

JOHN COOPER  
MAYOR



# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission  
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

## METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC)

### MINUTES August 19, 2020

**Commissioners Present:** Chairperson Bell, Vice-chair Stewart, Mina Johnson, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, David Price

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

**Applicants:** Evan Brooks, Brian Haun, Steve Ezell, Paul Martin, Barby Jo Todd, Brady Fry, Jason Proby, Brent Hunter, Dexter Samuels, Chris Tigner, John Root, Rob Cowles, Julia Grissett, Jeff Estep, Peggy Newman, Will Jenner, Brittney Blanton, Brice McPherson, Kamal Saba, Matt McCrary, Cheyenne Smith, Laurie Babin, Manley, Rodney Young

**Councilmembers:** Brett Withers (via email)

**Public:**

Chairperson Bell called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. She 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, fax and voicemail and will be read or played at the time of their relevant case. We will also take comments via phone. The number is 629-255-1911. Please do not call until the project you wish to speak about is announced.

Chairperson Bell confirmed the commissioners in attendance.

Chairperson Bell explained that the Commission must vote on the record that the COVID-19 pandemic requires us to hold a telephonic meeting as permitted under the Governor's Executive Order number 16.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart 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 in light of the COVID-19 outbreak. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chairperson Bell read information regarding appeals and the process for the public hearings.

## I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Chairperson Bell asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda.

Ms. Zeigler, historic zoning administrator, asked that the design guideline consolidation project be deferred until the Commission can meet again in-person, the applicant for 726 McFerrin has requested a deferral and staff requests to remove 1821 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N, which was a violation that has been corrected.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to revise the agenda by deferring the design guideline consolidation project and 727 McFerrin and removing the project for 1821 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**II. CONSENT AGENDA**

**a. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR TWO MONTHS**

**b. 1903 BEECHWOOD AVE**

Application: New Construction--Addition and Outbuilding/ Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead:Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020048335 and T2020048340

**c. 311 CHAPEL AVE**

Application: New Construction--Addition  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead:Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020048608

**d. 1510 HOLLY ST**

Application: New Construction--Addition and Outbuilding/ Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead:Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020048625 and T2020048640

**e. 1018 ACKLEN AVE**

Application: New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 17  
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead:Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020048744

**f. 1811 BEECHWOOD AVE**

Application: Partial Demolition; New Construction--Addition and Outbuilding/ Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit;  
Setback Determination  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead:Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020048994 and T2020048999

**g. 1814 BEECHWOOD AVE**

Application: New Construction—Addition; Demolition--Outbuilding

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020049121

**h. 3531 CENTRAL AVE**

Application: New Construction--Addition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020049409

**i. 413 N 16TH ST**

Application: New Construction-Addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020049423

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the cases for the consent agenda.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve all cases with their applicable conditions finding that the projects meet the design guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS**

**j. CONSOLIDATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ZONING OVERLAY**

Request to defer until the MHZC is again able to meet in person.

**IV. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW**

**k. 1516 ORDWAY PL**

Application: New Construction—Infill (Final SP Review)

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020048738

1516 Ordway Place is a vacant lot at the southwest corner of Ordway Place and North 16<sup>th</sup> Street. In 2009, the site was rezoned with a specific plan (SP) to allow for the development of a two-story mixed-use building. This is the third time the project has come before the Commission. The Commission approved similar versions of this project in both 2009 and 2017. Today’s application has been submitted by a new owner, but the development is similar to the two previous submissions and meets the SP requirements.

The setbacks and footprint conform to the SP and are similar to the previous approvals. The Ordway façade will have an overall height of about twenty-six feet (26’), which is in line with the previous approvals. Because of the

slope of the lot, there is a raised basement in some areas towards the rear. The rear façade will be highly visible because this is a corner lot. Access to the basement level parking is at the rear.

The right façade will not be highly visible because it is on the interior of the lot. On the right side and rear, the raised basement is only supported by small posts. Although this may be structurally sound, staff finds that visually the lack of a more solid foundation is not typical for historic commercial and mixed use buildings of this size. Staff recommends that on the right façade, the area of the foundation that is not brick and that is currently shown as open have a masonry foundation. On the rear façade, which will be highly visible because it is a corner lot, staff recommends that the foundation be open to create vehicular bays but otherwise have masonry piers.

With the condition that the structure have a solid foundation, staff finds that the infills height, scale, setbacks, fenestration pattern, roof form, and materials meets the design guidelines and in accordance with the SP zoning.

Staff recommends approval of the infill 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. Staff recommends that on the right façade, the area of the foundation that is not brick and that is currently shown as open have a masonry foundation. On the rear façade, staff recommends that the foundation be open to create vehicular bays but otherwise have masonry piers.
3. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
4. Staff approve a brick sample;
5. Staff approve the railing design;
6. Staff approve the driveway and walkway materials; and
7. MHZC staff approve the location of the HVAC units and other utilities.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Evan Brooks, Powell Architects, said that they accept all the recommendations.

Councilmember Withers sent an email saying the following:

I would like to express my support for the revised plans for the 1516 Ordway Place Specific Plan project in the Lockeland Springs neighborhood. I recall the many community meetings that then-District 6 Council Member Mike Jameson held about this project before the Specific Plan legislation was applied in 2009. This vacant parcel is the former site of what had been an early 20th Century grocery store building, and the proposed mixed-use development envisioned in the Specific Plan will enhance the commercial corner that exists there at 16th/Ordway. The designs that have been submitted this time improve upon past versions and I am sure that neighbors will be pleased that no rooftop deck access is contemplated. There are few opportunities to introduce multifamily housing units in the Lockeland Springs neighborhood and this proposal does that in a manner that is sensitive to the historic context of the neighborhood and in an appropriate location along a Collector Street that is part of a bus line. I would encourage the Commissioners to approve this project with the staff recommendations. Thank you.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the gutters and screening options. Mr. Brooks said they would add gutters so that downspouts that are not floating, as they appear in the plans. They are considering a privacy fence to act as a screen for the parking but are open to other suggestions.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the infill 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. **Staff recommends that on the right façade, the area of the foundation that is not brick and that is currently shown as open have a masonry foundation. On the rear façade, staff recommends that the foundation be open to create vehicular bays but otherwise have masonry piers.**
3. **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
4. **Staff approve a brick sample;**
5. **Staff approve the railing design;**
6. **Staff approve the driveway and walkway materials; and**
7. **MHZC staff approve the location of the HVAC units and other utilities;**

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

**I. 1228 4TH AVE N**

Application: New Construction—Infill (Final SP Review)

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock [Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov](mailto:Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov)

PermitID#: T2020014971

1228 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North is a vacant lot in the East Development Zone of the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

In November 2019, MHZC voted to approve the proposed townhouse development's height, scale, overall massing, roof form, and site plan as part of a preliminary SP (Specific Plan) review. In February 2020, Metro Council approved the SP rezoning for the site. The applicant is now seeking final approval of the project's design details.

The front façade that was submitted for the previous preliminary SP review. The height and scale of townhouse development is similar to what MHZC approved in its preliminary SP review, with a few exceptions.

One exception is that the front facades of the townhouses along 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North now include gabled dormers. Staff finds that the addition of the dormers increases the overall perceived scale of the townhouses and does not meet the design guidelines. The design guidelines state that new construction can be up to two-stories and thirty-five feet (35') in height. Staff finds that the front dormers enlarge the scale of the townhouses to be more akin to two-and-a-half stories. Staff recommends that the dormers on the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North façade be removed so that the scale of the townhouses remains two story.

Staff finds that the rear dormers meet the design guidelines since they will not be visible from the street but the front dormers do not. You can also see the side elevations of the one-story garages. Staff recommends that the brick walls be no taller than six feet (6'). Staff also recommends that there be a brick rowlock, soldier course or other design detail included at the foundation line.

Overall, staff finds that the materials, fenestration pattern, and overall design meets the design guidelines, with the exception of the front dormers, which staff finds do not meet the design guidelines

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The dormers on the front façade be removed;
2. A brick rowlock, soldier course, or other design detail be included at the foundation line;
3. The brick walls have a maximum height of six feet (6') from grade, as measured from the back of the townhouse;
4. Staff approve a brick sample, stone sample, tile sample, all windows and doors, the roof shingle color, the exterior lighting fixtures, the walkway and driveway materials, and all other materials prior to purchase and installation;
5. Staff approve the location of HVAC; and,
6. A new brick public sidewalk to match the historic brick sidewalks of Germantown be installed in front of the development.

With these conditions, staff finds that the preliminary SP review of the townhouse development meets Section III. of the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Brian Haun with Allard Ward Architects stated that they have worked with the neighborhood association, and that they are in support of gabled dormers on the front façade. He said there were 8 different buildings with dormers similar to what they would like to keep as a part of the design. They understand that the design guidelines are geared towards two-stories but based on context they think the two-and-a-half (2.5) would be appropriate.

Steve Ezell, developer, reiterated Mr. Haun's comments and read Britt DePriest's public comment. He requested approval of the front dormers.

Ms. Zeigler read a letter of support from the Germantown Neighborhood Association.

In answer to Commissioner Price's question regarding context, Ms. Baldock explained that the taller buildings in the immediate vicinity were approved under the previous design guidelines.

Commissioner Mosley said he was compelled by neighborhood comments and felt the dormers are appropriately scaled. Vice-chair Stewart, agreed with the neighborhood association that shed dormers would be inappropriate, but the small scale and setback of the proposal is appropriate.

Commissioner Johnson said the developer has followed what was previously approved SP, except for the front dormers, which does not change the mass and scale of the proposal.

**MOTION:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve the project with the following conditions:**

- 1. A brick rowlock, soldier course, or other design detail be included at the foundation line;**
- 2. The brick walls have a maximum height of six feet (6') from grade, as measured from the back of the townhouse;**
- 3. Staff approve a brick sample, stone sample, tile sample, all windows and doors, the roof shingle color, the exterior lighting fixtures, the walkway and driveway materials, and all other materials prior to purchase and installation;**
- 4. Staff approve the location of HVAC; and,**

**5. A new brick public sidewalk to match the historic brick sidewalks of Germantown be installed in front of the development;**

**finding that with these conditions, development meets Section III. of the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed without a vote from Commissioner Jones.**

**V. VIOLATIONS/ ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVALS/ SHOW CAUSE**

**m. 1013 PARIS AVE**

Application: New Construction--Addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020049173

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for a rear addition and a side addition were approved at 1013 Paris Avenue in July 2018.

The two additions were distinct, with an uncovered deck in the area between them. The addition was constructed and closed after a satisfactory final inspection on October 2, 2019. The property sold shortly thereafter – the date of sale listed as October 8, 2019. In July of 2020, MHZC staff observed that construction of a covered porch was in progress, connecting the side and rear additions. In situations where a side addition may be appropriate, the MHZC has typically said that a side addition needs to be separate from a rear addition, rather than having a single addition “wrap the corner” continuously from the side to the rear. The covered porch addition makes the two additions continuous.

Staff finds that the unapproved covered porch is not appropriate because it wraps the corner continuously, which is inconsistent with previous MHZC approvals and does not meet sections IV.A.1 and IV.A.2. of the design guidelines for rear and side additions.

Staff recommends that the unpermitted porch shall be removed within sixty (60) days.

Paul Martin, applicant, said that they took over the project and he was given a set of plans with a covered porch. The previous contractor left the job and Mr. Martin took over, believing the porch to be an unfinished part of the permit.

Barby Jo Todd, owner, said she was shocked. She explained her issues with the previous builder and the money she has put into the project. She would like to defer so there is more time to put together a game plan.

Commissioner Price asked if work has continued since the work shown in the photograph. Mr. Martin said no additional work has taken place.

Commissioners Johnson and Jones said the construction has to be exactly the same as what was previously approved, even if the contractor changes, and the permit specifies that changes should not take place without approval. Commissioner Mosley said that the confusion appears to be with the seller but Commission is not in a position to retroactively approve the project.

Commissioner Mayhall asked if there could be additional time to correct the violation.

Chairman Bell asked the contractor what happened and he explained that he was given a set of plans and he did not realize that the plans had been rejected.

Commissioner Mosley recognized that a good amount of money was invested. He recommended that the current owner seek recourse from the previous owner if they provided unapproved plans.

#### **MOTION**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to disapprove the covered porch as not appropriate because it wraps the corner continuously, which is inconsistent with previous MHZC approvals and does not meet sections IV.A.1 and IV.A.2. of the design guidelines for rear and side additions. The unpermitted porch must be removed within ninety (90) days. Vice-chair Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

#### **n. 908-910 SHELBY AVE**

Violation: Alteration-Painted Brick

Council District: 6

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

Violation #: 20190048928

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the violation at 908 Shelby. The owners painted the house, addition, and adjacent structure a dark blue color, which does not meet the design guidelines.

The site consists of an historic house constructed between 1908 and 1914, a c. 1970 addition to the historic house that is used for apartments, and a separate c. 1970 two-story brick apartment structure. While the historic house contributes to the historic character of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay, the addition and separate apartment building do not.

The design guidelines state that “Generally, the use of paint, stain, water repellent, or any other type of coating on brick is not appropriate.” For new construction and non-contributing buildings, the guidelines state that materials should be visually compatible with historic materials. The Commission, to date, has always required that paint for an existing building, historic or not, be a historic red brick color and that new brick for new construction also be a historic red brick color.

In this case, the structures were painted a red brick color prior to current owners purchasing the site. In cases where brick is already painted, the guidelines state, “*Previously painted brick may be repainted using a color which approximates the natural material color of the original brick.*” Similarly, the guidelines about painting stone state, “*Previously painted stone may be repainted using a color which approximates the natural color of the stone.*”

Staff finds that the blue paint does not meet the design guidelines and negatively impacts the historic character of the historic house and the Edgefield neighborhood, where brick and stone was historically unpainted. When painting brick and stone would be allowed, as it would be here because it was already painted, it is important to have the paint be a brick and stone color, respectively, so as to provide a sense as to what the masonry would have looked like historically.

Staff recommends disapproval, finding that the blue paint on the brick and stone foundation does not meet Sections II.5.c. and III.B.g of the design guidelines for the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Staff further recommends that the applicant submit samples of paint to MHZC staff for review within 30 calendar days and that



the buildings be repainted in colors MHZC staff approved within 60 calendar days. The brick should be painted a red brick color and the stone should be painted a grey stone color.

The applicant was not present and there was no public comment.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to disapprove, finding that the blue paint on the brick and stone foundation does not meet Sections II.5.c. and III.B.g of of the design guidelines for the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. The applicant shall obtain approval of paint color within 30 calendar days and the buildings shall be repainted in colors approved by MHZC staff within 60 calendar days. The brick should be painted a red brick color and the stone should be painted a stone color. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**o. 1309 6TH AVE N**

Violation: Alteration-Painted Brick

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

Violation #: 2019014004

The project was presented by Ms. Zeigler. The design of a new infill building was approved by the MHZC on March 20, 2019. A condition of approval was that window, door, roof color, brick, and stone selections would be approved by staff prior to installation. This requirement was repeated in the permit (2019-014004) both on the cover page and as notes on the drawing

The installed brick is tan or taupe. The design guidelines specify that “masonry should be similar to historic colors of the same or similar materials. Traditional brick colors range from red-oranges to dark red.”

The windows, front door, courtyard floor and porch floor have been approved, with email confirmation to the applicant and/or contractor. Staff has no record of having received a request for approval of a roof material or brick selection.

The installed roofing material is a black or dark gray standing seam metal. Standing seam is an appropriate material, and dark roofs are typical of historic houses in the surrounding area. Via email, we forwarded a document to you from the applicant showing properties that are not red. All of the examples show two types of properties: historic buildings painted either prior to the overlay or that are violations and non-historic buildings that were constructed prior to the current design guidelines which were approved in 2017. In the past, the Commission has not used non-historic buildings as context. In addition, here you see the immediate context.

Staff recommends that the installed black roof color be approved. Staff recommends that the brick shall be stained a red color to be more compatible with the colors of surrounding historic houses, with the color selection to be approved by MHZC staff prior to application.

Brady Fry said he met with Sean on October 3, 2019 regarding windows. He said he brought roofing and brick samples at that time as well.

Jason Proby, owner, said he works and lives in the Germantown community. He explained that the neighborhood is architecturally diverse. He apologized for any misunderstanding.

Ms. Zeigler read comments from Ron Hogan, President of the Germantown Neighborhood Association:

I am writing on behalf of the Historical Germantown Neighborhood Association (HGN) Board to inform you that the HGN Board would like to adhere to the Historic Germantown Guidelines that state “masonry should be similar to historic colors of the same or similar materials. Traditional brick colors range from red-oranges to dark red.”

Thus, we support the MHZC staff recommendation that the brick be stained a red color more compatible with the colors of surrounding historic houses.

Mr. Proby said he did the best he could to make sure that the design married the old and new.

Commissioner Price said the guidelines are clear and he supports the staff recommendation.

#### **MOTION**

**Commissioner Price moved to approve the installed black roof color shall be approved and to require that the brick shall be stained a red color more compatible with the colors of surrounding historic houses, with the color selection to be approved by MHZC staff prior to application. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**p. 1821 5<sup>TH</sup> AVE N**

Violation: New Construction—Outbuilding; Setback Determination  
Council District: 19  
Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman paul.hoffman@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: 2019-039725

Removed from the agenda.

#### **VI. MHZC ACTIONS**

**q. 726 MCFERRIN AVE**

Application: New Construction - Infill  
Council District: 05  
Overlay: Maxwell Heights Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020040967

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

**r. 1812 LILLIAN ST**

Application: New Construction-Addition  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020049418

Staff member Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 1812 Lillian. The proposed partial demolition meets the guidelines, with the exception of this existing window opening on the right side, which is proposed to be altered to a set of French doors. Staff recommends that it only be changed to a single door, to maintain the rhythm and proportion of openings. The demolition plan also includes a section on each side façade that was unclear. Staff recommends the applicant confirm the scope of that work, prior to permitting.

The new dormer on the right side is a long dormer that spans both the historic and the new roof. A dormer could be appropriate on the addition's roof if scaled to the historic building and in a manner in keeping with historic precedent, but staff finds that the long dormer as drawn is not compatible, and recommends that this dormer be revised to be two different dormers, or that it is moved solely to the addition's roof, and with appropriate glazing proportionally.

The addition meets the remaining design guidelines, with the conditions of staff review of materials. There also is an outbuilding indicated on the site plan, but no drawings were submitted, so it's not part of this review.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions noted in the staff recommendation. Mr. Hoffman said that the applicant has explained the demolition plans.

Brent Hunter said there are more up to date drawings which he tried to describe and that he submitted drawings for the outbuilding. Mr. Hoffman clarified that an outbuilding was not a part of the application received. Ms. Zeigler said that the Commission will have to make their decision based on the drawings received in the application. He agreed with all staff recommendations and explained that the addition will not be taller than the historic home.

Commissioner Price stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation.

#### **MOTION:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve with the conditions:**

- 1. The existing window opening on the right side of the house is altered to a single door instead of double doors;**
  - 2. The applicant confirm the scope of proposed demolition on each side façade;**
  - 3. The dormer on the right side is redesigned to be two different dormers or moved to be solely on the addition and with appropriate glazing for a dormer(s);**
  - 4. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of decks, stairs, windows and doors prior to purchase and installation; and,**
  - 5. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- finding that the proposed new construction meets Section II.B of the design guidelines for New Construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**s. 700 B SHELBY AVE**

Application: New Construction - Infill; Setback Determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020040548

Melissa Sajid presented the request for a detached infill behind an existing house at 700 Shelby Ave. The house located at 700 Shelby Avenue was constructed c. 1950 and does not contribute to the historic character of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Since the existing house is not historic, the house can be demolished and infill that meets the design guidelines could be constructed on the lot.

The lot is at the corner of S. 7<sup>th</sup> St and Shelby Ave, and the proposed infill would be oriented to S. 7<sup>th</sup> St. The design guidelines for Edgefield lists three circumstances in which a detached dwelling can be appropriate:

1. There is not enough square footage to legally subdivide the lot but there is enough frontage and width to the lot to accommodate two single-family dwellings in a manner that meets the design guidelines;
2. The second unit follows the requirements of a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit; or
3. An existing non-historic building sits so far back on the lot that a building may be constructed in front of it in a manner that meets the rhythm of the street and the established setbacks.

Staff finds that this particular lot does not meet any of these conditions. The lot frontage and area are typical for this block of Shelby Avenue, the detached unit does not meet the DADU standards, and the existing house is not situated at the rear of the lot.

Furthermore, the Commission has more recently approved several examples of infill duplexes that do meet the Edgefield design guidelines. Two of the three shown here are also located on a corner lot. The top left is a duplex located at 714 Shelby and the top right is a duplex at 719 Shelby, which is at the corner of S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Shelby Avenue. The bottom photo is the infill duplex that was approved last year for 628 Shelby; the site is directly across S. 7<sup>th</sup> Street from 700 Shelby.

The detached structure has a one and one-half story form with a ridge height of twenty-eight feet (28') from grade. While the one and one-half story form as well as the height and width could be appropriate for infill, the location of the infill at the rear of the lot does not meet the design guidelines. In addition, the height and scale of the proposed infill overwhelms that of the existing non-contributing house at the front of the lot, which is one-story and approximately fourteen feet (14') tall.

The infill includes wall dormers on two façades. This does not meet the design guidelines which require that dormers be set in two feet (2') from the wall below. The dormer facing South 7<sup>th</sup> Street incorporates a balcony that is located fully under roof.

There are two small horizontal windows on the left-side façade that do not meet the design guidelines.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the proposed infill finding it does not meet the following sections of the Edgefield design guidelines: Section III.B.2.a (Setbacks and Rhythm of Spacing), III.B.2.b (Height), III.B.2.d (Roof Shape), III.B.2.e (Orientation), and III.B.2.f (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings).

Dexter Samuels, owner, explained his family has lived in the neighborhood for eighteen (18) years. They researched diligently and are asking for less than what was approved at 820 Shelby in 2007. They have made multiple modifications to meet the guidelines. He asked for approval.

Ms. Zeigler read emailed comments from Councilmember Withers:

I am writing in support of the staff recommendation of disapproval for the proposed detached duplex at 700B Shelby Ave. The Commission has considered and approved detached duplexes in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning District on lots that are unusually wide, such as a recent project on Russell Street where the lot was nearly 90 feet wide and was almost a double lot. In that case, it was possible to build two infill houses on the lot while maintaining the historic rhythm and spacing of the street. But there

are no unusual characteristics about this lot at 700 Shelby Ave, and therefore I would encourage the Commissioners to uphold the requirement that duplexes be attached. There have been several attached duplexes constructed in Edgefield and specifically on Shelby Ave in recent years and those projects met the design guidelines. But I concur with the staff analysis indicating that this project does not. Thank you.

Mr. Samuels stated his disagreement with the Councilmembers comments.

Vice-chair Stewart said the project is straight forward and they have never approved structures in the back that are larger than the one in the front. Commissioner Johnson explained the difference between 820 and 700 Shelby is that 820 is a corner lot and 700 Shelby is an interior lot.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Price moved to disapprove the proposed infill finding it does not meet the following sections of the Edgefield design guidelines: Section III.B.2.a (Setbacks and Rhythm of Spacing), III.B.2.b (Height), III.B.2.d (Roof Shape), III.B.2.e (Orientation), and III.B.2.f (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings). Vice-chair Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**t. 703 SHELBY AVE**

Application: Alteration

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid [Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov](mailto:Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov)

PermitID#: T2020048752

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case to paint 703 Shelby Avenue is a c. 1920 brick bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay district. The applicant has requested to paint the brick. The brick on the rear wall has already been painted without a preservation permit.

The applicant has requested to paint the historic brick in order to cover existing stains as well as brick and mortar in need of repair. The stained areas are located near the front corners of the house and appear to be where the gutters were previously located.

The owner has suggested that the brick may have previously been painted or stained, but staff's inspection of the brick was unable to conclude that that is the case with the exception of the rear wall that was painted more recently without a permit.

Some of the bricks appear either to have been damaged or worn down by recent or previous cleaning attempts or to have been stained by mortar in previous repointing efforts. Staff also observed some individual bricks in need of repair. The owner has attempted to clean the brick using paint thinner, acetone, a wire brush, and multiple power washes, which are not effective or appropriate methods for cleaning historic brick.

Section II.B.5.c.3 of the Edgefield design guidelines states that the use of paint or stain on brick is not appropriate and that "if brick is so deteriorated that it cannot withstand the weather, a water repellent or paint may be appropriate." Staff finds that this case does not seem to meet the criteria for when painting brick could be appropriate.

Instead, staff recommends that the mortar be repointed and brick be repaired, as needed. If additional cleaning is desired by the applicant, staff recommends a gentle alkaline chemical cleaner or poultice such as those made by

Prosoco. The appropriate cleaner should be determined by testing different products as different types of masonry and staining have different requirements that can only be determined by testing.

The rear façade has recently been painted without a preservation permit. While painting the brick does not meet the design guidelines, staff finds that leaving the rear wall painted could be appropriate since the rear façade is not visible from the street.

In conclusion, staff recommends disapproval of the request to paint the brick, finding that the project does not meet Section II.B.5.c of the *Edgefield Historic Zoning District: Handbook and Design Guidelines* for when it is appropriate to paint brick. Staff recommends that the mortar be repointed, and the masonry be repaired as needed using products and methods appropriate for historic masonry to prevent further damage.

The applicant was not present and there were no public comments.

Vice-chair Stewart said the staining is due to an incomplete removal of mortar. There is little damage to the brick and if the applicant follows staff's guidance, they can improve the look of the brick.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to disapprove the request to paint the brick, finding that the project does not meet Section II.B.5.c of the *Edgefield Historic Zoning District: Handbook and Design Guidelines* for when it is appropriate to paint brick. The mortar shall be repointed and the masonry be repaired as needed using products and methods appropriate for historic masonry to prevent further damage. Vice-chairman Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**u. 918 LAWRENCE AVE**

Application: New Construction--Infill and Outbuilding

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020048323 and T2020048331

918 Lawrence is a non-contributing house constructed c. 1955. The house is non-contributing and MHZC staff issued a preservation permit for the demolition of the house in July 2020.

The project meets all the base zoning setbacks and its location and placement on the lot meets all design guidelines. Here is the front elevation. The infill is one-and-a-half stories, which meets the immediate context. It will have an overall height of twenty-six feet, six inches (26'6"), which is similar to the historic houses in the immediate vicinity.

Staff finds that the materials, fenestration pattern, roof forms, and overall design meet the design guidelines. The project also includes an outbuilding, which meets all of the design guidelines. Ms. Baldock noted that the applicant agrees with the conditions and does not wish to speak unless there are questions. Staff recommends approval with the conditions outlined in the staff recommendation.

There were no questions and no Commissioner discussion. Commissioner Price noted that it was a nice project and made a motion.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Price moved to approve the project 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. **Staff approve the roof shingle color and all windows and doors 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; finding that with these conditions, the proposed infill and outbuilding to meet Section III. of the design guidelines for the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

v. **1506 HOLLY ST**

Application: New Construction--Infill and Outbuilding

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020048588 and T2020048598

The folk Victorian house at 1506 Holly Street and its 2009 outbuilding were severely damaged in the March 3, 2020, tornado. MHZC staff issued emergency demolition permits under the Rules of Order and Procedure VI.C.2.c, which allow for administrative issuance of demolition permits for any structure that has become a major life-safety hazard and based on engineer's findings that the buildings were not repairable. The infill will have the same footprint and setbacks as the historic house that was on the lot. Staff finds that these meet the historic context.

The applicant proposes new infill and an outbuilding. The new infill is one-and-a-half stories and is similar in height, scale, and design to the previous house on the lot. The house will be approximately twenty-three feet tall (23') and thirty-four feet (34') wide, which meets the historic context. Overall the design is similar to what was previously on the lot, and the materials, fenestration pattern, roof form, and overall design meet the design guidelines.

The outbuilding meets the design guidelines. Staff recommends approval of the infill and outbuilding with the conditions listed in the staff recommendation.

Chris Tigner, contractor, asked for approval. There were no public comments.

**MOTION:**

**Vice-chairman Stewart moved to approve the infill and outbuilding 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. **Staff approve all windows and doors and the roof shingle color prior to purchase and installation;**
  3. **The siding have a maximum reveal of five inches (5");**
  4. **The porch columns have caps and bases; and**
  5. **the HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- finding that with these conditions the infill and outbuilding meet 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.**

w. **913 LAWRENCE AVE**

Application: New Construction—Infill and Outbuilding/ Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead:Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020048718 and T2020048726

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 913 Lawrence Avenue, which is a c. 1950 cinder block house that does not contribute to the historic character of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay (Figure 1). MHZC staff issued an administrative permit for the demolition of the house in August 2020. In 2017, the applicant also applied for an infill that is similar in design to what is proposed in this application. The Commission approved the plans, with conditions, but the applicant never submitted the final materials for a permit. Today's application is to construct infill and a detached accessory dwelling unit (DADU).

The lot is unusually wide at eighty feet (80').

The design guidelines state that there should be a minimum of twenty feet (20') in between a primary structure and an outbuilding. As proposed, the DADU is located in the rear left corner of the property. Therefore, only a small part of the DADU will be ten feet (10') from the rear of the house since both are located off-center. Staff finds its placement, the house's placement, and all setbacks to meet the design guidelines.

The proposed house meets the design guidelines for height and scale. You can see that the first floor is brick, as is the foundation. Although the foundation is delineated with a soldier course of brick, staff does recommend that there be a change in material at the foundation level – so the foundation could be stone or split face concrete block. The proposed DADU meets the design guidelines. Staff recommends approval with the conditions outlined in the staff recommendation. Staff recommends approval with the conditions outlined in the staff recommendation.

John Root, architect, agreed to the staff conditions and requested approval. There were no public comments.

**MOTION:**

**Vice-chairman Stewart moved to approve the project with the following conditions:**

- 1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. There be a change in material at the foundation line to delineate the foundation from the wall above;**
- 3. The lap siding be smooth with a maximum reveal of five inches (5");**
- 4. Staff approve a brick sample;**
- 5. Staff approve all windows and doors;**
- 6. Staff approve the metal and shingle roof color and texture;**
- 7. Staff approve the material of the side porch floor and steps; and**
- 8. Staff receive a filed copy of the restrictive covenant for the DADU;**

**finding that with these conditions, the project meets Section III. of the Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines and the DADU ordinance, Ordinance 17.16.030. G. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**x. 706 FATHERLAND ST**

Application: New Construction—Addition; Alterations

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020048741

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the project for 706 Fatherland. This is a request to construct a rear addition and to retain front porch posts that were replaced and brick piers that were painted without a preservation permit. The house located at 706 Fatherland Street is a one-story frame cottage that contributes to the historic character of



the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay district. After the staff report was published, the applicant notified staff that foundation had also been painted gray. Staff finds that this could be appropriate since the foundation is a smooth concrete block, and gray would be an appropriate color for the foundation.

The 1969 Property Assessor's photo appears to show tapered wood posts. Staff finds that an appropriate replacement would be a simple design similar to those seen in the 1969 photo rather than the more modern design that was installed.

When the posts were replaced, the brick piers were also painted white. Painting of brick that was previously unpainted is inappropriate and does not meet the design guidelines. However, this is a frame house and the brick piers are the only brick found on the house. Since it is such a small part of the house, staff finds that it may be appropriate for the piers to remain painted as long as the paint color is closer to the original color of the brick. The applicant has agreed to replace the posts but would like to request to keep the brick piers painted white.

The request also includes the construction of a new rear addition. As proposed, the addition is neither taller nor wider than the historic house and does not more than double the existing footprint. The new addition ties into an existing rear addition that was approved by the Commission in 2005.

The footprint of the existing rear addition will not change, but the shed roof form is to be altered to create a cross-gable roof form. Altering the shed roof form of the existing addition allows for the new addition to tie in more cohesively to the historic house and prevents the appearance of a house behind a house. Staff finds that the new addition meets the design guidelines for the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay with the condition that staff approve all materials prior to purchase and installation.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the project with conditions noted in the staff report.

Rob Cowles, owner, stated that he agreed with changing the posts and he is already working on that change. He would like to paint the foundation white or gray.

Vice-chairman Stewart said the brick posts should be a historic color, to meet their charge of ensuring preservation of the historic neighborhood.

In answer to Commissioner Johnson's question, Ms. Sajid explained the house is frame and the commission does not review the color of wood; however, the porch pedestals are brick and should be a historic brick color. She gave a recap of the recommendation. Commissioner Johnson agreed the material should be an appropriate brick color; however, it is such a small portion of the building perhaps it could be allowed.

Vice-chair Stewart said that they are obligated to follow the design guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Standards, all of which point them towards the brick being an appropriate brick color.

#### **MOTION:**

**Vice-chairman Stewart moved to approve the project with the following conditions:**

- 1. The front porch posts shall be square or tapered wood or a composite material to be approved by staff prior to purchase and installation and shall be replaced within 60 days in order to meet the design guidelines;**
- 2. The brick piers shall be repainted a color that is closer to the original color that is approved by staff prior to repainting of the brick piers, with the work being completed within 60 days in order to meet the design guidelines;**
- 3. Staff approve all materials for the addition prior to purchase and installation;**

4. Four-inch (4") casings are required around all windows and doors;
  5. Four-inch (4") corner boards are required at the face of each exposed corner; and
  6. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;
- finding the project meets Section III.B of the *Edgefield Historic Zoning District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

y. **3616 A WESTBROOK AVE**

Application: New Construction - Infill

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020048748

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the application to construct a new single-family infill including a raised pool deck and attached garage. These three features are all combined into one large building, with an interior corridor connecting the garage to the house underneath the raised pool deck.

The proposal does not meet the design guidelines for scale as the house is forty-five feet (45') wide where the context on similar sized lots is thirty to thirty-six feet (30'-36') wide. The proposal does not meet the design guidelines for open space as the house is very deep at eighty-seven feet (87'). The garage is connected to the primary house via a raised hallway underneath the pool deck. This connection creates one long footprint from front setback to rear setback, which measures about one-hundred-sixty feet (160') deep.

The Commission has approved attached garages when they are fully connected to the rear of the house. However, in this case, the method of connection is via a fully enclosed hallway from the house. The floor plan is one long structure, creating exceptionally large massing and lot coverage. This form is not typical of an attached garage and is not appropriate to the context.

Staff recommends disapproval of the project finding that it does not meet the following design guidelines:

- Section II.B.1.b for scale
- Section II.B.1.h for outbuilding.

of the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Julia Grissett, architect, said her client renovated the building next door. She provided an overview and explanation for the design. They disagree that the project is one building and believe that it fits in with the neighborhood. They believe that the house is consistent with the street. She pointed out that there is a raised railroad track behind the rear alley, making the rear of the property not visible from the alley.

Jeff Estep, owner, said he found fifteen (15) homes in the neighborhood that have the same large massing and take up the entire property. He mentioned addresses on both Richland and Central Avenues. Their massing, as proposed, is smaller.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Mosley said that he feels that the building appears to be similar to the context, in terms of massing. He is not concerned about the connection below grade. There is no neighbor behind the lot to be affected as the lot backs up to train tracks. Commissioner Jones agreed it is appropriate because of the low slope of the lot, low visibility from the street, and the fact that lot backs up to railroad tracks.

Vice-chairman Stewart noted that a lot of the buildings on Richland are very large homes; however, the buildings on this street are smaller in scale. He finds the front elevation to be appropriate, but the sides and overall massing of the proposed project overwhelm the scale of this particular street. It's a well-done plan and house but it may not fit in with the immediate context. He mentioned that the conservation overlay was put into place at the request of the neighborhood to help maintain the character and that this house seems too massive for the context.

Commissioner Johnson expressed concern with the massing and size in relationship to the lot size. She asked staff to clarify the issue with the connector. Ms. Warren explained that the Commission has consistently required connectors between houses and outbuildings to be open-air, not fully enclosed and that staff found this design to read as two separate, but connected, buildings as opposed to a fully attached garage. Thus, staff recommended against the connector.

In answer to Commissioner Mosley's question, Vice-chair Stewart said he believed it would be one of the 3 largest buildings on the street and the outbuilding is larger in scale than what the Commission typically approves. It will not be an average or close to the majority of buildings on the street.

Commissioner Price agreed with Vice-chair Stewart and the analysis that it is all one continuous structure, and therefore inconsistent with what they have approved in the past.

Commissioner Mayhall agreed it is a beautiful home and a great presentation, but she believes the house doesn't fit in with the context.

**MOTION:**

**Vice-chairman Stewart moved to disapprove the project finding that it does not meet the following design guidelines:**

- **Section II.B.1.b for scale**
- **Section II.B.1.h for outbuilding.**

**of the *Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines.***

**Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Jones and Mosley in opposition.**

**z. 1903 HOLLY ST**

Application: New Construction--Infill and Outbuilding

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020049118

Staff member, Jenny Warren presented the case for 1903 Holly Street. A historic house on this lot was recently demolished, having received an emergency demolition permit under the Rules of Order and Procedure VI.C.2.c after being severely damaged by the March 3rd tornado in East Nashville. This is a proposal to construct an infill house and an outbuilding on the lot. The new house will have a one-and-one-half-story form, with a width of thirty-three feet (33'), and a ridge height of twenty-eight feet, seven inches (28'7") from grade. Staff finds the height and scale of the building will be appropriate.

The building will have a side-gabled primary roof form with a shed dormer on the front and a gambrel form in the rear. The roof form, setbacks, materials, proportion and rhythm of windows, and proposed outbuilding all meet the design guidelines. Staff recommends approval with the conditions listed in the report.

Peggy Newman, designer, stated that she agreed with the recommendation.

Councilmember Withers sent the following comments via email:

I wanted to drop a quick note of support for the infill housing application for 1903 Holly Street. As noted in the staff report this parcel is one of many that were impacted by the March 3rd tornado. While this application does not approximate the house that originally stood there, it does respect the architectural character of the area as well as the height and massing of the houses that do remain in that portion of the neighborhood. I have been a fan of Peggy Newman's thoughtful designs for infill houses in the East Nashville overlay districts and this one brings many unique features, including tapered brick porch column bases, arched porch brackets, and a covered walkway connecting the house and the garage. I believe that this project would enhance the architectural interest and character of this portion of the Lockeland Springs neighborhood that is having to create a new built-form identity this year as tornado recovery slowly progresses. Thank you.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the infill house and outbuilding at 1903 Holly Street 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 consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. Windows in multiple sets shall have a four-inch (4") mullion between them;**
- 4. The window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff;**
- 5. The roof color and brick selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and**
- 6. The utility connections and HVAC units shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street facing façade;**

**finding that with those conditions the project will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Lockeland Springs East-End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Vice-chairman Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**aa. 1906 BLAIR BLVD**

Application: Demolition; New Construction--Infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2020049123

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the request for infill at 1906 Blair Blvd. This is a proposal to demolish a non-contributing one-story duplex and construct a new two-and-one-half-story duplex. The infill will have a height of thirty-two feet, six inches (32'6") from grade and will gain an additional story in the rear due to the change in grade. The historic context includes one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half (1.5 to 2.5) story houses, ranging from twenty-two to thirty-six feet (22' to 36'). Staff finds that the two-and-a-half story form and overall height can be appropriate for the context.

The infill will be forty feet (40') wide. Staff finds the proposed width to be inappropriate for the historic context. Nearby houses on fifty foot (50') wide lots, which is the same width as the subject property, range from thirty to thirty-two feet (30' – 32') wide. 1920 and 1918 Blair are both on fifty foot (50') wide lots whereas the house at 1916 Blair is a wider house but is located on a fifty-five foot (55') wide lot. The lot at 1906 Blair Boulevard is ten percent (10%) narrower than 1916 Blair Boulevard, but the lot is otherwise very similar. Therefore, staff suggests

that the structure at 1906 Blair Boulevard should be ten percent (10%) narrower as well, or thirty-five feet (35') wide. With the condition that the infill at 1906 Blair Boulevard is reduced to thirty-five feet (35') wide, staff finds that the height and width of the infill will be compatible with the surrounding context and that it will meet section II.B.1.a. and b. Staff recommends approval with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Will Jenner, architect, said he agreed with all conditions except for the width of the building. They are mitigating the width by undulating the front façade and recessing the front door.

Buck Snyder, contractor, said this project was based on an approval in a different district.

There were no public comments.

Vice-chair Stewart said that forty feet (40') is an inappropriate width for the historic context, even with the design elements used to lessen the impact. Commissioner Price said the building will overwhelm the historic context and he is in support of reducing the width. Commissioner Jones agreed with Vice-Chair Stewart and Commissioner Price.

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the proposed infill construction 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 consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. The width of the building shall be reduced to thirty-five feet (35');**
- 4. The window and door selections and roof color shall be approved prior to purchase and construction; and**
- 5. The HVAC units shall be located on the rear of the building or on the side behind the midpoint;**

**finding that with these conditions, the proposal will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Johnson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**bb. 1406 A & B BOSCOBEL STREET**

Application: New Construction – Addition; Setback Determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Jenny Warren [jenny.warren@nashville.gov](mailto:jenny.warren@nashville.gov)

Permit ID#: T2020049638 and T2020049641

This is an application for the construction of a rear deck which will encroach five feet (5') into the rear setback. The report states that there was some confusion as to whether a setback determination is needed and the Codes Dept has confirmed that the request does indeed encroach into the rear setback.

The purpose of the Commission having the ability to approve setbacks that are less than bulk standards is so that it can easily address historic conditions. This property has no existing historic conditions. The duplex already sits closer to the rear setback than the surrounding houses and is quite close to the alley already without an additional five feet (5') of depth. In addition, Codes has told us that there are likely to be lot coverage and storm water issues with this request. Staff does not see a compelling reason for the decks to be allowed within the setback and finds that the proposal does not meet Section II.B.3. of the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the setback determination, finding that it does not meet Section II.B.3 of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Brittney Blanton, designer, explained the project.

Commissioner Mayhall said that the setback matching the one next door is compelling. Commissioner Price explained that this block was greatly changed prior to be adding to the overlay so the carport next door would not likely have been approved by the Commission. The building already almost covers the entire lot and the setbacks exist for a reason so, he does not see a reason for approval

**MOTION:**

**Commissioner Priced moved to disapprove the setback determination, finding that it does not meet Section II.B.3 of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Vice-chair Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Root let the commission know that he wanted his project (413 N 16<sup>th</sup> St) removed from the consent agenda and asked that the project be reheard. Legal counsel said that the project has been approved with conditions therefore the applicant can request the project be reheard at the next meeting. He explained that someone could have wanted the project approved with conditions and then gotten off the call, when it was approved as part of the consent agenda. It should be put off until next month so that the public has the opportunity to participate.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 10/21/2020