

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
January 14, 2008**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, January 14, 2008, at 5:00 pm at City Hall in the Municipal Court Room at 109 Third Avenue South.

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

Staff Present: Shanon Wasielewski
 Shauna Billingsley

Mr. Kearns called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Minutes of December 10, 2007

Ms. Jordan moved to approve December 10, 2007 minutes. Ms. Jones 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 2 be placed on the consent agenda.

Ms. Jordan moved to approve the consent agenda. Ms. Jones seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Item 2:

Consideration of signage at 143 Fifth Avenue South; Franklin First United Methodist Church, Owner/Applicant.

Ms. Nesbitt questioned the term “temporary nature” and requested more explanation.

Mr. Kearns stated since Ms. Nesbitt required more information the item would be pulled for discussion.

Ms. Jaime **Witzer** explained the signage would be used for the daycare facility. The signs would only be used during daycare hours. She explained the signs were needed for the safety of the children being dropped off and picked up.

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

Item 3:

Consideration of alterations at 1022 West Main Street; Brian and Luci Beth Mayberry, Owner; Michael Lee, Applicant.

This item was withdrawn.

Item 4:

Consideration of reconstruction at 1016 West Main Street, Josh Ellis, Owner; George Hatcher, Applicant.

Ms. Wasielewski stated there was a garage there before, but was destroyed by a tree and they would like to reconstruct basically using the same foot print with the exception of enlarging it enough to enclose the stairs that were originally on the exterior.

Mr. Hatcher stated they changed the roof lines to match everything in the area.

Ms. Wasielewski continued with her staff report which stated the following:

1. The structure shall be no more than 10% taller than the average building height along its block and the existing historic property.
2. The structure should reinforce spatial distances and rhythm including lot coverage that does not exceed 30%. However, in this particular case, the garage previously existed and is grandfathered in.
3. Roof forms, pitch, eave widths and details, fenestration patterns and other details must be consistent with the existing historic house.
4. Details should be simplified so as not to create a false sense of history.
5. Windows must be wood, double-hung windows with historically appropriate profile and dimension. The windows should match the windows on the existing house in design and divided light pattern.
6. Doors must also be wood and have a design consistent with the historic house.
7. The shape and dimension of the dormers should match those on the existing house. The window design within the dormers should also match the existing house.
8. The application must meet all of the requirements of the Codes Administration Department prior to issuance of a permit.

Ms. Pearce requested to know how the height related to the house.

Mr. Hatcher stated the house is actually three stories so the garage is actually shorter.

Mr. Shea suggested a hip roof with brackets or columns over door instead of shed door.

Mr. Hatcher stated that was fine that what he was there for was for input.

Mr. Shea moved to approve with the condition added that the shed roof be changed to a hipped roof with brackets, the same color of the house be used or plain white and to include to staff comments. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Item 5:

Consideration of an addition at 122 Winslow Road, Tyler and Dudley Berry, Owners; Blaine Bonadies, Applicant.

Ms. Wasielewski presented staff reports which stated the following:

1. Conjectural elements such as the proposed front porch should not be added, particularly on primary facades, and original porches should be maintained.
2. If the Commission determines that a larger porch is appropriate in this case, options do exist that are more consistent with the guidelines than the current proposal. The Commission has approved (805 Fair Street is an example) extending the roofline directly out to create a larger covered area on homes with little or no porch. The porch should continue to read as it currently does with single columns flanking the front door and a simplified roofline.
3. A rear addition is consistent with the guidelines.
4. All historic windows and doors must be retained. Any existing historic windows that are removed as a result of the rear addition should be reused in the addition.
5. New doors and windows should be wood and should be compatible with the design of existing doors and windows. Windows must be dimensional and true divided-light.
6. The addition to the historic portion of the house should be offset where it meets the historic house so that it is clear where the new portion begins. The addition should be secondary to the historic house.
7. The roof pitch and eave details should be consistent with the historic house.
8. The addition should not be taller than the original structure.
9. Details on the addition must be simplified so as not to create a false sense of history.
10. The proposed half circle design for the clerestory windows reflects the shape in the existing gable ends on the house. The other option would be to follow the design of the existing dormers on the front of the house for the windows on the rear addition.
11. The application must meet all of the requirements of the Codes Administration Department prior to issuance of a permit.

Ms. Pearce requested the applicant to come back to staff with the windows to be used for approval. She questioned a window on the north left elevation. She asked what was on the inside.

Mr. Bonadies stated there was a vanity there. The owner was trying to get a view to the backyard.

Ms. Pearce suggested to move the small strip of mirror or eliminate all together that would be better. She added the half moon should be eliminated and maybe put a vent for decoration there instead.

Mr. Anderson stated he had a question concerning how the outdoor shower would be screened.

Mr. Bonadies stated Mike Kiser is the landscape architect involved in this and will design the landscape. He explained the owners have further plans for a pool and pool house in the future.

Ms. Pearce moved to have any outdoor enhancements come back at a later date and would not be approved with the request today. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion.

Mr. Kearns stated there were a couple of things going on so each thing should be handled individually.

Ms. Billingsley stated she had everything written down and preceded to name off the commission's requests. The first was to rebuild the window as is or salvage a window and bring to staff. The second request was by Mr. Shea to retain windows by the front door. Ms. Pearce wanted to eliminate the

window on the north elevation, eliminate the half moon window, eliminate all outdoor enhancements until a later date, simplify the front porch and bring back enhancements in a separate application at a later date.

Mr. Womack stated he had a question on the brick and wanted to know if it was matching, etc.

Mr. Bonadies stated it would be matching.

Ms. Wasielewski stated it could be brought back to staff for review and approval and Mr. Womack agreed that would be the best thing to do.

Mr. Womack questioned what size pan would be used on the standing seam roof.

Mr. Bonadies stated he thought it would be twelve.

Mr. Womack stated a 16 or 17 should be used.

Mr. Bonadies stated they had an option of 12, 16 or 18.

Mr. Shea voiced his concern with having a standing seam roof on the living space. He stated he understood having one on the porch, but not on the addition tying into the house.

Mr. Bonadies stated he felt it was aesthetically pleasing and did not see a problem with it.

Mr. Shea stated he understood it is a separate form and all that, but the rest of the architecture speaks of shingles.

Ms. Jordan stated she felt it was on an entirely separate plane and did not have a problem with it.

Mr. Bonadies stated he would argue it is auxiliary living space.

Mr. Shea made several suggestions to Mr. Bonadies and Ms. Jordan asked if this should go to the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Kearns stated he felt they were close and should go ahead and create the motion.

Ms. Jordan stated this is a very simple house that has been dressed up and everyone is sympathetic because of what you are having to start with, but if this commission starts to see people come in every month trying to make a house grander and bigger and newer then it will put the commission in a different situation.

Mr. Shea moved to approve with the following conditions:

1. The front porch could either remain as is or be made a simple extension of the existing.
2. The entablatures on the sunroom are omitted or simplified or engaged as pilasters.
3. The transom window in the bathroom be eliminated over the vanity.
4. The half moon on the north elevation be removed.
5. The bay in the rear conditioned sunroom be omitted or pushed flush with the house or maybe a three window bay and drop cornice.
6. Remove French doors and retain all windows.
7. Staff recommendations should be included.
8. Include eliminating outdoor enhancements from this request.

9. The windows should be rebuilt and windows that could be salvaged should be used.
10. The brick color should come back to staff for approval.

Ms. Pearce seconded the motion and the motion carried.

After the first motion was made and approved the sunroom was discussed with Mr. Shea stated he felt the shingle on the existing house set a precedent. He made a motion to disallow the metal roof or he stated it could come back to the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Pearce moved to allow the metal roof on the sunroom addition and that portion be clad in hardi plank or wood siding. She stated it would more meet what the owners wanted and could be read as change over time. Ms. Jordan seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Mr. Shea made a motion to accept the two motions made previously and Ms. Jones seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**Item 6:
Other Business.**

Ms. Wasielewski passed out preservation funnies. She stated March 3rd and 4th were lobby days and if anyone wanted to go to Washington DC for a couple of days let her know. She let everyone know there was a presentation at the BOMA meeting on the Eastern Flank Battlefield. She passed out copies of a possible small area plan and explained staff is working on it.

Ms. Pearce stated she had received a phone call from a concerned citizen that had interrupted this as wanting to see a lot more density downtown.

Ms. Wasielewski stated the commission had officially gotten approval to issue a request to review the design guidelines. She stated a finalist had been chosen for the wayfinding signage project and would know go before the board.

**Item 7:
Adjourn.**

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Shanon Peterson Wasielewski, Secretary