Although the surrounding area includes buildings that may be nearly as tall as the proposed infill, staff finds that the combined effect of being taller, wider, and deeper than nearby buildings produces a building for which the scale is incompatibly large. For these reasons, staff finds that the scale of the proposed infill does not meet sections II.B.a for height and II.B.b for scale of the design guidelines.

As proposed, the foundation will be split-face concrete block, and the primary cladding will be hardie siding. Accent materials have not been indicated on the plans. The infill is two stories at the rear. The roof slope on the rear has a pitch of only 3:12 while the design guidelines recommend a pitch of at least 6:12. For this reason, staff finds that the project does not meet Section II.B.e of the design guidelines for roof shape.

Here is the right side elevation, which includes some smaller square windows. Per the design guidelines, windows should be twice as tall as they are wide, as seen historically. Staff finds that the proportions of the square windows are inappropriate, as they do not meet these proportions. For this reason, staff finds that the project does not meet Section II.B.g for proportions and rhythm of openings. Here is the left side elevation, which also includes a window that does not meet the design guidelines for proportion and rhythm of openings.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the proposed infill, since the width, front setback, and proposed materials are unclear, and because the building would not be compatible with surrounding historic houses. Also, staff finds that the project does not meet the following sections of the Eastwood NCZO: Handbook and Design Guidelines:

- Section II.B.a for height;
- Section II.B.b for scale;
- Section II.B.c for setbacks and rhythm of spacing;
- Section II.B.e for roof shape, and;
- Section II.B.g for proportions and rhythm of openings.

Commissioner Mosley stated that the roof shape and the height are tied together.

David Hale, designer for the project, stated he was available for questions. The small windows are in the kitchen and bathroom. He asked to defer the project; therefore the Commission took no action.

y. 2314 NINTH AVENUE SOUTH

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Melissa Sajid, staff member, presented the case for 2314 Ninth Avenue South.

The building at 2314 9th Ave S is a single-story church that was constructed c. 1950, which does not contribute to the historic character of the Waverly-Belmont district. Staff issued a demolition permit for the non-contributing structure earlier this month.

The subject property is a triangular lot with double frontage that is bound to the north by 9th Ave S, to the south by Vaulx Ln, and the west by an unimproved alley. Public Works has indicated that the unimproved alley will not be improved. The site is also encumbered by two easements that are shown here. Properties fronting Vaulx Ln are not in an historic zoning overlay while properties fronting 9th Ave S are located in the Waverly-Belmont NCZO.

Very little historic context is found along this part of Vaulx Lane, which is not in the overlay. Most of the homes are new construction like the photo on the left, which is across the street from the subject property. The photo on the right is the house to the left of the site, beyond the unimproved alley.

As stated before, properties fronting 9th Ave S are in the Waverly-Belmont NCZO, where the immediate historic context is 1 to 1.5 stories. The house shown here on the left is the house next door on 9th Ave S and the house on the right is two doors down from the subject property.

The proposed infill will be oriented to Vaulx Lane, which is necessary given the shape of the lot and the location of the easements. The proposed front setback of 20' meets the context along Vaulx Lane, and the plan meets the bulk standards for the side and rear setbacks.

The new house is 1.5 stories at the front with an overall height of 25'-8". The building width is 45'-6", which is wider than other homes in the area. However, staff finds the proposed width appropriate given the shape of the lot and the easements at the rear, which limit the depth of the building footprint. As proposed, the foundation will be stucco, and the cladding will be lap siding with cedar shake accents.

The infill is two stories at the rear while the historic context on 9th Ave S is 1 to 1.5 stories. While this is the rear, staff finds that in this case the rear should be more closely scrutinized since it will not only be highly visible from 9th Ave S, but also it will be the façade that is oriented to the Waverly-Belmont district. As such, staff finds that scale to be inappropriate as the plan proposes two stories whereas the immediate historic context is 1 – 1.5 stories. For this reason, staff finds that the project does not meet Sections III.A and III.B of the design guidelines for height and scale.

In addition, the roof slope on the rear has a pitch of only 3.5:12 while the design guidelines recommend a pitch of at least 6:12. For this reason, staff finds that the project does not meet Section III.E of the design guidelines for roof shape.

Furthermore, the rear façade includes some smaller square windows on the rear and both side façades. Per the design guidelines, windows should be twice as tall as they are wide, as seen historically. Staff finds that the proportions of the square windows, especially those on the rear and right façades are inappropriate as they do not meet these proportions and these façades will be highly visible from public rights-of-way. For this reason, staff finds that the project does not meet Section III.G for proportions and rhythm of openings.

Here is the right façade that face the intersection of Vaulx Ln and 9th Ave S. It also includes a couple of windows that do not meet the design guidelines. Here is the left side elevation that faces the unimproved alley, which also includes several windows that do not meet the design guidelines for proportion and rhythm of openings.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the proposed infill, finding that the principal building would not be compatible with surrounding historic houses and that the project does not meet the following sections of the Waverly-Belmont NCZO: Handbook and Design Guidelines:

- Section III.A for height;
- Section III.B for scale;
- Section III.E for roof shape, and;
- Section III.G for proportion and rhythm of openings.

Pete Jones, owner of the property, stated that he worked with staff to present a craftsman home. They are trying to improve the property by bringing historic value and more neighbors to the area. The shape and easements create challenges. It is cheaper to build up rather than expand footprint. The proposed design suits his modern family. He has lived in the area for 6 years and 50% -60% of the homes have been rebuilt. He handed out photographs of other buildings in the neighborhood that are two-stories.

Commissioner Mosley asked if there was a reason for the wide skirt board that is typically seen on larger homes. The applicant said it was just a design detail.

Amy Gill, designer for the project, said she didn't know that the pitch of the roof or the window proportions was an issue until today. There are two-story buildings in the neighborhood and this is a difficult lot. She described the design and design intent.

Commissioner Mosley agreed with the applicant that windows were appropriate and that it is a challenging site. He did not find the two-story addition to be out of character with the neighborhood. The skirt board size is out of scale for the size and shape of the lot and recommended an adjustment.

Commissioner Cantrell agreed with Commissioner Mosley. Commissioner Stewart stated that the rear elevation could be improved.

Commissioner Nielson recommended that the applicant defer and work with Staff and the applicant requested not to defer.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve with the conditions that

- **Staff review materials,**

- finished floor height be compatible with adjacent structures;
- that the HVAC be located beyond the midpoint of the house and preferably not visible from 9th, and;
- the use of the square window be mitigated so that they are not spread out on all elevations and all locations,

finding the project to meet the design guidelines based on the unique constraints of the lot. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

z. 120-122 THIRD AVENUE SOUTH

Application: New construction-addition
 Council District: 19
 Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
 Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

Staff member Hoffman presented the application for a rooftop addition and storefront alterations. Proposed changes to the existing building include:

- Replacing the four double windows on the second story of the left and middle bays;
- Relocating the existing window set on the first story from the left side to the middle bay;
- Replacing the left window set with operable windows;
- Adding a new entry door in the middle bay, in what is currently a set of windows;
- Removal of metal sidelights (a previous violation of materials) to be replaced with glass;
- Removing gas meters from the front facade.

The building's original windows, doors, and storefronts have been previously changed, so the proposed changes will not affect original materials. Section II.A and B of the design guidelines require that replacement elements of the storefront and front doors be compatible with the materials, composition, design, texture, and general appearance of the original or other buildings of the same style and era if the original is not known. Staff recommends having final review of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation. With this condition, staff finds that the changes to the storefront meet Sections II.A, II.B. and II.C and D of the design guidelines for storefronts, windows, display windows, and doors.

The applicant proposes to repaint the building a natural brick color, which is in accordance with the district design guidelines. In its past, the building has been painted white, red, and most recently its current two-tone gray and white combination that was not permitted by the MHZC. Staff recommends having final approval of the paint color.

The roofing was replaced in 2015, during which time, the existing parapet tiles were removed. Section II.L of the design guidelines requires historic roofs, chimneys, and related elements to be retained. The applicant has included replacement of the parapet tiles in this scope of work. Staff recommends having final approval of the material prior to purchase and installation.

The addition is set back from the Third Avenue façade by the required thirty feet (30'). The total height of the addition is fourteen feet (14') above the existing parapet, and meets the requirements of the design guidelines. The railing and step-back area should not be used to support any extra elements, such as lighting, signage, or speakers. The applicant has designed the addition to sit atop part of the parapet on the sides with a partial clay coping tile over flashing. Although this leaves the historic parapet partially revealed, Staff recommends that the addition's side walls are inside the parapet, to fully express that feature of the building.

The drawings submitted indicate signage and lighting, but no specific details were provided. All illumination and signage must be reviewed and approved by the Commission to ensure that it meets the design guidelines, and Staff includes this as a condition of approval of the project.

Commissioner Nielson left the meeting at the beginning of the presentation and returned before the presentation was complete.

Eric, architect for the project stated that the existing roof drops 6' in the back with an 18" exposed parapet. In order to keep the new second floor as low as possible they are pouring the slab without touching the historic structure. They are asking to keep the side walls in the proposed location as the addition will still be removable. They will replace the clay tiles that were removed last year.

David Cartwright, structural engineer, explained the construction of the building. In order to move the walls inside the existing walls you are putting them on the original roof, which would not be structurally sound. The proposed will have less impact and stress on the historic building and walls.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

The Commission asked for clarification of the third condition.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **Staff have final approval of the new paint color, windows, doors, parapet tiles, railings, trim, cornerboards, canopy and awnings, and mechanical screening;**
- **Fiber-cement panels and siding are smooth-faced;**
- **Signage and lighting will be reviewed in a separate application;**

finding that the addition and proposed alterations will meet Section II and Section III.H of the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

aa. 1810 FIFTH AVENUE NORTH

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Sean Alexander, staff member, presented the case for a rear addition at 1810 5th Ave North.

He explained that the rear addition would serve as an attached second dwelling. The project includes a ridge raise on the historic house, replaces an earlier addition and adds a new component that would be taller and wider than the original building.

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

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove finding that the project would not meet the following sections of the design guidelines for the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: II.B.1.a and II.B.1.b (Height and Scale), II.B.1.e (Roof), II.B.2.a and II.B.2.f (Location and Removability), II.B.2.b-e and II.B.2g. (Design Character). Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

bb. 1404 LINDEN AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Sean Alexander, staff member, presented the case for infill at 1404 Linden Avenue.

The application is to construct an infill single-family house with detached outbuilding. The house will be one and one-half stories and will have a cross-gabled roof. GIS data shows the tallest comparable building nearby to be 33'

tall. It is proposed to be 34' tall, but the plans do not appear to accurately depict the grade of the lot. Staff recommends that the height of the house be decreased to 33', with the plans corrected to show the grade.

The applicant had to leave the meeting, but left a note stating that he agreed with all conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Neilson moved to approve with the conditions that:

- The overall height of the building shall be reduced by one foot (1');
- Drawings accurately showing the grade are submitted prior to permitting to verify that the foundation height is consistent with the context, and if those drawings show that the building is taller than thirty-three feet (33'), as measured at the front grade, staff will bring the case back to the Commission;
- The construction progress shall be inspected on site to verify that the floor level is in line with the adjacent houses;
- The brick, windows, doors, and other materials not known shall be administratively approved prior to permitting;
- The materials of all paving shall be approved by Staff;
- The HVAC shall be located on the rear façade or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house;
- The front wall of the gable dormer and the side walls of the shed dormer on the outbuilding shall step in two feet (2') from the walls below; and,
- The windows and doors on the outbuilding, including vehicle door, are approved prior to permitting;

finding that the project would be compatible with surrounding historic houses, and that the project will meet the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

cc. 0 MURPHY ROAD

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Sean Alexander, staff member, presented the case for infill at 1810 5th Ave North.

The lot is currently in the process of being sub- divided. Platting and infrastructure is currently under construction. This is a proposal to construct six new single-family houses on the six northern lots. There will be two duplex lots that will be developed later.

The six new houses are all one and one-half story, thirty feet wide and thirty feet tall, and thirty five feet deep. They are primarily side-gabled roofs with variations like projections and dormers to differentiate the designs.

The materials include cement-fiber siding, asphalt single roofs, but additional information on materials is needed.

Pat Chisholm, owner of the property, said he was available for any questions.

Motion:

Commissioner Neilson moved to approve with the conditions that:

- Staff shall inspect the foundation heights during construction to verify that the floor levels are consistent with the surrounding context;
- The siding reveals and textures, roof colors, windows, doors, and other materials not known shall be administratively approved prior to permitting;
- Walkways are added to lead from each porch to the sidewalk; and
- The materials of all paving shall be approved by Staff and the HVAC shall be located on the rear façades or on side façade beyond the midpoints of the houses;

finding that the project would be compatible with surrounding historic houses, and that the project will meet the Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

dd. 3641 RICHLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented 3641 Richland Avenue, which is lot 4 of the former Welch College development.

The Commission has already approved the designs for Lots 1 through 3. In August, the Commission approved a different design for Lot 4 from what is proposed today. The application is for new infill and an outbuilding. The overall height, scale and form of the house is in line with what has been previously approved at this development and is similar to the historic context. Staff finds that the proposed infill and outbuilding meet the design guidelines, and recommends approval with the conditions outlined in the staff recommendation.

The applicant Chad Gore, stated he agreed with the conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Ms. Zeigler asked the Commission if in the future they could place the infill projects for this particular project on consent, since the massing and scale will all be similar to other homes already approved for the project. The Commission agreed.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of neighboring historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- **Staff approve the brick sample prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve a stone sample prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve the asphalt shingle color and texture; and,**
- **Staff approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation;**

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

ee. 2206 WHITE AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding
Council District: 17
Overlay: Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Melissa Baldock presented 2206 White Avenue, which is a non-contributing structure in the Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

In September 2016, MHZC staff issued an administrative permit to demolish the structure. The application is to construct a duplex infill and an outbuilding. Staff is recommending disapproval of the project, finding that the infill's scale does not meet Section III.B.2. of the Woodland in Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

This block of White Avenue has several one-story non-contributing structures, several one-and-a-half story historic houses, and two 2-story historic houses that are each about forty feet (40') tall. The proposed infill does meet all base zoning setbacks, and the front setback will line up with the front setback of the historic house next door. The infill's two-story form and overall height of 30' meets the varied context of this block of White Avenue.

While the height and width and two-story form of the house may meet the historic context, the large depth of the house increases the overall scale so that the house overall is much larger than the other houses on the block. The proposed infill has a depth of eighty-one feet, four inches (81'4"), not including the eight-foot (8') deep front porch. By comparison, the historic houses on the block have depths between fifty-three and fifty-eight feet (53'-58') – i.e. the other historic houses on the block are over thirty feet shorter than what is proposed. As an example, the historic two-story house at 2223 White Avenue has a height of approximately forty feet (40') and a width of forty-two feet (42'), but its depth is just fifty-three feet (53'). The applicant is also planning a one-story, 659 sq. ft. garage that meets all base-zoning setbacks and meets the design guidelines.

Staff finds that the combined height, scale, and depth of the proposed infill create a scale that is not in keeping with the historic character of the immediate vicinity and does not meet the design guidelines. Staff therefore recommends disapproval of the project.

The applicant was not present.

Tom Lerner, has lived in the neighborhood for 35 years. He is opposed to the project, based on the massing. The taller historic context noted by staff is at the end of the block. The proposed will be about 8' taller than the adjacent home on the right and significantly taller than the home on the left.

Betty Horton, 726 Benton, stated that she is opposed because the building is not compatible with the historic homes next door to it. Previous approved buildings do not fit in well and the overlay does not protect the neighborhood so she is commending the staff's recommendation of disapproval.

Pete Horton, 726 Benton, stated that he is opposed to the project. He is disappointed in past decisions of the Commission.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to disapprove the project, finding that the infill's scale does not meet Section III.B.2. of the Woodland in Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

ff. 927 SOUTH DOUGLAS AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented 927 S. Douglas, an application to demolish the existing non-contributing duplex on the lot and to construct new duplex infill.

The lot is unusually narrow at just 40'. In addition, the site does not have alley access. The narrowness of the makes it difficult to have a driveway from the front to the rear, as is typically required. There is an existing curb cut and front yard parking. The applicant is proposing to expand the front yard parking. It is currently about 502 sq. ft., and the applicant is proposing to make it 890 sq. ft. Front yard parking does not typically meet the design guidelines, as historically, parking was located at the rear of the house. However, the lot's narrowness and lack of an alley constrain the location of on-site parking. Staff recommends working with the applicant to find a material that will best minimize the visual impact of the front yard parking.

The infill will be two-stories and about 32' tall, which staff finds to be appropriate in this location where there is little historic context and there are a lot of recently-built 2-story houses. Although the structure is a duplex, there is just one entrance facing S Douglas. The other entrance is located at the rear. Staff finds that the duplex meets the design guidelines and recommends approval with the conditions outlined in the staff recommendation.

Manuel Zeitlin, architect for the project, stated he was available for questions.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The siding reveal be a maximum of five inches (5");**
- **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- **Staff approve the roof color, dimensions and texture;**
- **Staff approve the side step porch railing design and material;**
- **Staff approve the material of the front parking area and walkway; and,**
- **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**

finding that the project meets Sections III. and V.B.2. of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW

There are no requests for a preliminary SP review.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

gg. VOTE FOR NEW VICE-CHAIR

Vice-chair Cantrell nominated Commissioner Menié Bell to serve as Vice-Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion:

Vice-Chair Cantrell moved to elect Commissioner Bell as Vice-chair. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

X. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

The meeting concluded at 5:51 p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 1/18/2017