

JOHN COOPER
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC)

MINUTES March 17, 2021

Commissioners Present: Chair Bell, Leigh Fitts, Mina Johnson, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, David Price

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Jenny Warren, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Alex Dickerson (legal counsel), Alex Blonder (legal counsel)

Applicants: Alan Minchew, Brittney Blanton, Jeff Zeitlin, Ajeya Upadhyaya, Amber Veach, John Paul Boulifard, Preston Quirk, Van Pond, Blaine Bonadies, Dan Huffstutter, Helen Simpkins, Craig Daily, Moss Pettigrew, Michael Klamann, Rowland Stebbins, Faith Meyer, Mike Campbell, Daniel Tansey, Alan Dooley, Kent Basil

Councilmembers: Brett Withers, Burkley Allen

Public: Jim Snell, Brad Denefro

I. EXECUTIVE SESSION 1501 FATHERLAND

Commission met in a closed hearing to receive follow-up information regarding the appeal case for 1501 Fatherland Street.

Chair Bell called the meeting to order at 2:14 p.m. and Ms. Zeigler confirmed quorum.

Alex Blonder, legal counsel explained that out of an abundance of caution, and pursuant to recommendations from federal, state, and local health agencies regarding avoiding group gatherings due to the COVID-19 Coronavirus this meeting is a teleconference meeting. Advance public comments have been possible through email, mail, and voicemail and will be read or played at the time of their relevant case.

Motion: Commissioner Price moved that the meeting agenda constitutes essential business of this body and meeting electronically is necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of Tennesseans considering the COVID-19 outbreak. Commissioner Jones seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Mosley moved to assign Commissioner Johnson as chair pro term for this meeting because of the chair's inability to lead the meeting due to illness and in the absence of the vice-chair. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson read information regarding appeals and the process for the public hearings.

Chair Johnson asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda. Ms. Zeigler said that the applicants for 1017 N 16th, 118 S 11th St, 3916 Cambridge, 945 S Douglas, 1408 Boscobel, 949 Russell and 1204 Russell are asking to defer.

Motion: Commissioner Jones moved to revise the agenda by deferring 1017 N 16th, 118 S 11th St, 3916 Cambridge, 945 S Douglas 1408 Boscobel, 949 Russell, and 1204 Russell. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

a. February 17, 2021

Motion: Commissioner Mayhall moved to ratify the minutes for February 17, 2021. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner read information regarding the consent agenda and staff member Melissa Sajid read the consent agenda.

b. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

b. 1104 PETWAY AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021011981

c. 1821 4TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuildings
Council District: 19
Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021011993, T2021012247 and T2021012254

d. 1712 BLAIR BLVD

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid
PermitID#: T2021012172

e. 907 WALDKIRCH AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition; Partial Demolition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012192

f. 1913 19TH AVE S

Application: New Construction - Addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012230

g. 1017 N 16TH ST

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012234
Deferred by request of the applicant.

h. 1411 N 14TH ST

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012251

i. 2218 GRANTLAND AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012252

j. 1804 5TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012256

k. 1051 PETWAY AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012269

l. 1406 EASTLAND AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition and DADU
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012298 and T2021012299

m. 2529 FAIRFAX AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012301

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to approve all projects with their applicable conditions and with the exception of 1017 N 16th Street. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

n. CONSOLIDATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ZONING OVERLAY

(Public hearing to take place on March 17th with vote on April 21, 2021)

Ms. Zeigler began the presentation. The Historic Zoning Commission received funding from the Tennessee Historical Commission for this project which began in January 2019. The grant period ended on September 30, 2019. Multiple stakeholder meetings, community meetings and 6 public hearings have been held with the intent of

voting on the final product in March 2020, but that meeting was cancelled due to COVID. We deferred the case each month but did not receive additional public comment until this month, the final public hearing.

In addition to meetings, staff created an email list of every email available in Metro's permitting software program for the last two years that was linked to a preservation permit and collected emails from public comments sent via email on other projects in recent years. This list was used to inform about community meetings, encourage people to take part in the online discussion board, and to let interested parties know when revisions were available on the website. Meetings were also promoted via social media. Offers were made to all relevant neighborhood associations for staff to attend a meeting they scheduled specifically for this topic or to attend a regularly scheduled meeting. A community meeting, the September 2019 public hearing, and this March 2021 public hearings all received mailed notices.

A Nashville.gov webpage dedicated to the project, which included a description of the project, links to the online discussion board, design guideline drafts, meeting notes, videos and links to additional resources has been available for approximately two and one-half years. A direct link to this page is available on the zoning commission's home page. An online discussion board ran from February to September 2019.

Metro Nashville has 22 neighborhood conservation zoning overlays, all with their own individual set of design guidelines that are largely similar. While having a set of design guidelines for each district worked fine when there were just a handful of conservation overlays, today, 22 separate documents of design guidelines is cumbersome. The idea is to consolidate the various design guideline documents into one document, while still preserving the important differences between the neighborhoods.

Unlike the adoption of the conservation overlays, which change zoning, the guidelines are not reviewed by Planning and Council, because they do not change zoning. Instead, the document is adopted by the Historic Zoning Commission only. The original document and all revisions must meet the Secretary of Interior Standards developed by the National Park Service.

This project is only for some neighborhood conservation zoning overlays and does not affect other types of historic zoning overlays. Neighborhood conservation zoning overlays not included as part of this revision, at this time, are Elmington, Belmont-Hillsboro and Hillsboro-West End. Recently, the Elmington neighborhood said that they would like to be included but since they did not receive the notice, we are proposing holding a public hearing for that neighborhood to join the consolidation at the May meeting, if it is adopted in April. No new overlays are a part of this proposal. No boundary changes are proposed. If you do not live or own in an existing conservation overlay currently, then this will not apply for you.

There are multiple goals for this project. One goal is to provide clearer direction for property owners and applicants. All the guidelines are almost the same as a set created decades ago. A lot has changed over the years in terms of how the Commission interprets the design guidelines and we think it will be useful to reflect those changes in the language of the design guidelines. Along those same lines, in the current guidelines, some sections are primarily italicized language and need to be updated. Italicized language is information added to the guidelines without a formal process to explain how the Commission has interpreted an existing design guideline. The goal is to make most of the italicized language formally part of the guidelines in this process.

Another goal is to address actions not contemplated when the guidelines were originally written.

We also think this project will make the process easier for applicants, particularly those repeat applicants who work in multiple neighborhoods, to better understand what guidelines are universal to all conservation overlays, and what, if any, differences there are for an individual neighborhood.

We propose to change the title of the consolidated design guidelines to clarify that it is for turn-of-the-century neighborhoods, roughly 1890s to 1950. These are the Nashville neighborhoods where Queen-Anne, Folk Victorian, Craftsman bungalows, Tudors, and minimal traditional houses are common. Last month you approved a new set of design guidelines that address the different styles, forms, and development patterns of mid-century neighborhoods.

The draft guidelines are divided into two parts. Part I is most of the guidelines and includes guidance that applies to all the districts. Part II includes a chapter for every individual district with any guidelines that may be specific to that district.

At this point, I'm going to turn the presentation over to Melissa Sajid.

The guidelines are reorganized, and some information is repeated in each section, so the user doesn't have to flip back and forth. It's this repetition that makes the draft guidelines look longer than the original guidelines.

New terms are added, and some terms are revised in the glossary section. This section will remain as italicized information which means that the terms are not actual guidelines.

The guidance for materials is now its own section and has been revised to provide a longer list of appropriate and inappropriate materials. Most of it remains italicized text—which means it can be updated without a formal review process. That is so the Commission can easily address whatever new materials might become available in the future.

Speaking of materials, there is language that increases the allowable maximum reveal for lap siding. By “reveal” we mean that portion of lap siding that is exposed once the pieces are lapped. The current practice, which has been in place for several decades, is for all lap siding to have a reveal with a maximum of five inches (5”). There is no record as to how the requirement was initially determined but it may have been considered an average or a typical reveal. Since historic siding comes in a variety of reveals, Staff recommends increasing the maximum to seven inches (7”), as that is a size that is readily available and still within the range of historic reveals. The draft also provides an explanation as to when even wider reveals might be appropriate.

The section for demolition was moved to the beginning of the document to emphasize that the review of demolition is the most important role of the Commission. The demolition section is fleshed out to reflect how the Commission has applied this section since the beginning of the overlays, specifically partial-demo and non-contributing buildings. The additional language follows the Commission's interpretation of this section since the guidelines were first created. For instance, demolition of non-contributing – or non-historic – buildings have always met the guidelines, but that guidance currently isn't clear.

In addition, there is language that would count removal of historic siding as partial demolition that required review. Currently replacement siding, windows, doors, and roofing are not reviewed. When all those materials are removed and the interior is completely gutted, the historic building is all but demolished. Siding, of all those materials that are not currently reviewed, was chosen to be reviewed in this draft since it is a character defining feature and provides some structural stability, which is lost when all other materials are removed. There was discussion previously about not including this review; however, the neighborhood that was the most concerned about it is no longer a part of the project. The public and commissioners have spoken for and against this change, so for those reasons it remains in this current draft.

State and local law requires that our design guidelines be based on the National Park Service's Secretary of Interior Standards. Those have changed slightly since our guidelines were created so that revision is included. We also added some language to explain the role of the Standards in the design review process.

The drawing shown here is currently in all the neighborhood conservation zoning design guidelines and has been a source of confusion. It is often read as showing the only place where an addition can be constructed, which is not the case. Instead it is meant to show that if an addition is small enough to fit into that triangular area, then the addition would not need to be reviewed.

A related concern is that the text portion of the design guidelines, which attempts to state what is reviewed, is confusing in that one section states that the design guidelines only apply to areas that are visible from the public right-of-way and the next section states that public facades are more carefully reviewed than others. Since the establishment of the first overlay, the Commission has interpreted these sections-- and the drawing-- as a review of all sides of any new construction but applying a less stringent review of those facades that are not publicly visible.

The proposed solution is to remove the image, revise the text and add a list of actions that would not require review.

In terms of additions, guidance for solar panels and skylights has been added, again following how the Commission has looked at these two features in the past.

There is new language to stress that additions that are taller or wider are only appropriate if all other solutions have been exhausted and in certain conditions. When the first few such additions were approved, it was never the intent to allow all additions to be wider or taller, which is how applicants have interpreted the italicized language. The existing guidelines state that additions could be up to four feet (4') taller if going taller was the only option; the new guidelines will allow additions to be two feet (2') taller, in some instances.

Ridge raises are something the Commission came up with many years ago that allows for an extra two feet (2') feet of height on an existing side gable home but there wasn't much guidance as to what conditions would warrant such an addition, so that has been added. The requirement that the ridge raise be inset two feet (2') from the side walls and extend no taller than two (2) vertical feet has not changed in the revised guidelines.

New language clarifies the difference between a rooftop deck that is above a roof's eave and an upper level deck. The draft states that rooftop decks are not allowed on historic buildings and provides guidance for including them as part of an addition, if desired.

There is language to stress that in terms of new construction, the focus is on form, massing, and scale, rather than architectural style.

The draft adds clarity for how "context" will usually be determined. Context is how the Commission determines if a request is what is called—appropriate—for the district. The "context" for an addition is the building which the addition is being attached too. Text clarifies that it's the existing building's features and form that provide context for additions. So, when considering the appropriateness of an addition, the commission is looking solely at the historic house and not at what other historic houses in the area may look like.

For infill—a new primary building in an existing neighborhood-- the context is the immediate surrounding neighborhood. New text clarifies that in most cases the context for infill will be the "block face." Using context far away from a proposed project has been a concern voiced by numerous neighborhoods over multiple years. The Commission will retain the ability to define "block face" in situations where that is unclear or expand the context beyond the block face where the immediate context is not considered relevant.

The draft provides clarity on how building types relate to zoning. The building types should be consistent with the types in the immediate vicinity, no matter how the lot might be zoned. For instance, let's say the area here is zoned commercial—this is just a hypothetical. If there were a vacant lot here, a new building might have a commercial use, but its building type would still need to be similar to the residential building type found here.

Most guidelines had italicized information for multi-unit developments. Again, italicized text is not actual guidelines. We've removed that language, as multi-unit development can result in encouragement of demolition of historic buildings; alterations and additions that are not appropriate for the historic building; or require infill that is not appropriate for the district. Where multi-unit developments are appropriate, the site is usually so unique that the

italicized design guidelines are of little use. Staff recommends addressing each of these requests on a case-by-case basis.

The language for outbuildings has been rewritten to allow for minimum and maximum sizes, roof slopes, and setbacks for all sites rather than basing the dimensions on the historic building. This could mean that an outbuilding is taller than a principle building if the principal building is short; however, the outbuildings should be set back enough on the lot that the additional height shouldn't be evident from the street. This will allow people to use outbuildings in all the ways people do now, that they didn't historically. They are no longer just about housing cars and garden equipment but also serve as apartments, guest rooms, home offices and studios and playrooms, among other uses and where zoning allows.

Specific guidance and dimensions for add ons, such as the features you see here is given. This is largely communicated via drawings, rather than text alone.

We've also added clarification as to how measurements are taken and how setbacks are determined.

Moving on to Part II. Part II, is all the individual chapters for each district, where language specific to each district was collected from the current design guidelines.

All the maps have been revised. The boundaries have not changed, just the graphics of the maps so that they all have a consistent look since they were originally created at different times.

There are very few changes recommended for individual districts. One is to clarify in the Bowling House district that if a two-story building is appropriate, then it should have a hipped roof. It's been a policy but not officially part of the design guidelines.

Recently, property owners in the Cherokee Park neighborhood asked that stone be included as a potential primary siding for infill. Currently the design guidelines only allow for brick.

Several years ago, the Commission found that rear-attached garages could be appropriate because of the lack of a rear alley and other reasons, so that guidance has been added as italicized information. New "short histories" have been added to Greenwood and Maxwell Heights design guidelines. This doesn't change any actual design guidelines.

Recently the Greenwood neighborhood stated that they wanted all infill to be capped at 1.5 stories so that has been added.

In the Lockeland Springs-East End design guidelines, there were references to MDHA's design guidelines for Five Points Redevelopment District, to keep an applicant from having to reference two different documents when planning a project in Five Points. The language has been removed since the MDHA district has expired. The draft also includes some italicized information, that has been followed for about 8 years or more, as un-italicized guidance.

Recently, the Woodlawn neighborhood requested clarification on attached and detached garages and that has been added.

That concludes the summary. Today we will take public comment and the vote is scheduled for the April meeting to give you an opportunity to reflect on the comments as this is a large project with several parts to it.

Councilman Withers emphasized that staff did a great job working with the neighborhoods. There have been numerous meetings and a great deal of information has been available online. Few have had this amount of public engagement.

Ms. Zeigler noted that public comment was sent via email and that emails submitted prior to 10 am on March 16 were posted online. Jim Snell, 1620 Forrest Avenue, Brad Denefro 1011B N 6th Street, and Blaine Bonadies spoke in opposition.

Councilmember Allen said she appreciated staff's efforts, she understands the comments, and she appreciated that the Commission was not attempting to vote this month.

Commissioner Mosley referenced Councilmember Murphy's email requesting a deferral. He said that the point of spreading the case over two meetings was so that people could participate again.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked if the Commission had objection to keeping the public hearing open until next month.

Motion: Commissioner Mosley moved to keep the public hearing open. Chair Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

o. 945 S DOUGLAS UNIT #17

Application: New Construction – Infill

Council District: 07

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021012245

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

p. 1801-1803 5TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021012255

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for infill a on a double lot, with a one-story non-contributing building and a one and one-half story historic house.

The applicant has applied to the Planning Commission to rezone the property to SP, with a plan to demolish a non-contributing building on the southern half of the lot, then to construct two new structures. The contributing historic bungalow on the northern half of the property will remain.

One structure will be a one-story building with a commercial form at the front of the corner lot.

This building will have fifty-four feet (54') of frontage on 5th Ave N and forty-six feet (46') on Buchanan and will be twenty feet (20') tall to the top of the parapet wall, with a flat roof behind.

The second structure will be a row of three attached townhouses. This structure will have a total frontage of eighty-eight feet (88') on Buchanan. The proposal is thirty-five feet (35') and is two and one-half stories. The design guidelines permit infill to be thirty-five feet (35') tall, but there were no two-and-one-half-story houses in the neighborhood historically. A previous proposal that would have constructed a two-and-one-half-story structure on 4th Avenue South was approved by the Commission with the condition that the upper half-story was eliminated.

Staff recommends that the Commission make a condition of approval be that the applicant return to the Commission with the final approval of the design, materials, window/door placement, and all utilities, mechanicals, and other appurtenances, if the SP is approved by Council.

Preston Quirk, applicant, said that his client agrees with condition 1 but they would like to proceed with the project now. Mr. Zeitlin explained the SP process.

There were no requests from the public to speak. Commissioners Mayhall and Mosley expressed that they were comfortable approving the proposal knowing that the project will return to them, as part of the SP process, for final review.

Motion: Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

- 1. The townhouses are revised to be two stories and return to the Historic Zoning Commission for approval before proceeding to the Planning Commission; and**
- 2. The applicant returns to the Commission with the final approval of the design, materials, window/door placement, and all utilities, mechanicals, and other appurtenances if the SP is approved by Metro Council;**

finding that with these conditions, the massing of the project meets the design guidelines for new construction in the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. VIOLATIONS/ ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVALS/ SHOW CAUSE

q. 3707 RICHLAND AVE

Application: Demolition; Show Cause

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021010977

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for demolition. We are recommending denial of demolition and requesting a show cause hearing for permit #2019-042830 with a condition that the building be reconstructed. The issued permit was for an addition but there was no mention of foundation work as a part of that permit or the Codes permit.

That work has been done in a manner that now requires the building to be demolished, according to engineer Mark Buchanan. You will see in the report that Mr. Buchanan has extensive experience with creating plans to repair historic buildings. We cannot recommend demolition as the building is historic and contributes to the overlay and the National Register district and we cannot recommend demolition based on economic hardship as the owner has created his own hardship with the work he has done. Because the work was not included in their permits, we request a show cause hearing to show why the permit should not be rescinded.

We recommend disapproval of demolition since the application created his own hardship.

We recommend that the permit for the addition be rescinded, the building be fully documented over the next 15 days as outlined in the report and that the historic building be reconstructed and inspected for final approval before any new permits are issued.

Dan Huffstutter, owner, disagrees that the hardship was created by the homeowner but instead by water intrusion.

Ms. Zeigler indicated that two emails containing public comment on this issue were received prior to 10am on Tuesday, March 16th and were posted on the website.

During the public hearing, neighbor Wesley Weeks, 3705 Richland Ave, spoke in favor of demolition.

Alex Dickerson explained the process.

Commissioner Mosley said he is very troubled by the engineer's report as it is clear that the person hired to do the work either did not know how or undermined the stability of the building on purpose.

Commissioner Price said this house did not meet demolition criteria prior to this work so the owner has created his own hardship, as reported in the engineer's report.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to disapprove demolition since the applicant created his own hardship. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Jones said the applicant did not provide any information to show cause as to why the permit should not be rescinded and the work was done outside of the scope of the permit. Commissioners discussed whether or not there were options beyond full demolition. Commission Mosley said if the applicant was willing to lift the building for a new foundation, they would be open to that.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved that the preservation permit for an addition be rescinded, finding that the foundation work was done outside of the scope of the permit. Further, it was moved that the building be fully documented and reconstructed using original materials and historic images following the detailed direction of this report and with the following conditions:

1. Plan for removal storage and reuse of salvage materials be submitted with 15 days;
2. Dimensions of all features are collected with 15 days;
3. Analysis of mortar type and documentation of design be undertaken with 15 days;
4. Plans for reconstruction of the house with details on its features and the results of conditions 1-3 be submitted prior to issuance of demolition and new construction permits;
5. The previously enclosed rear frame porch may be reconstructed as documented or not constructed; and,
6. No additional Preservation Permits be issued until the reconstruction has been inspected and reviewed by the Commission as to whether or not it is a true reconstruction of the historic building;

finding that reconstruction meets section II.A.4. of the design guidelines for the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 1512 DALLAS AVE

Application: Demolition; Show Cause

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: 2021036693

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for demolition. This is not a request for economic hardship but rather a show cause hearing as work has taken place far beyond the issued permit for an addition. All that is left is the front wall. Because the building is historic, staff cannot recommend demolition but does request a show-cause hearing to show why the permit should not be rescinded. Staff recommends that the permit be rescinded and that the building be reconstructed following the specific requirements outlined in the report and inspected for final approval before any new permits are issued.

Paul Martin explained that the chimney fell and hit another chimney causing it to fall which demolished part of the right wall and floor joists. It was a safety concern, so the walls were removed. He doesn't understand rescinding the permit, but he agrees with reconstructing the house.

Ms. Zeigler indicated that three emails were received prior to 10am on Tuesday, March 16th and were posted on the website and that there were no callers.

Commissioner Price said that rescinding the permit is appropriate so that they can see plans. Commissioner Mosley agreed. Commissioner Fitts warned applicants to take the highest precautions and means in terms of the contractors they are hiring. This type of work can be done. This accident could have been prevented with proper stabilization.

Commissioner Jones noted that the staff report said that the violation was found during inspections whereas the applicant said he contacted staff the day after the collapse. Mr. Hoffman said that he called the applicant from the site on February 9th after discovering the violation while conducting other inspections. Commissioner Jones and Chair Bell encouraged applicants to call staff prior to conducting work outside of the permit, as stated on the permit.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove demolition; finding that demolition does not meet section III.B; the Preservation Permit for an addition be rescinded, finding that demolition took place outside of the scope of the permit; and the building be fully documented and reconstructed using original materials and historic images following the detailed direction of this report and with the following conditions:

- 1. Plan for removal, storage and reuse of salvage materials be submitted with 15 days.**
- 2. Dimensions of all features be submitted within 15 days;**
- 3. Plans for reconstruction of the house with details on its features and the results of conditions 1-2 be submitted prior to issuance of demolition and new construction permits; and,**
- 4. No additional Preservation Permits be issued until the reconstruction has been inspected and reviewed by the Commission as to whether it is a true reconstruction of the historic building;**

finding that reconstruction meets section II.A.4. of the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

s. 201 2ND AVE N

Application: New construction—Rooftop Addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021007304, T2021007301

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for a rooftop addition at 201 2nd Ave N. This a situation where work was done without a permit. It does not meet the design guidelines but it is also not something that can easily be removed and still allow for roof access; therefore, staff recommends that a cornice be added back to the building, using the historic photos of the also chamfered corner building that used to be across the street as inspiration. With the small size of the addition, coupled with the addition of the cornice to minimize its visibility, it may be that the massing of the addition could be appropriate. If not, staff recommends removal of that portion of the addition—seen here in blue-- within 180 days that does not meet the design guidelines, the front stair tower and railings along Church Street and 2nd Ave.

Ajeya Upadhyaya, owner, asked for approval of the application as presented. He provided an overview of the process, claiming that the addition was approved two years ago. He argued that the building never had a cornice and could not support the weight of a cornice. He asked that the cornice not be required and that the stairwell be clad in copper and cedar shakes, rather than stucco.

In answer to commissioner's questions, Mr. Hoffman explained that the issued building permit states that it is for interior work only and that the MHZC did not receive plans until after contacting the applicant about the violation. Commissioner Price said that the cornice could be a good compromise and believes there is evidence a cornice was there. If the cornice is not added, the violation should be removed.

Commissioners provided their condolences for the damage caused by the Christmas morning bomb. Commissioner

Mayhall said that a person has been hired to apply for grants to assist property owners with damage. There is a benefit concert on the 25th, on channel 5, with some funds going to property owners.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to approve the rooftop addition with the conditions that:

- 1. A cornice, to be approved administratively, be added to the 2nd Ave N and Church Street facades within 180 days using the cornice from the building that used to be at 200 2nd Avenue as an inspiration;**
- 2. The rooftop additions be clad in stucco;**
- 3. MHZC staff approve doors prior to their purchase and installation; and,**
- 4. The rooftop element has no additional lighting, signage or other features installed without a Preservation Permit;**

finding with these conditions, the application will meet section III.H (New Construction—Additions).

Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

t. 1131 RIVERWOOD DRIVE

Application: New construction—Outbuilding

Council District: 07

Overlay: Eastdale Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman; paul.hoffman@nashville.gov

PermitID#: 2020079831

1131 Riverwood Drive is an outbuilding that was installed without permit. Staff recommends disapproval based on the design guidelines and past interpretations of the design guidelines; however, it may be appropriate for the Commission to reassess and provide staff with new direction in terms of whether or not a foundation should be continuous and whether or not a wall and eave heights need to be proportional to the historic building on an outbuilding, or on an outbuilding under a certain size.

Staff observed this garden shed in September 2020, after a previous non-contributing outbuilding was demolished

The one hundred and twelve (112) square foot outbuilding meets the Eastdale Place conservation zoning overlay design guidelines for location and design but does not meet section H.2 due to a low wall height that is not compatible with historic outbuildings.

The shed also does not meet section H.6 for materials, as the siding is T1-11 which has not been an approved siding material, the foundation is on piers, and the windows are vinyl.

Staff recommends disapproval, finding the project does not meet section III.B for New Construction or III.H for Outbuildings of the Eastdale Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Staff recommends that the building be removed from the site within sixty (60) days.

Helen Simpkins, owner, asked to request the outbuilding as-is since it is consistent with the overlay, it is only slightly larger than the size that would not require a permit, they were not aware of the overlay prior to purchase and replacement would prevent them from restoring the principal building.

Councilmember Benedict sent an email yesterday. She writes,

I have reviewed all of the documentation on this case and have driven by the property. While I wish Mr. Simpkins would have been aware of the conservation overlay prior to his actions, I do not see any reason why the current structure needs any modifications. My hope is that you will not follow the staff recommendation, but rather that you will allow Mr. Simpkins to leave the structure as it currently is. As always, thank you for your service to the city.

There were no callers.

Commissioner Mosley said it is a temporary shed installed for a temporary purpose. Requiring a permanent foundation makes the building more permanent and may not be what they want to do for a small storage building. Commissioners Price and Jones agreed because the building is so small.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve based on its size of one-hundred and twenty (120) square feet and its impermanence, finding the project meets section III.B for New Construction and III.H for Outbuildings of the Eastdale Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Bell in opposition.

u. 1408-B BOSCOBEL STREET

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2020048615

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

The Commission took a break at 4:50 p.m. and returned at 4:55 p.m.

v. 1515 GALE LANE

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding Revision
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2020073959

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented a request for a substitute material at 1515 Gale Lane. She explained that additional materials were sent to the Commission yesterday. An outbuilding has been approved for 1515 Gale Lane with fiber cement siding. The applicant would like to request a material for the siding that has not been approved in the past for the siding and that staff found not to meet the guidelines, so could not be administratively approved. The product is Everlast Advanced Composite siding which is an extruded material made of inorganic materials, polymer resins and acrylic colorants. It has an embossed texture which has not been approved by the Commission in any scenario so far.

The product does not meet the design guidelines for substitute materials because of its texture and details. To date, the Commission has never allowed for a textured lap siding material because it creates a “theme park effect.” The material is described as having a “rough sawn” texture whereas most historic lap siding had a smooth, milled surface. The design guidelines Principle 3 states that “fake old buildings are not appropriate.” The Commission determined several decades ago that textured siding can create a faux old house look. (This interpretation is consistent with commissions across the country.)

In the past, the Commission has considered “workability” as a “detail” of a proposed substitute material, this follows national standards and the guidance of the National Park Service. In terms of workability for replacement of historic wood lap siding, the commission has considered if the substitute material can be repaired, sanded, and painted like wood.

The material cannot be sanded due to being made of all inorganic materials. It can be painted; however, paint will void the warranty. Since it cannot be repaired, if damaged it would have to be fully replaced, unlike historic wood siding.

Craig Daily, supplier of the product, said that early wood siding was not smooth, and the product’s texture is an imprint of actual wood. Amber Veach, distributor, asked for it to be approved as a sample project for later inclusion

in the list of approved products. She provided information about the benefits of the product. Moss Pettigrew, owner, asked for the product because it does not need to be painted.

Commissioner Price said the guidelines are clear that the product is not allowed and there are other synthetic sidings available. Commissioner Jones agreed and said that wood is readily available and so a substitute is not needed.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to disapprove revision of permit #2020073959 finding that the proposed product does not meet II.A.3 and II.B.d. for “texture” and “details.” Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

w. 2121 WESTWOOD AVE

Application: Demolition (revision to existing permit)

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: 2020073959

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for demolition of 2121 Westwood Ave.

Staff administratively approved partial demolition due to structural issues but once that demolition was done, the applicant determined that the remaining wall could not be saved. They now request full demolition. Staff recommends disapproval of demolition; finding that demolition does not meet section III.B since the building is historic.

If demolition is found to be inappropriate, then the issue of creating a complete foundation still exists and needs to be addressed. Staff recommends the building be reconstructed following the plans from 2020 and the historical documentation and that the addition continue as planned, using the plans from 2021. Section II.A.4. of the design guidelines allows for reconstruction if the building was contributing, it had an appropriate massing and scale for the neighborhood and is based on documentary evidence. The building was contributing and was an appropriate massing and scale for the district. There is photographic evidence of earlier conditions and the existing permit plans. The design guidelines also assume that a building is “no longer existing” as a condition for allowing reconstruction and all that remains is the front wall and porch.

Blaine Bonadies, applicant, said that they agree with the staff recommendation and to reconstructing the building by temporarily removing the gable end. Using mitered siding and diamond windows are not a part of their proposal but recommended by staff. They are fine with using the mitered siding but not the diamond windows because they are too expensive.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Fitts noted that this demolition is not a violation or due to the fault of the contractor, but rather a flaw in the construction. Commissioners Jones and Price said they did not feel the diamond lights were needed because of the low visibility of the house.

Commissioner Mosley left the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to disapprove demolition; finding that demolition does not meet section III.B and that the building be reconstructed using some original materials, 2020 permit plans, and historic images following the detailed direction of this report, with the exception of the diamond lite requirement, finding that reconstruction meets section II.A.4. of the design guidelines for the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VI. MHZC ACTIONS

x. 1204 RUSSELL ST

Application: Demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021007274

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

y. 949 RUSSELL ST

Application: Demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021007298

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

z. 1609 FRANKLIN AVE

Application: Demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021007392

Staff member, Paul Hoffman presented the case for demolition of 1609 Franklin. This application was presented as an economic hardship case but based on the extent of long-term damage and the type of damage—mold and moisture—staff found that the building simply was not rehab-able. Therefore, the economics of the situation were not relevant. Two engineer reports and a mold report were submitted. The mold/moisture inspection by Frost Environmental Services LLC concludes that there is visible mold growth, elevated moisture levels, and water damage on floors, walls, visible joists and studs, and ceiling. The remediation work needed is not possible with the building in its current condition.

Staff finds that sections 1,2, and 4 have been met. Sections 3, 5, and 6 are incomplete but staff does not find them necessary based on the compelling evidence of the engineer reports and mold estimate. Section 8 may not have been met; however, the issue for this case is not the cost of repairs but the inability to repair. Even if economic hardship exists, in this case, repair would likely not be possible for any owner at any purchase price or any cost. Staff recommends approval of demolition based on inability to rehabilitate the building.

Mr. Klamann requested the ability to demolish the building.

Councilmember Withers spoke in favor of demolition.

Commissioners Mayhall and Jones said they went by the property and understand the recommendation. Commissioner Jones said she had the opportunity to walk-thru the house and the roof structure has been open to the elements for decades. They could not go upstairs because two vultures lived there. Chair Bell and Commissioner Price also visited the site and agreed that once water gets into a building, it is a lost cause, and in this case, water has infiltrated for decades.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to approve demolition, finding that sections 1,2, and 4 have been met. Chair Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

aa. 3916 CAMBRIDGE AVE

cc. Application: Demolition—Outbuilding; New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021006556 and T2021006562

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

bb. 321 S 16TH ST

Application: New Construction—Addition; Partial Demolition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012205

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for an addition at 321 South 16th Street. The lot is oriented to Boscobel Street, but the building entrance is oriented to South 16th Street. The application is to add a covered deck to the Boscobel Street façade, to remove an existing window, and to add a door opening.

While the entrance of the existing structure is oriented to South 16th Street, the lot is oriented to Boscobel Street. According to the zoning code, the front property line for corner lots is the shorter of the two street frontages. Although the house is not historic, additions to the house must meet the design guidelines for Lockeland Springs-East End to ensure that the new construction moves the structure closer to being compatible with the historic context. In this case, staff finds that a front porch addition on the Boscobel Street frontage could be appropriate since it would align the primary entrance with the lot orientation. Furthermore, a primary entrance oriented to Boscobel Street would be more appropriate for the context. Two nearby corner lots include structures oriented to South 16th Street, but in both cases, there are also structures with primary entrances oriented to Boscobel Street.

In this case, the design of the addition is not appropriate for a front porch addition since it would be more of a covered deck that is more typical for a rear addition. The proposed addition does not include a foundation and material in the gable field. While a front porch addition could be appropriate, covered decks are elements more suitable for rear or minimally visible side façades. A front porch that includes the design elements that are characteristic of a front porch such as a foundation, material in the gable field, appropriately scaled porch posts, and appropriate front door dimensions could move the site closer to meeting the design guidelines.

To access the covered deck, the plan includes removing an existing window opening on the Boscobel Street façade and adding French doors in that area. While it could be appropriate to add a door opening to the Boscobel Street façade, the width of the opening and type of door proposed are more appropriate for a side or rear façade that is less visible from the public right-of-way. If a door is added to the Boscobel Street façade, the location and design of the opening should be more appropriate for a front door in order to meet the design guidelines.

According to Zoning, the setback along Boscobel Street is contextual since it is considered the front, the setback from South 16th Street is forty feet (40') since it is a collector street, and the minimum interior side setback is five feet (5'). The addition meets the interior side setback, but setback determinations are needed for the front and side-street setback.

The proposed porch is located approximately twenty-five feet (25') from the Boscobel Street property line. The three houses to the right of the site as well as the house across South 16th Street are non-contributing. As proposed, the new construction would sit forward of the front wall of 1603 Boscobel Street as well as the front porch at 1605 Boscobel Street but would be approximately eleven feet (11') behind the front porch at 1523 Boscobel Street. Given the context, staff finds that the proposed front setback could be appropriate for a front porch since it would create a transition between the adjacent front setbacks.

The applicant proposes to locate the covered deck seventeen feet (17') from South 16th Street. Staff finds that the proposed street setback could be appropriate since it is similar to the setback of the infill at 1523 Boscobel Street and a forty foot (40') setback would be nearly impossible to meet on a fifty foot (50') wide lot.

While the proposed setbacks along both street frontages could be appropriate, staff finds that the design and materials are inappropriate for a front porch.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the covered deck, finding that the project does not meet Sections II.B.3 (Setbacks), II.B.4 (Materials), II.B.6 (Orientation), and II.B.7 (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings) of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines.

Faith Meyer Yeung, owner, requested a deferral.

cc. 306 S 15TH ST

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding; Setback determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021012264

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for an outbuilding at 306 South 15th Street, which is a c. 1930 vernacular bungalow. The lot has a significant slope down from the front to the back.

You can see the significant slope in this photo – the addition, constructed before the overlay is almost 3 stories but no taller than the house. The applicant wants to construct a garage that is less than 500 sq. ft. in the location of the parking area you see here. You can also see here that the area to construct the garage is limited by a concrete retaining wall.

The applicant is proposing a reduced rear setback in order to accommodate the garage on the lot. The drawings shown here are the same as the ones in the staff recommendation – they should have a two foot, two inch (2'2") setback. However, the applicant has volunteered to move it to three feet (3') from the rear property line and has sent revisions showing that change. The three foot (3') rear setback still does not meet the setback required in the design guidelines, which is five feet (5').

The garage will be just one story. The outbuilding is one story with a flat roof form and a roof deck. Staff finds that the flat roof and roof deck are appropriate because the garage is one story, sits so much lower than the historic house on the lot, and is shorter than the house, even without the grade.

Although the site is constrained due to the slope and the existence of a concrete retaining wall, staff finds that a setback of less than five feet (5') is not appropriate for this site because it would not allow for a vehicle to get in and out of the garage safely. Staff therefore recommends that the rear setback be at least five feet (5').

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The rear setback be at least five feet (5');
2. The concrete block be split face; and,
3. Staff approve the doors prior to purchase and installation.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed outbuilding meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines.

Paul Boulifard, architect for the project, explained that the topography, the pool location, a retaining wall, and the existing foundations are the reasons they are making the proposal in the manner presented. Mike Campbell, owner, requested approval.

Commissioners Jones and Price said they were disinclined to approve a setback because there was no historic reason for changing the bulk standards.

Motion:

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

1. **The rear setback be at least five feet (5');**
2. **The concrete block be split face; and,**
3. **Staff approve the doors prior to purchase and installation;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed outbuilding meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

dd. 118 S 11TH ST

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021012276

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

ee. 110 S 17TH ST

Application: Partial Demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021012212

Staff member, Melissa Sajid presented the proposal for partial demolition at 110 South 17th Street , which is a c. 1930 stone bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The applicant proposes partial demolition of an enclosed stone porch railing and to change the porch orientation from side entry to front entry. The c. 1964 Property Assessor's photo shows the current porch configuration. The plan is to remove the sloped stone and brick wall at the center as well as the rusticated stone planter railing on each side.

In a neighborhood conservation zoning overlay, replacement of open-style porch railings is not reviewed. Staff finds that this case is different for two reasons. On many historic homes, porch railings often have an open design of wood or metal. In this case, the porch railing is enclosed and more of an integral part of the overall porch and is a character defining feature. In addition, the plan proposes to change the porch orientation from side entry to front entry. The orientation of the front porch is considered a character defining feature that makes this house unique. As previously stated, staff has found no evidence indicating that the front porch design or configuration has been changed.

Given these factors, staff finds that the porch design and side-orientation are character defining features of this historic house. Removal of the planter-railing may be appropriate since that feature is not as visually tied to the historic home in the same way as the center enclosed railing, which is designed with brick and stone, similar to the walls of the house. In addition, retention of this porch, will not change the side-orientation of the porch.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the removal of the center, brick-and-stone, enclosed railing as well as the changing the porch orientation from side entry to front entry, finding that the work would not meet Sections II.B.6 and III.B of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Brittney Blanton, applicant, explained that the jagged rocks provide a safety hazard and not visible from the street with landscaping. Removing them allows a front orientation to what will be a single-family home.

Commissioner Price said that the features are character defining and removal would be a substantial alteration that would not meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove removal of the center, brick-and-stone, enclosed railing as well as the changing the porch orientation from side entry to front entry, finding that the work would not meet Sections II.B.6 and III.B of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

ff. 1015 HALCYON AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill and Outbuilding
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012217 and T2021013043

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for infill and an outbuilding at 1015 Halcyon Avenue, which is a vacant lot in the Waverly-Belmont neighborhood. In 2016, MHZC staff issued a permit to demolish the non-contributing house that previously stood on the lot. As proposed, the infill meets the design guidelines for height & scale, setbacks, roof form, and rhythm & proportion of openings. Staff recommends that the project include a walkway connecting the front door to the public sidewalk. The proposed DADU meets all guidelines for outbuildings.

The infill is 1.5 stories with a height and width that is appropriate for the historic context. The plan shows brick to grade on the primary massing of the infill. The Commission has typically required a different foundation material to delineate the foundation line. Staff recommends that the infill incorporate a different material for the foundation.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the conditions set forth in the staff recommendation.

The applicant was not present and there were not requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to approved with the following conditions:

- 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. The front setback shall be verified by MHZC staff in the field after staking;**
- 3. There shall be a change in material for the foundation of the infill;**
- 4. The site plan shall show a front walkway connecting the front door to the public sidewalk;**
- 5. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of doors, roof material and color, and a masonry sample for the infill prior to purchase and installation;**
- 6. Staff approved the roof color, windows, doors, and garage doors for the outbuilding prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- 7. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5’ of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s);**

finding with these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III of the *Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

ii. 1000 WOODLAND ST

Application: New Construction—Infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012258

The applicant is proposing to construct two new commercial buildings on a lot that is currently vacant.

One of the buildings will be at the corner and will address both streets, the other will address only Woodland Street. Both buildings will be one story.

The structure at the corner will have seventy-six feet (76’) of frontage along South 10th Street, and forty-five feet (45’) of frontage along Woodland Street. At its tallest point at the corner, the South 10th Street facade will be twenty-three feet (23’) tall.

The other building will have seventy-nine feet (79') of frontage along Woodland Street. This building will be twenty-four feet (24') tall.

There will be a twenty-eight foot (28') wide courtyard between the two buildings.

The windows and doors will be aluminum storefront type. The proposal includes four overhead doors on the Woodland Street façade. This type of door is more typical of a garage or vehicular-oriented building, whereas the historic buildings on Woodland Street are typically pedestrian-oriented. The Commission has not previously approved overhead doors on a primary façade.

Overhead doors are also proposed on the courtyard elevations, beginning at the second bay from the front. Staff finds that the overhead doors are appropriate on the non-street facing elevations.

The street facing and courtyard elevations will be primarily brick and wood siding, with fiber cement-panels. The rear elevation will be cement-fiber siding.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed infill construction with the conditions:

1. The bays on the street-facing elevations not have overhead doors; and
2. Information is provided for staff approval of the exterior materials, including: brick texture and color, siding texture and reveal, metal color, and the material of the railings.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the project meets the design guidelines for New Construction in the Lockeland Springs East-End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Dan Tansey, applicant, requested to keep the overhead doors, as submitted based on the use of the building. The door will simulate a storefront.

Councilmember Withers sent an email the day prior and spoke in favor of the project.

Commissioners Jones and Fitts found the rollup doors to be appropriate because of how they will be designed and how they will look when closed. In answer to Commissioners questions, Ms. Zeigler explained that a roll up door has to have horizontal divisions so that when closed, they do not look like storefront windows. Ms. Zeigler recommended that there are alternatives but Mr. Tansey said they were too expensive. Commissioners agreed that rollup doors, if allowed, should only be on new construction located in commercial nodes, only on the ground floor, and should approach the look of a historic storefront window.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to approve the proposed infill construction with the condition that information is provided for staff approval of the exterior materials, including: brick texture and color, siding texture and reveal, metal color, and the material of the railings finding that the project meets the design guidelines for New Construction in the Lockeland Springs East-End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

jj. 1809 HOLLY ST

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2021012259

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for infill at 1809 Holly Street, which was constructed c. 1948, Based on the date of construction, the materials, and the form, the building is non-contributing. The house did suffer damage from the March 3, 2021 tornado, but its demolition would have been allowed without the damage due to its non-contributory status. MHZC staff issued a demolition permit for the house in July 2020.

The setbacks all meet the historic context and the base zoning setbacks. The site lacks an alley, so will use an existing side driveway and curb cut. The new building will be a one and one-half-stories, which is compatible with the historic houses on the block and the surrounding area. The height and width of the infill is similar to historic houses in the immediate vicinity on similar sized lots.

Staff recommends approval with our standard conditions seen here on the screen.

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

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Staff approve a masonry sample, windows, doors, front porch floor and step material, roof shingle color, metal roof color and dimensions, and driveway and walkway materials prior to purchase and installation; and**
- 3. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within five feet (5') of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s);**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 4/21/2021