

JOHN COOPER
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES February 19, 2020

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Bell, LaDonna Boyd, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart, Brian Tibbs

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

Applicants: Scott Morton, Matthew Hagerty, Kristin Dabbs, Danie Reeder, Mary Holby, Nathan Douglas, Michael Ward

Councilmembers: None

Public: James Hensley, Derrick Smith, Ken Browning, Barry Walker, Karin Kalodimos, Michael Ward, Dan Gochberg

Chairperson Bell called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Chairperson Bell read information about the amount of time people have to speak, the process regarding the consent agenda, and the process for appeals.

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: Items on the agenda may be removed or moved at this time.

Ms. Zeigler requested that the discussion of the design guideline consolidation be moved to the end of the agenda. The applicant for 1231 6th Ave N requested their item be removed as they will make changes that can receive an administrative permit and the applicant for 1716 Greenwood requested a deferral to next month.

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve the revised agenda. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

There were no councilmembers present.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. January 15, 2020

Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the minutes and Commissioner Jones seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

b. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

c. 1522 DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination

Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2020007196

d. 942 MAXWELL AVE

Application: New Construction--Addition
Council District: 05
Overlay: Maxwell Heights Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2020008047

e. 202 MANCHESTER AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition and Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock melissa.baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2020008086 and T2020008089

f. 1108 S DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New Construction--Addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2020008090

g. 1514 FERGUSON AVE

Application: New Construction--Addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2020008106

h. 4205 ELKINS AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition (Revision to a Previously Approved Plan)
Council District: 24
Overlay: Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2019053293

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the consent agenda.

Decision:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve all consent items with their applicable conditions. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

i. 2001 LEBANON PK

Application: Recommendation for Historic Landmark
Council District: 15
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

Roy Dale and Councilmember Syracuse requested that the Cole House at 2001 Lebanon Pike be designated as a Historic Landmark. It was constructed by Edmund Cole circa 1859. The house is significant as an example of early Tennessee vernacular architecture and is the only one of three Cole residence remaining. Cole served as president of

the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad and had extensive interests in iron and coal mines in Alabama as well as large land holdings in the Nashville area. The National Register nomination states that the house “stands as the only remaining residence of this noteworthy couple [Edmund W. “King” and Anna Russell] who contributed both culturally and monetarily to the advancement of Nashville” and that it is “one of the few remaining structures built by the early leaders of our state.”

The property was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1974. The building retains historic integrity and there are no planned alterations; therefore, staff finds that the property meets section 17.36.120.B.5.

Staff suggests that the Metro Historic Zoning Commission recommend approval of the historic landmark to the Planning Commission and Metro Council and the adoption of the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines to apply to exterior alterations. Staff finds that the building is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and therefore meets the qualification requirements.

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

Motion:

Commission Stewart moved to recommend the historic landmark to the Planning Commission and Metro Council and to adopt of the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines to apply to exterior alterations; finding that the property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places thereby meeting the qualification requirements. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

j. 1600 10TH AVENUE N

Application: Recommendation for Neighborhood and Historic Landmarks

Council District: 19

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

Staff member, Jenny Warren, introduced a request for a Neighborhood Landmark and a Historic Landmark designation for 1600 10th Avenue North. The Neighborhood Landmark would allow a multi-family use and the Historic Landmark will ensure the long-term protection of the property.

The two-story brick building at 1600 10th Avenue North was constructed in 1892 by a group of young women known as the Flower Mission. This group had formed the previous year with the purpose of providing flowers, ices and delicacies to the ‘poor sick’ in Nashville. They quickly saw a greater need and shifted their efforts to caring for children whose mothers worked during the day. They began raising funds to construct a new building and secured a \$2,500 appropriation from the county. In 1892 they purchased two lots at the corner of Polk and Scott Streets (today 10th Avenue North and Garfield Street).

The building was constructed at a cost of \$4,400 and opened in April of 1893. The original front façade of the building included the projecting entry bay and the side wing to the right. Other original features include the terra cotta detailing under the eaves, a stone foundation and decorative brickwork.

The side elevation along Garfield Street has one-story portion that dates to at least 1897 but may well be original. In 1894, the Flower Mission changed its name to the Day Home for Working Women’s Children but was also known as the Polk Street Day Home. A 1909 newspaper article reported that the home hosted an average of forty-five (45) children a day, feeding them lunch and dinner and offering a variety of classes.

The second wing was added in the early 1900s, north of the entry bay – it creates a fairly symmetrical façade with three bays of tall windows on both floors to match the south wing – the primary difference is that the hipped roofline is lower and shallower on the later wing. The addition of this wing created an L-shape to the building and a one-story porch was constructed along the L in the rear.

The Day Home was operated here until 1924, when the property was presented to the Junior League to benefit their home for Crippled Children. The Junior League owned the property for six (6) years before selling it to the Cofer’s Free Will Baptist Church in 1930.

This church owned the building until 1965, and constructed a one-story rear addition in the 1950s, to create a squared footprint. From 1965-2018, the property was owned by the Christ Temple Apostolic Faith Church. In 2018, it was sold to a private owner.

The property is noted as a contributing building in the Buena Vista Historic District, which was listed in the National Register in 1979. The building retains historic integrity and remains contributing today.

The Neighborhood Landmark and Historic Landmark requests both require this Commission to review any proposed work to the structure. We will now briefly review the proposed changes.

The fire escape will be removed. This may be an early feature, but it is not significant, and its removal is appropriate. On the front façade, several non-historic punctures into the historic masonry will be re-filled with brick. It is possible that brick can be salvaged from other areas for use here.

There will also be a few changes to the current fenestration. On the front elevation, the enclosed window will be reopened. On the north elevation, the third window from the front will be converted into a door. Along Garfield Street, there are three bricked-in windows. One of these will be turned into a door, and windows will be re-introduced into the other two. On the rear elevation, the bricked-in window on the first floor will be reestablished. On the second floor, two of the enclosed windows will become doorways to a second level deck, the third window will be reestablished. The proposed fenestration changes are primarily located on side and rear elevations and all either restore or maintain original openings, although some windows are becoming doors. Staff finds that the proposed work meets section IV.A and B of the Historic Landmark Design Guidelines.

The project does not propose any change to the massing of the building – no addition is planned. A portion of the roof of the 1950s addition will be used for an upper level deck, accessed by re-opening enclosed openings. The project meets sections II.B.1 and 2 of the design guidelines.

The windows and doors are not original and will be replaced. Except for those openings already discussed, the new doors and windows will fit within the existing openings. The applicant proposes to use multi-light windows. Based on the oldest photographs we have; staff recommends that the new windows be 1/1 and that staff review and approve the final window selections.

The current front door is also not original. This early photograph shows what appears to be a four-panel ¾ light double door. Staff recommends a new door of similar design be installed. Further, staff recommends that the original transom shape and dimensions should be retained. The side and rear doors are not original, and their replacement is appropriate.

Staff recommends final review of railing materials and designs. Staff further recommends final review of wood trim repair and the final composite panel for the front gable-field. Masonry will be cleaned and tuck pointed. There are some areas where more extensive work may be required due to decay. Staff recommends final review of this work as well.

The bell tower will be cleaned and painted. Staff recommends final review of the method of cleaning. Lastly, staff recommends final review of fencing design and materials.

Staff suggests that the Commission recommend approval of the neighborhood and historic landmarks to the Planning Commission and Metro Council and the adoption of the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines to apply to exterior alterations.

Staff finds that the building is a contributing building to the Buena Vista National Register district and therefore meets the requirements of section 17.36.120 and that the rehabilitation plan meets the Historic Landmark design guidelines thereby meeting section 17.40.160 of the ordinance with the conditions that the replacement windows be one-over-one windows with clear glass, the original transom dimensions be retained and that the applicant obtains final approval of:

- 1) Replacement masonry

- 2) Make and model of replacement windows
- 3) Make and model of new and replacement doors
- 4) Repair and replacement of wood features
- 5) Masonry cleaning and repair
- 6) Bell tower cleaning; and
- 7) Design and materials of fencing and railings.

With these conditions, staff finds the work to meet the Historic Landmark Design Guidelines, which meet the Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Applicant Scott Morton of Smith-Gee explained the project. All exterior alterations will follow the requirements of the design guidelines. They have support from the Buena Vista neighborhood association and Councilmember O'Connell.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Ms. Zeigler recommended an added condition that the applicant apply for a historic landmark with the Planning Commission.

Motion:

Cyril Stewart moved to recommend approval of the neighborhood and historic landmarks to the Planning Commission and Metro Council and the adoption of the existing Historic Landmark Design Guidelines to apply to exterior alterations; finding that the building is a contributing building to the Buena Vista National Register district and therefore meets the requirements of section 17.36.120 and that the rehabilitation plan meets the Historic Landmark design guidelines thereby meeting section 17.40.160 of the ordinance with the conditions that the replacement windows be one-over-one windows with clear glass, the original transom dimensions be retained and that the applicant obtains final approval of:

1. replacement masonry;
2. make and model of replacement windows;
3. make and model of new and replacement doors;
4. repair and replacement of wood features;
5. masonry cleaning and repair;
6. bell tower cleaning;
7. design and materials of fencing and railings; and
8. applicant apply for a historic landmark overlay with the Planning Commission.

With these conditions, the project meets the Historic Landmark Design Guidelines, which meet the Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Boyd arrived at 2:25 p.m.

k. MARATHON VILLAGE

Application: Recommendation for Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Council District: 19

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

Councilmember O'Connell has filed for a historic preservation zoning overlay for Marathon Village. The proposed district includes two complexes listed in the National Register of Historic Places; industrial buildings associated with the manufacturing industry.

Ms. Zeigler provided background on the case, noting that the Commission had previously voted unanimously to defer based on concerns regarding the boundaries and owner opposition. The Commission expressed concern with the qualification of the district due to the amount of vacant lots and non-contributing properties included in the original boundary. The proposed boundaries have changed and no longer include Jo Johnston and 16th Avenues. The current boundaries include approximately seventy-seven percent (77%) contributing buildings and several vacant lots.

In addition, property owners expressed concern with the guidelines regarding height for new construction not matching underlying zoning potential. The design guidelines have been changed to match underlying zoning with the exception of some properties immediately adjacent to historic buildings and owned by Barry Walker. You have received public comment via email.

The area includes two buildings listed in the National Register of Historic Places, industrial buildings associated with the manufacturing industry, and additional industrial buildings located on Clinton Street.

The two buildings listed in the National Register of Historic Places are the Mill building (1200-1310 Clinton Street) and the Administrative building (1305 Clinton Street). In 1995, the National Park Service found the district eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A of the National Register's criteria for its significance to the industrialization of Nashville and Tennessee between 1881 and 1914. Marathon Village represents Nashville's and the state's industrial and economic history, reflected in the changing uses of the buildings from Nashville Cotton Mills to Marathon Motor Works. Although the building underwent modifications in the period between serving as a cotton mill and an automobile manufacturing plant, few changes have occurred since 1912.

The overlay also includes the industrial strip at 1404 Clinton Street, as well as the George M. Fly & Sons LL building located at 1419 Clinton Street. They are contributing buildings to the overlay because of their association with the industrialization of Nashville Tennessee.

The proposed district meets section 17.36.120.A.5 as a portion of the district is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The areas outside of the National Register district meets section 17.36.120A.1 due to its association with the Werthan Industrial complex and its contribution to the understanding of the history of the industrialization of Nashville.

Staff suggests that the Commission recommend approval of the Marathon Village Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay, finding the area to meet criteria 1 and 5 of section 17.36.120.

Staff recommends that adoption of the draft design guidelines proposed for the new district finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

James Hensley, Nelson Greenbriar Distillery, opposed the overlay and asked that the parcels that they lease be removed. Commissioner Stewart asked Mr. Hensley to elaborate on the severe repercussions noted. Mr. Hensley said they needed a loading dock and they have already spent money on design ideas to open up the front of the building. They are a draw to the district and want to see that grow.

Derrick Smith, attorney representing property owner Mrs. Walker, opposed the overlay based on the belief that the value of the property will be reduced.

Ken Browning, 607 14th Ave N, opposed the overlay although he does not own property within the district, as it will stifle development.

Barry Walker, property owner, spoke in favor of the overlay and explained the purpose. He noted that other overlays in Nashville and other cities have some of the highest property values and that most of the property owners are in favor of it.

Karin Kaladimous, does not own property in the district, explained that she owns property in an overlay and their property has increased in value. Tourism is attracted to historic preservation rather than away from it.

Commissioner Mayhall arrived at 2:41p.m.

Commissioner Jones agreed to recommend the overlay based on the data behind improving property values and other issues brought up are in their purview. Commissioner Tibbs agreed that it qualifies.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to recommend approval of the Marathon Village Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay, finding the area to meet criterion 5 of section 17.36.120 and to adopt the design guidelines proposed for the new district finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Stewart said that studies have been conducted all across the country and show that property values increase with historic overlays. He commended Mr. Walker for the work he has accomplished over decades to restore and improve the area.

I. CONSOLIDATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ZONING OVERLAY

[The discussion of the design guidelines consolidation was moved to the end of the agenda.]

VI. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED/DECIDED ITEMS

m. 1501 FATHERLAND ST

Application: Demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2020000869

[Public comment received and forwarded to commission via email.]

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 1501 Fatherland St, an application for demolition, arguing for economic hardship of this home, built circa 1930. Members of the Commission visited the building on January 22nd. The Commission has also received correspondence about this application.

The building has a compromised foundation and support system. On first viewing the joists and subfloor are dry and intact. As you go farther forward however, the condition of the beams and joists get more deteriorated. The front of the house is built very close to grade, with the front right corner being below grade due to the flow of water runoff down the street. On staff's first visit to the building, we thought the structure was in good enough condition to permit rehabilitation and adding on. Although the grading and foundation obviously needed to be addressed, we hoped that the structure could be rehabilitated and perhaps raised onto a new foundation. Once the owners looked into getting work done, they told staff that they had trouble getting contractors to do the work, as the required structural work was dangerous.

The engineer's report notes the compromised condition of the structural elements, with undersized and poorly constructed framing leading to sagging and damaged structural components over time. The floor and support systems have settled, leaving a difference of more than ten inches in the floor level. The engineer told staff by email that the foundation needs replacement, and that it would necessitate further rebuilding of the framing, as that has settled with the foundation. Due to the amount of replacement required once the foundation is fixed, staff finds that the building would not at that point maintain its historic integrity.

Staff therefore recommends approval of the application for demolition, finding that the cost of necessary repairs exceeds the value of the home. The proposed demolition meets Section III.B.2 for appropriate demolition.

Commissioners Tibbs and Mosley recused themselves since they were not in attendance at the previous meeting or the walk thru. Commissioner Fitts noted that she was not present for the meeting or walk-thru but listened to the previous meeting and has reviewed the materials so feels comfortable with participating in the discussion and vote.

Matthew Hagerty, engineer, provided his credentials. In his experience he has inspected over one thousand (1,000) historic homes and there is only one other historic building he has recommended to be demolished. He provided an example of an attempted church restoration in California which illustrates the concerns and difficulty with lifting and leveling this building.

Commissioner Stewart thanked the applicant for deferring so that they could meet with the engineer and tour the property. He noted some dissimilarities to the church example, such as the plaster finishes, which only exists in a closet as most of the rest is covered in paneling and so would need to be removed. Most of the damage appears to be in the front-right of the structure. The rest of the house appeared to be intact, as observed from the exterior, interior and from below. He didn't see cracking and decaying brick that he sees in a lot of old homes. They have approved full demolition before, but they do not go into that lightly. He objected to the statement that all the wood was deteriorated as that is not what he observed. He checked a fair amount of the wood with a pen knife and found it to be solid. The house is contributing to the neighborhood and concerns about its potential demolition have been received from the Councilmember and the neighborhood. He said he tends to concur that the building can be rehabilitated.

Commissioner Jones agreed that rehab is possible but was concerned that it was not financially reasonable. Chairperson Bell agreed with Commissioner Stewart, stating that she didn't see extreme deterioration and that the house appeared to be structurally sound, but she struggles with the economics of the case. She was surprised that the interior was in good condition after being vacant without services for two years.

Chairman Bell agreed with Commissioner Stewart. She did not see deterioration of old-growth wood. She expressed concern with balancing the economics of the question since there are so many properties that have been rehabilitated successfully and without an economic loss. The structure appears to be sound with the exception of the right side of the home where there has been water intrusion. She noted that the interior was in good condition, especially when you consider that the mechanicals have been off, and the building has been empty for two years.

Commissioner Fitts agreed with both Commissioners Stewart and Jones. She noted that the ordinance states that the economics may be considered, not shall be considered. She feels that there is the possibility of recouping an investment on a rehabilitation. She believes that an addition could make it possible to recoup an economic return.

Commissioner Boyd said she agreed with demolition; however, she did not have the benefit of visiting the site for herself.

Commissioner Mayhall said she has difficulty approving demolition if the building is sound and the neighborhood is against demolition.

Mr. Hagerty was invited back. He disagreed with Commissioner Stewart's assessment of the plaster since most of the original interior finish is plaster but covered with a thin paneling. He finds that the house is a life-safety issue in a structurally compromised state.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the request for demolition based on the analysis of information and the expert witnesses. Commissioner Mayhall seconded with four concurring votes. Commissioner Boyd voted in opposition and Commissioners Mosley and Tibbs recused themselves.

VII. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

n. 1716 GREENWOOD AVE

Application: Final SP Review

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020008160

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

VIII. VIOLATIONS/ ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVALS/ SHOW CAUSE

o. 1717 VILLA PL

Application: Partial Demolition; New Construction—Addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Edgehill Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2019074220

[Public comment received and included in the staff recommendation.]

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 1717 Villa Place.

For this item, the applicant is seeking after-the-fact approval of an exterior staircase that was recently constructed without a Preservation Permit or Building Permit.

The stairs were added on the left side of the house, beginning approximately five feet (5') back from the front of the house and leading up to the gable-field wall and a doorway that was converted from a window opening. The window had already been replaced, but the size of the opening has now been increased.

The stairs currently do not meet the standard five foot (5') setback requirements, although if the stairs had open risers the setback can be reduced to three feet (3'). The applicant agreed to remove or open the risers to meet the setback. The setback is not the only issue, however, as this is not an appropriate location for a side addition. Additions are appropriate on houses that are atypically narrow, on houses shifted to one side of a lot, or on houses on lots wider than sixty feet (60'). This meets none of those criteria.

The stairs are pressure-treated wood with wood and steel-cable railing. These materials may be appropriate on a rear addition or a more contemporary context, but they are not consistent with the character of the historic Craftsman style house.

Additionally, the alteration of a window to door on the upperstory wall in a prominently visible location is not appropriate.

Staff recommends disapproval of the request for after-the-fact approval to retain the exterior staircase and window alteration on the left side of the house at 1717 Villa Place, and that original conditions be returned within 60 days, finding that the work does not meet the following sections of the Edgehill Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines:
III.C. Setbacks and Rhythm of Spacing
III.D. Materials
V.A. Additions (Location and Removability)
VI. Demolition (Partial)

Kristin Dabbs, owner, handed out photographs of other houses with side stairs. She explained the reason for the request.

Chairperson Bell noted that the existing stairs on other properties were likely installed prior to the overlay.

Commissioner Tibbs said he understands why they thought it would be appropriate but the way it is constructed right now does not meet the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones and Mosley agreed that it does not meet the guidelines for stairs and side-additions. Commissioner Stewart explained that neighbors generally want an overlay to keep the historic character and exterior stairs are not a part of that character as they are not original to the houses. He agrees with the councilmember and the neighbor's opposition.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the request for after-the-fact approval to retain the exterior staircase and window alteration finding that the project does not meet the design guidelines III.C, III.D, V.A. and VI and required that the work be corrected within 30 days. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion

passed unanimously.

p. 1404 N 14TH ST

Application: Show Cause; New Construction—Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman; paul.hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2017077941

[Public comment received and forwarded to the Commission via email.]

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented the show cause hearing for violations at 1404 North 14th Street, which has a different roof form than was approved, windows installed that were not approved, and siding with embossed grain, contrary to the requirements of the permit issued. The Commission approved the rear addition in December 2017, with permit 2017-077941 issued. In November 2018, the applicant applied for additional height, for the addition to be a total of 2 feet taller than the ridge of the house, which the Commission approved.

The rear addition was approved with a clipped roof, making less apparent the two feet (2') of additional height. As built, the addition has a gabled form without the clip. Although this was not built as permitted, the gabled roof is a traditional roof form historically. The additional height above the existing ridge is minimal, and thirty-eight feet (38") back from the front of the house. For these reasons and the minimal visibility of this portion, staff recommends approval of the gabled roof as built.

The Eastwood Design Guidelines, Section II.B.1.d for Materials specify that cement fiberboard siding, when used for lap siding, should be smooth and not stamped or embossed. Both the cover page of the permit and the notes on drawings specify this as well. Notes on every permit and drawings require final approval of specific materials, including windows. The windows that were installed are a vinyl model that the Commission has not approved and were not approved by staff. The windows are single hung, shallow windows with grills between the glass, and brick molding.

Staff recommends disapproval of the siding and windows, and that they be replaced with staff-approved materials within thirty (30) days of the Commission's decision. Staff recommends approval of a revision to the permit for the roof as constructed. With these conditions, the addition will be in compliance with Section II.B.2 for Additions in the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Daniel Reeder, applicant, said he has a good reputation with codes. He explained his conversations with multiple metro departments and what he sees in the neighborhood. He would like to keep the windows as they are appealing. He is fine with replacing the siding on the front and sides.

Commissioner Stewart asked if he had the drawings on site, during construction. Mr. Reeder said he did. He explained that he ordered smooth siding, but the company installed embossed and is now out of business.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Tibbs said he appreciates staff recommending approval of the roofline as that would be costly to reconstruct. He does not see how they can improve embossed siding as they have always required the siding being smooth and have always required that the windows be approved. Commissioner Mosley said he was sympathetic with the applicant, but the guidelines are clear regarding the siding and they have always required textured siding to be replaced. Brick molding on the windows is inappropriate as it is for brick houses and not frame houses.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve a revision to the permit to accommodate the roof as constructed and disapprove the unpermitted siding and windows with the condition that replacement windows be approved and replaced within 30 days; finding that with these conditions, the project meets section II.B.2 for additions. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. MHZC ACTIONS

q. 1307 BEECHWOOD AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020008085

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 1307 Beechwood. 1307 Beechwood is a circa 1930 frame bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The addition meets the base zoning setbacks. It steps in two feet (2') for a depth of four feet (4') at both corners and then steps back out to line up with the house. Both the first and second floor plans show the two foot by four foot (2' x 4') inset. The addition will have a depth of twenty-seven feet (27'). The side elevations show that the addition is a two-story addition behind the one-and-a-half story house. Staff finds that the two-story scale of the addition is inappropriate to the house, particularly since the second level is not inset two feet (2') for its entire depth. The second level, most of which is not inset, will have an eave height that is nine feet (9') taller than the eave of the house. Staff recommends that the entirety of the 2nd story be inset two feet (2') in order to keep the scale of the addition appropriate. Staff is fine with the first story lining up with the side walls of the house after the inset.

The main form of the addition is a side gable with a 3.5/12 slope. In this case, the low slope increases the perceived height and scale of the addition and pushes the eave height of the addition taller. The design guidelines state that roof forms should have a minimum slope of 6/12. The historic house has a side gable with a slope of approximately 6/12. Staff recommends that the primary roof forms have slopes of at least 6/12, in addition to the recommendation that the addition be inset two feet (2') on both sides on the second level.

No changes to the window and door openings on the existing house were indicated on the plans. Staff recommends the addition of window openings on the ground floor of the right side since this is a twenty-foot (20') wall expanse without a window or door opening.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The addition be inset a minimum of two feet (2') on both sides at the second level;
2. The primary roof slope be at least 6/12;
3. Window openings be added to the right façade, ground floor, where there is a twenty-foot (20') expanse of wall space without a window or door opening;
4. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
5. Staff approve the roof shingle color; and
6. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed addition meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Mosley said that the condition to change the roof pitch would reduce usable space. Ms. Baldock agreed that the condition could change the design so significantly that staff would bring the project back to the Commission.

Mary Holby, property owner, explained the reason for the project and a description of the project. She requested to retain the project as presented.

Nathan Douglas, contractor, explained the changes that have been made based on staff comments. He noted that they have not maxed out the footprint that they could have. There is precedent, he claims, with the neighboring house.

Michael Ward, architect for another project, asked if an addition could be two-stories behind a one-and-a-half story

house?

Baldock said the recommendation is to bring the eave down so the addition would be one-and-a-half stories. Commissioner Mosley suggested that turning the orientation of the roof would help. Commissioner Stewart said it does appear as a two-story structure on the back of a one-and-a-half story house. The recommendation calls for a different design. Commissioner Mosley agreed that a new design could meet all their requirements and be in compliance with the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones said that a 2-story addition behind a one-and-a-half story house is not appropriate and the conditions require a new design.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the application since the recommendations would require a new design and there is the possibility of a design that would be more compatible with the house. He recommended that the conditions provided by staff be used as a starting point for a new design and that the addition not increase in height. Commissioner Boyd seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 2000 20TH AVE S

Application: New construction-Addition; Setback Determination

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2020008661

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented the case for 2000 20th Avenue South, an application for a rear addition and attached garage to this contributing building in the Belmont-Hillsboro conservation overlay.

The project requires a setback determination, of which staff recommends approval.

The proposed addition is one-and-a-half stories with a basement level due to the grade. The additional footprint is one thousand, one hundred ninety four (1,194) square feet, compared to the existing one thousand, five hundred and three (1,503) square feet. The ridge height is half a foot lower than the ridge of the house. The foundation height and eave height match those of the house.

The outbuilding meets the design guidelines for height and scale, design, location, roof form, proportion and rhythm of openings. The materials include fiber-cement siding, brick, aluminum-clad wood windows, and have been approved on similar projects by the Commission. With the condition that staff approve the usual materials, masonry, roofing color, windows, doors and garage doors, the application meets Section II.B.1.d for materials. The width of the addition matches the width of the historic home, at approximately seven feet (7') from the side property line. The applicant requests a setback determination for the side of the new construction facing Portland Avenue.

The Commission has routinely approved rear additions that match the width of the historic building. Section 17.12.030 of the Zoning Code (Street Setbacks) requires a twenty foot (20') street setback, and Section 17.20.060.D (Parking Area Design Standards) requires that garage doors opening onto a public street be a minimum of twenty feet (20') from the property line. However, the section on street setback also allows for the setback to be reduced fifty percent (50%) when the rear setback of a corner lot is oriented toward the rear setback of a neighboring lot, as is the case here, hence the usual ten feet (10') from the side property line. It is the Commission's decision of course to determine appropriate setbacks, but that is how staff arrived at the ten feet (10') that we are recommending for that side. Staff is suggesting that just the garage doors could be recessed, as we have seen that on previous projects for setbacks with garage doors facing a street.

This is very similar to a project approved by the Commission in 2016 at 2100 20th Avenue South, one block away on the corner of 20th Avenue and Bernard Avenue. In that case, the addition matched the existing width of the house and was six feet (6') off the side property line. At that time, I do not know if our staff was reviewing side setbacks the same, but as we try to direct applicants in line with the requirements of other Metro departments like Zoning and Public Works, this is the reason for our recommendation in this case. So, Staff recommends approval of the setback determination, with the condition that the addition's left side, or at least the garage doors, are moved to ten feet (10') off the property line.

Staff recommends approval of the setback determination. Staff recommends approval of the addition and attached garage with the conditions:

1. The left side of the addition or at minimum the portion housing the garage doors be moved at least ten feet (10') from the left side property line;
2. Staff approve samples of brick and stone prior to purchase and installation;
3. Staff approve the color of roofing material, and final details, dimensions and materials of windows, doors and garage doors prior to purchase and installation; and,
4. If they are moved, HVAC and other utilities shall be located on the rear façade, or on the non-street-facing side of the house.

With these conditions, Staff finds the proposed addition meets Section II.B.1 and II.B.2 of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, explained the goals of the project and the process he went through. If they have to pull the garage doors in three feet (3') it destroys the design for the owner's home office. Additions like this are difficult to mass and to design.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart left the meeting at 4:11p.m. and returned at 4:15p.m.

Commissioners Mosely, Jones and Tibbs expressed a comfort level with the reduced setback because of the additional distance of the garage from the street, as there is additional greenspace and sidewalk between the property line and edge of the street. Commissioner Tibbs and Mosley felt that the design is architecturally appropriate for the lot and the historic building because of the unique conditions of the lot, specifically the width of the lot and the existing setback. Commissioner Jones added that overall the massing of the addition is also appropriate for the house.

Chairperson Bell noted that it is a busy street and expressed concern that they might be approving something they should not be. Commissioner Mosley said the owner will be responsible for safety on their lot. Commissioner Fitts said there is a generous amount of property between the property line and the edge of the street. Commissioner Fitts noted that they need to honor the property line rather than the street edge; however, the additional greenspace does visually help.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve the project with the conditions:

1. Staff approve samples of brick and stone prior to purchase and installation;
2. Staff approve the color of roofing material, and final details, dimensions and materials of windows, doors and garage doors prior to purchase and installation; and,
3. If they are moved, HVAC and other utilities shall be located on the rear façade, or on the non-street-facing side of the house.

Based on the existing home location and the lot size and with these conditions, he finds the proposal to meet Section II.B.1 and II.B.2 of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

s. 1231 6TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020008107

Removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

The Commission took a break at 4:23p.m. and returned at 4:29p.m.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

CONSOLIDATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ZONING OVERLAY

Ms. Zeigler reminded the commission that the Historic Zoning Commission received funding from the Tennessee Historical Commission for a design guideline consolidation project. The project began in January 2019, and the grant period ended on September 30, 2019. A draft came to the Commission on September 18, 2019 and was deferred until March 2020.

The current draft is available online at the Nashville.gov website, as well as other information regarding the project.

The project was first presented to the Commission in three parts. Part I is a consolidation of all the neighborhood conservation design guidelines into one universal set of design guidelines, with Part II being individual chapters for each district. All the neighborhood conservation design guidelines are already very similar, but the consolidation will provide an opportunity to reorganize and add clarifying language. The third component is to create new design guidelines and a plans book for outbuildings, to provide more flexibility in terms of size and design and clearer guidance.

As a reminder, in November the Commission voted to remove Part III, the form book, from consideration and to break the discussion up into different sections at each meeting.

These are design guidelines and not hard and fast rules, so the language here does not preclude you from continuing to make decisions on a case by case basis based on the physical conditions of the site. You will continue to take public comment at and up-until the March public hearing but I would encourage people to send us their comments early so we can include them in any revisions proposed in March. Again, the most current draft is available on the website and has been there since mid-January.

Ms. Zeigler recommended that the Commission hear public comment on any portion of the design guidelines and then she would follow with some information to guide their discussion regarding outbuildings.

Dan Gochberg, Edgehill neighborhood. He said there are series of emails that have gone to stakeholders and he has been refused addition to the stakeholder list. He also expressed concern with the twenty feet (20') between outbuildings and principal buildings. He said that Edgehill should not change.

Ms. Zeigler explained that the stakeholder list was created by the Councilmembers and there has been no move to change that list.

Ms. Zeigler provided guidance on some of the changes for the outbuilding section.

The consolidation will clarify the difference between detached outbuildings and attached garages. Attached garages are in the "addition" section.

Most of the design guidelines have two to three sentences that are not italicized. The direction given is that outbuildings should be compatible with historic outbuildings in terms of height, scale, roof shape, materials, texture and details. Its not really possible to have a usable outbuilding in this age, that is similar in scale to historic outbuildings, which were typically a true one-story building with one-bay. These images are from a study conducted in 2008 of historic outbuildings. Today outbuildings are used for more than to store a car or garden tools. They serve multiple functions, depending on the underling zoning.

Several years ago, the italicized information was added to follow the ordinance requirements for DADUs as many applicants requested that the regulations be the same.

In this most recent draft, posted last month, we recommend removal of all the references to the form book, Part III.

Generally, the maximum dimensions in the draft are similar to what they are now in the italicized language, except that the dimensions are not tied to the existing house, with the exception of corner lots. This means that there could be cases where an interior lot has a garage that is taller than the historic building. Due to an outbuilding's location towards the rear of the lot, staff feels that the additional height will be negligible. The height of an appropriate outbuilding on a corner lot will be required to not exceed the height of the primary building.

Commissioners Stewart, Mosley and Jones stated that they would still have the opportunity to review outbuildings on a case-by-case basis.

The draft includes clarification of how eave and ridge heights will be measured. We are using a drawing created for us for the form book to further illustrate the text.

Roof slopes are required to be at least 4/12 so that will mean that flat roofed outbuildings would not be appropriate.

Measurement of dormers is simplified.

Setbacks are defined and more closely follow the bulk standard requirements for safety reasons, especially for corner lots. Also clarified is that any projections beyond the footprint would be considered in determining the appropriate setback, including roof overhang.

For the most recent draft we also re-used the add-on features from the form book.

To refresh your memory, here are the options:

Hoods & Awnings

- a. Hoods and awnings should not exceed three feet (3') in depth.
- b. Hoods and awnings should only be located over windows and doors.
- c. Width shall not exceed the opening it covers by more than two feet (2') on each side to allow for brackets and connections.

Stairwell Bay

- a. All stairs should be enclosed. For forms that have a footprint of less than five hundred (500) square feet and that are one-and-a-half or two (1.5 or 2) stories, a stairwell bay may be added.
- b. No more than one per building.

Enclosed Vestibule

- a. Vestibules are fully or partially enclosed stoops.
- b. They should not exceed five feet (5') wide and four feet (4') deep.
- c. Should not exceed one-story.
- d. No more than one per building.

Projecting Balcony

- a. Should not have a cover.
- b. Should not exceed thirty (30) square feet
- c. No more than one per building.

Projecting Oriel

- a. Should not exceed a depth of two feet (2')
- b. No taller than ten feet (10')
- c. No wider than ten feet (10')

- d. No more than one per building.

Projecting Porch

- a. Should not exceed full width of the side of the building to which it is attached.
- b. Should not exceed six feet (6') in depth
- c. Should be one-story only
- d. No more than one per building.

Roof Dormer

- a. Fourteen feet (14') wide total maximum.
- b. Front-face of each dormer should be primarily glazing.
- c. No more than one per roof plane.
- d. Inset a minimum of two feet (2') from side walls and from wall below.

Wall Dormer

- a. Fourteen feet (14') wide total maximum.
- b. Front-face of each dormer should be primarily glazing.
- c. No more than one per building.
- d. Inset a minimum of two feet (2') from side walls.

Staff and commissioner discussed the potential impacts of the add-ons and if someone used all the add-ons.

Ms. Zeigler said that they will make what are expected to be minor changes to the current draft based on today's feedback and public comment that we may receive after this meeting. The final draft will be presented to you in your regularly scheduled public hearing on March 18th. We'll be back at our usual meeting location on 2nd Ave S.

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 pm.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 10/21/2020