

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
MARCH 9, 2009**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, March 9, 2009, at 5:00 pm at City Hall in the Board Room at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Tim Kearns
 Rusty Womack
 Trisha Nesbitt
 Danny Anderson
 Mary Pearce
 Tina Jones
 Rudy Jordan
 Preston Shea
 Virginia Bowman

Staff Present: Susan Coleman, Planning Department
 Steve Valley, Codes/Planning Department
 Shauna Billingsley, Law Department
 Amanda Hall, Historic Intern

Mr. Kearns called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm.

Minutes of February 9, 2009

Mr. Womack moved to approve the minutes of February 9, 2009 with some corrections requested on Item 6. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the motion carried.

**Item 1:
Consent Agenda**

The items under the consent agenda are deemed by the commission to be routine in nature and will be approved by one motion. The items on the consent agenda will not be discussed. Any member of the commission or the public desiring to discuss an item on the consent agenda may request that it be removed and placed on the regular agenda. It will then be considered in its printed order. The staff recommends that Item 6 be placed on the consent agenda.

Mr. Anderson moved to approve the consent agenda with staff conditions. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the carried.

Mr. Kearns explained to the applicant that basically it passed with the conditions that materials come back to Mr. Valley to review and the placement of plaque.

**Item 2:
Consideration of an addition at 123 Lewisburg Avenue; Timothy and Elizabeth Adgent,
Owners/Applicants.**

Mr. Valley explained he had met with the homeowners on site and went through the addition with them and then the applicants came to DRC and everything looked in keeping with the guidelines.

Ms. Pearce stated basically at the DRC it was recommended for approval as submitted.

Mr. Womack moved for approval with staff comments. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the motion carried.

The time started on this item at 5:10 pm and ended at 5:12 pm.

Item 3:

Consideration of signage at 228 Public Square; Fifth Third Bank, Applicant.

Mr. Travis Rutherford and Ryan Deeg were present to represent this item.

Mr. Valley explained that he and Ms. Hall walked the property to view all the signs that are being requested to be replaced and agreed with all the sign replacements.

Mr. Rutherford requested to withdraw sign N and explained the lease would be ending and they did not want to replace the signage.

Ms. Jordan questioned if there were other illuminated signs.

Mr. Valley explained there was one in the back and it can't be viewed from the street and felt it would be fine. He added he did not recommend approving the one on the front of the building that will cover up the architectural details. He stated the lettering change would be fine, but not the logo.

Ms. Jordan moved for approval with staff comments, which includes the sign on the front of the building not cover the architectural details.

Ms. Pearce asked if that also meant no logo.

Mr. Valley stated yes.

Ms. Billingsley suggested the motion should include the withdrawn sign N.

Ms. Jordan stated yes she would include sign N being withdrawn.

Mr. Kearns stated there was a motion and requested to know if there was a second.

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Mr. Rutherford passed around an example of how the sign would look without a logo.

Mr. Shea stated after reviewing the example with the larger text and no logo, he felt the logo would be less obtrusive if maybe have the Fifth Third lettering smaller and be contained within the detail.

Ms. Hall stated the guidelines state the signage must adhere to a flat surface of the building.

Ms. Pearce reiterated you generally do not put signage in the detail of the building.

Mr. Rutherford stated the text size submitted is the same size as the existing, but the text style is different.

Mr. Shea moved to amend the previous motion to include the font not be any larger than existing including up and down and side to side. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the amendment to the motion carried.

Ms. Pearce moved to amend the motion to include all colors be disregarded that were submitted and have the colors match the color on cut sheet sign C and the reason is materials were not submitted and the commission has no idea what the colors would actually be.

Mr. Rutherford suggested maybe to resubmit with the colors.

Mr. Deeg questioned if instead of resubmitting there could be an opinion approval of actual samples rather than resubmit.

Commissioners stated yes.

Ms. Jordan seconded the amendment motion and the motion carried.

Mr. Deeg requested to make comment concerning the colors. He explained the drawings created by the engineering company are very specific on how they do it and visit the factories of design companies and to ensure these colors are standard across the nation and feels when samples are submitted they will see that.

Mr. Anderson moved to have the color samples brought back to staff for approval. Mr. Shea seconded the motion and the motion carried.

With the motion having been made and amended with 3 amendments the motion carried.

The time started on this item at 5:13 pm and ended at 5:28 pm.

Item 4:

Consideration of demolition and an addition at 419 Boyd Mill Avenue; Buzz and Sandy Brainard, Owners/Applicants.

Mr. Valley stated he visited the applicants, reviewed the outbuildings and stated they are not functional. He explained the applicants came to DRC and the composite sketches were liked by the DRC committee.

Ms. Pearce stated the plans submitted today have corrected the concerns the DRC committee had. She stated to her recollection they looked at the material the building would be built out of and it would be hardi-plank or wood, the door openings would be square and there needs to be more detailing submitted on what the garage doors were. Ms. Pearce then made a motion to approve with staff comments and amendments.

Mr. Shea stated he had a question concerning that at the DRC there was a photo of a sample building and this is the first time we have seen the actual drawings.

Mr. Brainard stated that was correct they had just wanted to give the committee and idea of what they were considering.

Ms. Nesbitt seconded the motion Ms. Pearce made.

Ms. Pearce amended her motion to include the doors be brought back to staff for review, the clap board on the porch out to the side should be vertical, if the vent gables are not necessary than they should be removed. She stated she would defer to someone else to make an amendment concerning the eave.

Mr. Shea seconded Ms. Pearce's motion to amend her original motion and the motion carried.

Ms. Jordan requested more discussion.

Mr. Shea moved to amend the motion to include addressing the cornice details. He stated they should be less ornate and formal, the outbuilding simplifications should include open rafter tails or elimination of bird box cornice, the arched gable vents should either be omitted or squared, the simplification of the door and window header casing omit crown molding and use simple one by material to wrap the openings, omit shutters, arched glass in doors should be square and more slender columns.

Ms. Jordan seconded Mr. Shea's motion.

Ms. Pearce commented that where Mr. Shea was taking inspiration from looking at the old building and if he just continued down that road, it occurs to her that it may need to be deeper and questioned the scale of the building.

Mr. Shea stated it was hard to tell if the building that was designed is wider than the existing.

Ms. Pearce stated it was wider and going down that same road the application of the siding on this is vertical and that could be an option and would help it have more of the appearance of the old building.

Mr. Kearns stated there was a first and second on Mr. Shea's motion and the motion carried.

Ms. Pearce stated she had another amendment and moved to have the lighting on the garage be simplified and could come back to staff. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Mr. Womack moved to add an amendment concerning the roof material and moved the material should be a 5V agricultural style material. Ms. Jones seconded the motion and the motion carried.

With the original motion having been made and amended the motion carried.

The time started on this item at 5:29 pm and ended at 5:45 pm.

Item 5:

Consideration of new construction at Lot 8 Harlinsdale Manor Court; Ty and Lisa Hasty, Owners; Preston Shea, Applicants.

Mr. Shea recused himself from this item.

Mr. Valley passed out copies of pictures of contributing outbuildings on Franklin Road and then email comments from Mr. Hathaway concerning the item.

Ms. Jordan requested for future reference that Mr. Hathaway say in his comments that he recommends approval because of the guidelines.

Ms. Pearce stated the drawings Mr. Shea provided showed exactly what she had been trying desperately to say.

Ms. Pearce commented that she wanted this new structure to get more sympathetic to the historic resources in the area.

Mr. Shea stated part of the issue is the scale of the house and the problem is nearly every home approved already in this neighborhood is 5,000 to 6,000 square foot homes and this one will never be a 3,000 square foot house.

Ms. Pearce stated this home was 7,000 square feet.

Ms. Jordan asked how many had been approved.

Mr. Valley stated 4.

Ms. Pearce added that out of the 4 one would not be built.

Mr. Shea stated he has tried to break up the massing of the home so it would not look so symmetrical and imposing.

Ms. Jordan stated she had a question concerning how the garage will come out in front of the house and that you will have to drive back to get into the garage and her question is whether you will see the side of the garage.

Mr. Shea stated yes and pointed out on the drawings what would be seen.

Mr. Anderson asked if the fence shown was the property line.

Mr. Valley stated yes and explained that fence was part of the conservation plan and cannot be removed and the circular drive must have codes permission to be done.

Mr. Shea stated he had sent Mr. Hathaway an email regarding this issue and had requested more comments, but had not received a response yet.

Mr. Kearns stated he had received a response and proceeded to read it aloud to everyone. He stated Mr. Hathaway commented "that his opinion was purely opinion based on the little he knows about this project and not necessarily as it relates to guidelines of the Historic Zoning Commission, but the challenge he has with circular driveway is that they would normally be appropriate in a larger lot, however it is not unusual to see this done in the Buckhead area of Atlanta, but this would put a lot of concrete and other pavement in the front yard. Because of the grade it appears there is not enough room around it to screen it with landscaping and would put cars at the front door. The flip side is there not a lot of on street parking available because of the cul-de-sac design and parking on the street would virtually clog up this end of the project creating some access issues. My opinion would be not to do it, but it is purely an opinion. Other wise I think the house fits nice in hiding the garage doors and is perfect on the site for that emergency

access. Also if there is a place to put a circular drive this site and the adjacent one to the north would be the most reasonable versus the other lot.”

Mr. Shea summed up Mr. Hathaway’s comment by stating if any lot could handle a circular drive this one could and the next one too. He stated they are looking at alternative materials for the drive and where any cutting would be simple stone would be used and try to ease the landscaping back and do it in a tasteful manner. He stated the flat portion of the drive would 4 or so feet above the grade and feels like inside the crescent it could be screened.

Ms. Pearce stated he was saying he would cut in to put the drive and then the front of the lot will sit above the drive.

Mr. Shea stated it would be a horseshoe shape that rises and as the lot raises the drive behind will be less flat and with minor landscaping the majority would not be visible.

Mr. Anderson asked if this met the thirty percent lot coverage.

Ms. Jordan stated yes.

Ms. Pearce requested to know what kind of stone would be used.

Mr. Shea stated they had not chosen yet, but a stone being considered is a fairly random more rectangular shape structural masonry stone.

Ms. Pearce asked if would be a natural limestone.

Mr. Shea state it would be a natural stone, not manufactured.

Ms. Nesbitt questioned the roof material

Mr. Shea stated it would be a heavy dimensional shingle and copper.

Ms. Jordan and Mr. Anderson questioned massing and scaling of this house compared to the Dunnivant house and requested to see the Dunnivant plans.

Mr. Shea stated this house would be 2-story and the Dunnivant would be 1 1/2-story. He explained the 2-story element on this house is 48ft. into the envelope of the house (unable to make out the other measurements).

After a lengthy discussion Ms. Jordan moved to defer this item back to DRC. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion and the motion carried.

A discussion was held after the vote to give suggestions on what needs to be addressed before DRC. The suggestions included the following:

1. Simplify porch, roof board and chimney pots and natural stone should be used.
2. Less stone castings, break up with clapboard
3. Circular drive
4. Simplify porch and columns
5. Remove flower boxes
6. Remove chimney accent
7. Lower roof pitch

8. Remove arch windows all around
9. Less formal
10. Remove ⁱdiagonal window pattern

Item 6:

Consideration of signage at 347 Main Street; William Espy Woods, Sr., Owner/Applicant.

This item was on the consent agenda.

Item 7:

Other Business.

Mr. Kearns moved to add Mr. Bill Powell and Mike Hathaway to the Design Review Committee. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion with the condition specific instructions are given based on the guidelines.

Item 8:

Adjourn.

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Steve Valley, Secretary

*A full audio version of this meeting minutes can be heard in the Planning Department office by contacting Susan Coleman.