

JOHN COOPER  
MAYOR



# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission  
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

## METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC)

### MINUTES

November 18, 2020

**Commissioners Present:** Chairperson Bell, Vice-chair Stewart, Leigh Fitts, Mina Johnson, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Dr. Lee Williams

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

**Applicants:** Martin Wieck, Cheyenne Smith, Mark Bixler, Ethan Spencer, Brad Norris, Mark Thomas, Lynn Taylor, Matt Schutz, Sandy Moss, Van Pond, Traci Buck, Peggy Newman, Andrew King, Shawn Henry, Samantha Schneider, Brian Layton, Aole Ansari, Chris Vanags, Andy Rhodes, Mitch Hodge, Brandon Liggett, Doug Schenkel

**Councilmembers:** None.

**Public:**

Chairperson Bell called the meeting to order at 2:01 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, 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.

Chair Bell took a roll call to confirm 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 65.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley 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 Williams seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

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

Chairperson Bell asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda. Ms. Zeigler said that there are three requests for deferrals: 307 N 16<sup>th</sup> Street, 208 Gentry and 616 Fatherland as well as a request to defer the design guideline consolidation project.

[Vice-chair Stewart joined the meeting at 2:05.]

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to revise the agenda by deferring the design guideline consolidation project, 307 N 16<sup>th</sup> Street, 208 Gentry and 616 Fatherland. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

## I. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

### a. October 21, 2020

**MOTION:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to ratify the minutes for October 21, 2020. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**II. CONSENT AGENDA**

Staff member Melissa Sajid read the consent agenda.

**b. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH**

**c. 1708 SHELBY AVE**  
Application: New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068564

**d. 1805 RUSSELL ST**  
Application: New Construction—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#: T2020069305

**e. 1424 SUMNER AVE**  
Application: New Construction—Addition; Partial Demolition  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068680

**f. 2012 CEDAR LN**  
Application: New Construction—Addition; Partial Demolition  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068892

**g. 2531 ASHWOOD AVE**  
Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020069392

**h. 1506 BEECHWOOD AVE**  
Application: New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068634

**i. 2518 BLAIR BLVD**

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068608

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve the items on consent with their applicable conditions. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Fitts recused.**

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

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

[Deferred]

**IV. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW**

None

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

**k. 1020 SEYMOUR AVE**  
Application: Violation (work done without a permit)  
Council District: 05  
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020064053

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for a violation at 1020 Seymour Avenue. This case was deferred from the October agenda. Several emails from neighbors in support of the application as well as an email from the council member were received prior to the October meeting and sent to you.

The house located at 1020 Seymour Avenue is a c. 1910 bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. A rear dormer was added to the historic house without a preservation permit or a building permit. According to Metro’s permitting software, the Codes Department issued a “stop work order” on June 8, 2020; however, the property owners never saw it. The dormer as constructed does not meet the Greenwood design guidelines, but the owners would like to request to keep it as constructed.

The location of the addition at the rear of the existing building is in accordance with the design guidelines. The rear dormer, however, is not inset two feet (2’) from the side walls as required by Section II.B.2.a of the design guidelines.

The two foot (2’) inset is a standard requirement that helps differentiate the addition from the historic house, ensures that if the addition were to be removed in the future the historic character of the house would still be intact, and prevents an addition from overwhelming the historic building. Staff does not find that there are any conditions relating to the existing house or lot that would warrant not requiring the two-foot (2’) inset.

In conclusion, staff recommends that the dormer be inset a minimum of two feet (2’) on each side in order to meet Section II.B.2. for additions, or the dormer may be removed, reconstructing previous conditions. Staff recommends that the correction be completed within sixty (60) days of the date of decision.

Ethan Spencer, property owner of 1020 Seymour Ave, provided background on how the project was funded and happened. They informed their contractor of the overlay and the contractor ensured them that he would obtain all necessary permits. Mr. Spencer did not know there was a violation until receiving the abatement letter in August. He said that no stop-work-order was issued, which they would have seen since they are home every day due to COVID. His contractor is ill with COVID and cannot afford to repair the issue, so if sued he will just file for bankruptcy.

There were no requests from the public to speak; however, Ms. Sajid noted that public comment had been received via email last month, when this issue was first on an agenda.

Ms. Zeigler explained that the only department authorized to issue stop-work-orders is Codes. It is Code's procedure to take photographs of stop-work-orders, once posted. In this case, the permitting system shows that an order was issued but Codes does not have the photograph to prove it was posted. In addition, it is historic zoning staff's policy to issue abatement letters. The permitting program shows that MHZC's inspector visited 3 times, but it is unclear whether he spoke to anyone. In this case, the violation was first seen in June; however, an abatement letter was not sent for several months.

Commissioner Jones said that generally she believes that the owner is responsible for violations and obtaining permits but in this instance, due to the lack of notice to the owner and the small visual impact of the addition on the character of the neighborhood, she thinks it should be retained. Commissioner Johnson and Mosley agreed that there was not sufficient evidence that Metro did what they were supposed to do, in this case, and so they were inclined to allow the violation to remain as constructed. Commissioner Mosley also stated that the cost of correction would have been significantly less if proper notice had taken place and the additional expense now needed for correction is unnecessarily punitive. Vice-chair Stewart noted that the wide overhang and the rear location will lessen the impact on the historic character of the house.

Commissioner Fitts countered that the timing of notice was not relevant; however, she agrees that the physical conditions of the building are unique and so the dormer is appropriate.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve the dormer as constructed. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

<b>I.</b>	<b>610 RUSSELL ST</b>
Application:	Violation (work done without a permit)
Council District:	06
Overlay:	Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#:	T2020070539

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for violation at 610 Russell Street. On July 27, 2020 MHZC staff observed work being undertaken without a Preservation Permit and without Building Permits. The work included construction of an addition and the removal of windows. Staff contacted the homeowner and requested a stop work order from Metro Codes.

Staff has since issued a permit for replacing the windows. Interior work does not need MHZC approval to resume. The applicant has been in communication with Staff about submitting an application to proceed with the addition, and so far they have submitted floor plans and a front elevations, but a site plan and rear and side elevations are also required to adequately review the project.

As it has been built to this point, the addition is stepped in two feet (2') from the right side of the house as has always been required of two-story additions. The left side of the addition is not stepped in.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

The applicant was not present and there no public comments.

Vice-chair Stewart said the report was sufficient for him to make a decision.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to approve the project with the conditions:**

1. The addition is inset two feet (2') from each rear corner of the historic structure;
2. The applicant submits a complete application including site plan, floor plans and elevations, for review by MHZC staff with the possibility of returning to the Commission if a setback determination is needed, within thirty (30) days of the Commission's decision;
3. All materials are approved prior to purchase and installation; and,
4. HVAC and other utilities are located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house, if a new location is needed.;

**finding that with these conditions and assuming no encroachments into setbacks, the proposed new construction will meet Section III.B of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Vice-chair Stewart seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

## VI. MHZC ACTIONS

<b>m.</b>	<b>4909 ELKINS AVE</b>
Application:	Demolition
Council District:	24
Overlay:	Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
Permit ID#:	T2020008667

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, began by first explaining, for the benefit of the public, the staff report. She said that she thinks the public often thinks of the staff report as representative of the Commission's decision, or even one side of a two-sided argument, but it is just one of multiple tools the Commission uses to make a decision. The report is staff's analysis and summary of the project written without the benefit of the additional tools that are available to the Commission such as public input and the experiences and background of commission members.

In this case, the applicant did a great job of providing a very complete and thorough application which we appreciate; however, it does still leave staff with some questions.

She also addressed the claim that the building isn't historic because it was only constructed as worker-housing and doesn't have any architectural details. Our built environment is important because it is a tangible reminder and educator about our past, which is one of the many reasons we all do the work we do to preserve our historic buildings. But our history isn't just revealed in high-style buildings. The people who built our city are often represented in what we call "worker housing" and their stories are as important as the homes of the more affluent. This house retains its original form and design, albeit is simple. Ultimately, in this case, the basis for the building as a historic building is irrelevant, as the applicant did not apply for demo based on the argument that the building is not historic, but rather with an economic hardship argument.

Staff member, Ms. Warren, provided an overview for a request to demolish 4909 Elkins Avenue arguing for economic hardship. The Horace. H. Hooper House is a contributing building in the Park and Elkins overlay, built in 1925.

Since it is the Commission's primary goal to ensure the preservation of historic buildings, demolition requests are reviewed by staff in detail providing not only an analysis of the information given but an analysis of what questions remain. It is the responsibility of the applicant to prove hardship rather than for staff to disprove hardship. In this case, the building is currently occupied and functioning as a family home and staff found that the estimates provided were unclear, did not necessarily match the engineer reports, and included unnecessary costs.

Both engineer reports agreed that the foundation needs to be replaced. The Rhodes report adds that the roof and porch need to be replaced. Staff agrees that these three features need to be replaced or will require significant rehab based on multiple inspections.

The Rhodes report also notes that the “most of the interior was in good condition,” specifically noting that the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor was in good condition, with an exception for some ceiling water damage on the first-floor mid-way back. But the estimates from that same report appear to be full replacement of all elements of the house. It is also unclear if estimates for framing and new drywall are full replacements or repairs. For instance, is the drywall estimate only to repair the ceiling water damage or to replace all drywall? If all drywall, no evidence was provided to illustrate that all drywall needs to be repaired.

There is no evidence provided to prove that expenses related to replacement windows, electrical systems, plumbing systems, new insulation and drywall, replacement of interior and exterior doors and hardware, replacement interior trim, and replacement bathroom hardware and fixtures, are necessary to make the building habitable and provide a reasonable return, so this was not available for staff to include in its analysis. Expenses such as new cabinets and countertops, wood and tile flooring, closet shelving, mirrors, appliances, and a security system—which were not noted in the engineer reports but included in the construction estimates—were also not included in staff’s analysis because they are not necessary to make a building habitable and ensure a reasonable return.

In addition, the Rhodes report says, “the house will need exterior wall improvements before the proposed addition in the rear can be loaded on the exterior foundation walls.” An addition is not required to make the house habitable and repairable.

Staff recommends disapproval of the application for full demolition, finding that there is a reasonable use of the property with proper repairs and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there would not be a reasonable return for the property as a residence once repaired. Accordingly, the proposed demolition meets Section III.B.1 for inappropriate demolition as it is a historic building and it does not meet section 17.40.420 D for economic hardship as there is a reasonable use for the property.

Lynn Taylor, designer, stated that the staff report was incomplete and not similar to other hardship cases. If renovated it will have to be a huge house and they don’t want a large house.

Sandy Moss, property owner, provided a background for how they came to the conclusion to demolish the building. She explained how she disagreed with the staff report.

Mr. Henry, applicant’s legal counsel, claimed that reasonable use has no bearing in the economic hardship ordinance. He provided background on a portion of the ordinance that is not relevant to this case. He claimed that the owner will suffer a \$71,000 loss. He asked for consistency on how criteria are evaluated.

Jenny Warren, read a portion of a letter from the public, up to two minutes. [The full letter was forwarded to the Commission the day before the meeting.]

Vice-chair Stewart commended the staff on the analysis and the applicant’s application. He explained that he walked-thru the building and based on all the features that need to be replaced and the lack of maintenance he is not sure it is worth preserving.

Commissioner Johnson stated that their mission is to preserve historic buildings but they also have to think of the homeowner’s safety and financial burden and it may not be fair to force rehab just because the condition is fair and livable and the previous owner did not maintain the building. Commissioner Jones agreed.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve demolition finding demolition meets Section III.B.2.c for economic hardship. Commissioner Williams seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Mayhall in opposition.**

**n. 616 FATHERLAND ST**

Application: Alteration  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068678

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

**0.** **801 RUSSELL ST**  
Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020063854

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for an addition at 801 Russell St. The application is to construct multiple substantial additions to a non-contributing commercial building, including an attached outbuilding. The proposal requires a setback determination on the right side and rear.

The existing footprint will be retained and will have two story additions constructed on the front and rear, with a garage at the rear of the lot, connected by a porch and covered walkway. The covered walkway would cross the property line and attach to an existing brick wall on the adjacent property. Codes does not permit structures to cross property lines, and this does not meet the required five foot (5') setback. Staff recommends that the walkway is eliminated.

The porch between the primary mass and the garage is substantial, with a roof and one wall, making the garage an attached portion of the primary building. As such the building does not meet the five foot (5') side and twenty foot (20') rear setbacks. Also, the structure with the porch covers forty-eight percent (48%) of the lot, exceeding the permitted maximum of forty-five percent (45%). Staff recommends eliminating the covered porch so that the house meets the side and rear setbacks and doesn't exceed the maximum allowed lot coverage. Even if the porch is eliminated, the garage would have a three foot (3') side setback, encroaching on the five foot (5') required for a garage larger than seven hundred (700) square feet. Staff recommends that the outbuilding should meet the five foot (5') setback requirement.

With those qualifications, the width of the building and the front setback and side setbacks of the two-story portions are compatible with the surrounding context.

The one-story commercial building will be largely retained, with two-story gabled components added to the front and rear, with a flat-roofed second story added between them. The front gable ridge will be thirty-five feet, six inches (35'6") tall – the height is compatible with the historic context. There will be a flat-roofed component in the very front, it is designed to read as a single-story front porch but it does have a second story above the porch. The primary wall material will be brick. Staff recommends that the color of the brick shall be red, and if painted that the color is red. The front porch component will be board-formed concrete, with a pigment added as a reference to a foundation line. Staff asks to approve the material colors.

Portions of the right and front will be clad with vertical glass-plank siding and vertical wood siding. Glass siding is not present in the district, but may be appropriate as contemporary material of its time for new construction. Staff asks to see samples of the material prior to construction. Wood siding is appropriate but only with horizontal orientation. Staff recommends horizontal wood siding or another common cladding. Other materials include stucco and metal roofing and chimney cladding, metal railings – staff asks to approve material colors. The window proportion and rhythms are contemporary, but compatible with no large wall expanses without openings.

Staff recommends approval of the new project with the following conditions:

1. The covered porch between the primary building and garage be eliminated so that outbuilding is not attached;

2. That there is twenty feet (20') of open space between the primary building and the outbuilding;
3. The garage meets the minimum five foot (5') setback requirement on the right side of the property;
4. The covered walkway on the right side be eliminated so that the primary building completely meets the standard five foot (5') setback on the right side;
5. The material selections are approved by MHZC staff prior to installation including:
  - a. The new brick is red and if painted, that the color is red;
  - b. A more typical type of cladding than vertical siding is used;
  - c. The roof color is approved;
  - d. Additional information is provided on the glass plank, metal chimney cladding, and metal railings;
  - e. The location of utilities and location and design of any appurtenances be reviewed prior to purchase and installation.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III.B of the Edgefield Historic Zoning District: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Brad Norris, a architect for the project, explained what the house used to look like before the Sistrunks turned the commercial building into a home. He claimed the project will enhance the neighborhood. Mr. Norris said they were willing to remove the tall chimney and wall and reduce the size so that they meet the lot coverage.

The neighbor agrees to the Sistrunks using two feet (2') of their property. This is needed in order to make the garage functional because of artwork that cannot be moved. He asked that it be approved based on approval by Codes to straddle the property line.

The original brick color of the building was peach and black. He argued that the brick is not a primary material and to paint it red would be a jarring contrast to the contemporary design and that the current black color is similar to colors found in the neighborhood.

He made the argument for the vertical siding, although unusual for the neighborhood.

Ms. Zeigler read two emails for the record:

Carol Williams wrote: Living at 800 Russell, I am pleased with the new modern plan for a cross the street at 801 Russell. This nonconforming property deserves a chance to enter 2020 with a new creative architectural design while at the same time following our historic guidelines.

The guidelines are set but need to relate to the modern design so as not to decimate the creative plan. It appears to comply without copying. That is why I love it.

I am asking for your approval of the Sistrunk's plan. They want to save their nonconforming home (previously training center for the blind) and are willing to invest what it takes to stay in the neighborhood. The architect has created a beautiful modern plan (what some may have thought impossible) adding to the variety of historic homes in the 800 block of Russell. What a fun history at 801 Russell...from the Uthmanor home forward to present and hopefully future.

I appreciate you all and am thankful for your service to Historic Edgefield over the years.

Lois Layne wrote: The Sistrunk's existing house has provided a modern and unique contrast to the historic homes on the 800 block of Russell St. It contributes to the character of the neighborhood. The proposed construction continues in that tradition and will be an asset to the neighborhood.

The home should have the appropriate scale and setbacks and be constructed of quality materials; it appears to meet the appropriate guidelines with some modifications recommended by staff. However, because of the proposed home is a contemporary design and because it is a non-contributing infill construction, the construction shouldn't be expected to adhere to some of the usual style guidelines. Because it is unique style for the neighborhood, it may be difficult to reach consensus on exactly which design guidelines should be applied.



I urge you to approve the proposed choices of materials and colors for the home. The colors and materials were chosen to work together to enhance the overall contemporary design. Making a change in the color of the brick to red, for example, would detract from the coherence of the overall design. The house would look like it had been designed by a committee, or the change might trigger a cascade of other color and design changes in an attempt to restore design integrity.

The 800 block of Russell has red brick homes but it also has homes built of light colored stone and of dark brick, as well as a couple colorfully painted homes. I believe that the proposed colors for the new Sistrunk home will be compatible with the other homes on the block.

I am looking forward to seeing this home at the end of my block. It is going to stimulate some discussions, as have all of the contemporary homes in Historic Edgefield. I believe it will be a welcome addition to my block and an asset to the neighborhood.

I appreciate all of the work the MHZC Commissioners and staff do to preserve our little residential and historic neighborhood.

Commissioner Mosley asked for clarification of the materials, specifically corner details. Mr. Norris explained that vertical siding would have a mitered corner. A lap siding would require cornerboards and window trim that would be incompatible with the contemporary design. The thickness of the roof is approximately 12" with a fascia material.

Commissioner Mosley said that they would not encourage painted brick; however, he is compelled by arguments for a dark wine or maroon color that would not set a precedent for inappropriate brick elsewhere. There may also be an argument to retain the painted color that it is there now.

Commissioner Fitts said that the porch needs to be removed between the garage and primary building and that the covered walkway needs to be removed, to be consistent with past decisions. In the past, vertical siding has been approved for additions because it helps to distinguish between the old and new and although this isn't a historic building, a case could be made for the siding. Since the brick has already been painted, retaining the existing color is appropriate.

In answer to Commissioner Johnson's question, Mr. Norris said they would remove the back wall of the connecting porch so that you can see through it. The neighbor has a connected garage. They would also reduce the size, but the space would remain covered. Mr. Alexander clarified that a breezeway of no more than a six foot (6') depth and open sides have been approved in the past; however, the proposed revision still exceeds that precedent in terms of size of covered area and crossing the property line. He provided reasons why the condition next door is not a similar case.

Commissioner Johnson said she is convinced that materials are appropriate for the contemporary design. She asked if the Commission had the authority to approve a setback variance. Ms. Zeigler clarified that they do not have the authority to review variances; however, they do have the authority to determine the appropriate setback.

Vice-chair Stewart said that removal of the walkway and maintaining twenty feet (20') between the garage and primary building are important. He said the existing sculpture being in the way of an accessible garage is an imposed hardship.

Commissioner Mosley agreed that the connection between the outbuilding and primary building could be appropriate as long as it was only a narrow breezeway, and if that is approved, it should be as far from the street as possible. Commissioner Mosley asked Mr. Alexander his thoughts on the materials. Mr. Alexander said that the paint was verbally approved years ago, probably based on the darkest existing brick that was part of the previous multi-colored brick. He explained that staff was reluctant to approve vertical siding because of a recent approval that was not received well in a different neighborhood.

Vice-chair Stewart explained that the existing conditions are unique since it wasn't a historic form to start with and was not a traditional form. The addition is picking up the original form and expanding on that. The existing paint

color has been there for years and so there is some precedent for keeping it. He and Commissioner Fitts added that since it is an addition, the vertical siding is appropriate.

**Motion:**

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

1. **The covered porch between the primary building and garage be eliminated so that outbuilding is not attached and with the option of a covered walkway with open sides, not greater than 6' in width;**
2. **That there is 20' of open space between the primary building and the outbuilding;**
3. **The garage meets the minimum (5') setback requirement on the right side of the property;**
4. **The covered walkway on the right side be eliminated so that the primary building completely meets the standard five-foot (5') setback on the right side; and,**
5. **The material selections are approved by MHZC staff prior to installation including:**
  - a. **The new brick is red or the existing color;**
  - b. **The roof color is approved;**
  - c. **Additional information is provided on the glass plank, metal chimney cladding, and metal railings; and,**
  - d. **The location of utilities and location and design of any appurtenances be reviewed prior to purchase and installation;**

**finding that with these conditions, the project meets Section III.B of the *Edgefield Historic Zoning District Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

[Commission took a break at 4:20 p.m. and returned at 4:30 p.m.]

<b>p.</b>	<b>1513 16TH AVE S</b>
Application:	New Construction—Addition
Council District:	17
Overlay:	South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
Permit ID#:	T2020069402

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for an addition at 1513 16<sup>th</sup> Ave S. This is an addition to the historic building at 1513 16<sup>th</sup> Ave South. It isn't a perfect fit for the guidelines; however, in the past the Commission has looked at this district a little differently. The majority of building types in the district are single-family with some multi-family types; however, for decades most of the buildings have had an office/studio use related to the music business. The use of these properties has become an important character defining feature of the district, so additions have been considered differently than they might in residential districts that may have some commercial or office uses within a residential building type. Because of the use, rear yards are now parking areas so there is less of a concern with a long or even tall addition changing the "open space" character of the district as there might be in other buildings with residential uses.

The project meets the design guidelines with the exception of height, lack of windows on the right side and a rooftop addition. The addition is at least two feet (2') taller and might be taller—the architect is unsure at this time—and is readily visible. Staff recommends approval of two feet (2') of additional height as that amount has been allowed on other projects in the past and the size of the addition is minimal. Staff recommends a new evaluation of any additional height beyond the two feet (2').

Staff recommends approval despite the lack of windows on the right because the addition is a minimal size and adding windows will not meet building code. If or when the neighboring lot is developed, the window-less wall will not be visible.

Staff's main concern is the request for a rooftop deck. Staff is looking for your guidance on how to address rooftop additions in general, as well as for this specific case, as there have been a few requests so far and there is another request on the agenda today. For this project, the rooftop deck is proposed on top of the existing building. No rooftop decks have yet been approved on a historic building—only on additions or new buildings. Although small and well designed, staff is concerned that approval would set a precedent for future rooftop decks on historic buildings and that rooftop decks do not meet the design guidelines for roof forms. Historically residential buildings

did not have rooftop decks.

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the existing roof form is retained, windows and doors are reviewed; and that the addition's height should be reassessed if it is more than two feet (2') above the existing building. With these conditions, staff finds the project to meet the South Music Row design guidelines.

Mark Bixler, designer, provided a background and an overview of the project. He claimed that the addition of a railing on the rooftop would not be visible and therefore not negatively affect the neighborhood. He said that the existing roof is not a distinctive feature. The rooftop deck would provide space for meetings.

In answer to Commissioner Fitts's question, Mr. Bixler said the wall that does not have openings was designed in that manner because of fire codes. Fire rated windows would be allowed; however, the addition is proposed as elevator, stair and windows are not conducive to windows.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve with the condition that the existing roof form is retained, windows and doors are reviewed; and that the addition's height should be reassessed if it is more than two feet (2') above the existing building; finding that with these conditions, the project meets the South Music Row design guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**q. 2806 OAKLAND 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#: T2020055397

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented 2806 Oakland, a c. 1930 brick bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. While the house has a one-and-a-half story form on the front and right facades, on the left, the addition is two stories above a raised basement. This is an historic condition.

In September 2020, MHZC approved an addition and a garage/DADU on the lot with the condition that "The applicant work with staff for a new design for the rooftop deck". Staff provided the applicant with the options of moving the deck fully to the rear of the addition or a design that was in keeping with past approvals for rooftop decks on new construction. The applicant would like to request the proposed design that staff found was not consistent with past decisions.

In the September 2020 version, the floor of the rooftop deck posts was inset two feet (2') from the back wall of the historic house. In the proposed revision, the posts are inset approximately three feet, six inches (3'6") from the side wall of the historic house. In addition, the balcony railing seen on the September right side elevation is now mainly a pitched roof.

Rooftop decks are not an element seen historically in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The design guidelines state, "The roof(s) of a new building shall be visually compatible, by not contrasting greatly, with the roof shape, orientation, and pitch of surrounding historic buildings. With the exception of chimneys, roof-top equipment and roof penetrations shall be located so as to minimize their visibility from the street." Staff considers rooftop decks like this one to be a roof penetration that should be located so as to minimize visibility from the street.

When the Commission has approved rooftop decks in the past, they have been tucked in, without a roof, so as to be minimally visible. Staff finds that this re-design does not go far enough to tuck the rooftop deck in and to obscure its visibility and is concerned about setting a precedent for future rooftop decks.

Staff therefore does not find that this rooftop deck meets Sections II.B.1.e. and II.B.2. of the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval, finding that the proposed rooftop deck does not meet Sections II.B.1.e. and II.B.2. of the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Martin Wieck, architect for the project, said that there was another project that was approved that is similar to this request and he read out loud for the commissioners portions of the design guidelines with an explanation as to how the project met them.

In answer to Commissioner Mosley's question, Mr. Wieck said that the rendering provided was of the previous proposal.

Ms. Baldock clarified for Commissioner Johnson that there were likely no rooftop decks on historic buildings or on new construction. She further clarified that some of the examples provided by the applicant were upper-level decks off a second level rather than a rooftop deck.

Commissioner Johnson said that new construction needs to respect the context that is specific to Belmont-Hillsboro.

Vice-chair Stewart said that the changes from the previous proposal are minor, don't change the view of the proposed addition, and interrupts the roof plane in a way that is inappropriate for conformance of the design guidelines. Enclosing the side with a roof would have been appropriate. Commissioner Jones and Mosley agreed, adding that the examples given were not a similar situation. Looking at the historic house from front to back you see roof, roof and then a third floor and so it is not compatible. Commissioner Mosley noted that it is not staff's job to design the project.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Vice-chair Stewart moved to disapprove, finding that the proposed rooftop deck does not meet Sections II.B.1.e. and II.B.2. of the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Williams seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**r. 208 GENTRY AVE**  
Application: New Construction—Outbuilding  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068795

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

**s. 1904 BLAIR BLVD**  
Application: New Construction—Infill and Outbuilding  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068826

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for infill and an outbuilding at 1904 Blair Blvd. This is a proposal to construct a new two-story house. The house will be thirty-five feet (35') wide, with a cross-gabled roof and a partial-width one-story porch. The proposal also includes a detached outbuilding in the rear yard.

The proposed new structure will have a two and one-half-story form, similar to that of an American Foursquare house, a common historic house type in the neighborhood. The house will have a maximum roof height of thirty-three feet, three inches (33'3") from grade at the front, with an eave height of twenty feet, four inches (20'4") above the floor level and a one foot, six inch (1'6") tall foundation.

Materials are appropriate, the roof form is appropriate, window proportion and rhythm is appropriate, and the outbuilding is appropriate.

Staff Recommends approval of the proposed infill construction with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height is consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The front setback is consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. The foundation is differentiated from the first floor with a different material;
4. The brick selection, window and door selections, and roof color is approved prior to purchase and construction;
5. The HVAC units is located on the rear of the building or on the side behind the midpoint.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposal will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Ms. Newman, designer, clarified the setback with staff and said she agreed with all conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to approve the proposed infill construction with the following conditions:**

- 1. The finished floor height is consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. The front setback is consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. The foundation is differentiated from the first floor with a different material;**
- 4. The brick selection, window and door selections, and roof color is approved prior to purchase and construction;**
- 5. The HVAC units is 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. Vice-chair Stewart seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

**t. 307 N 16TH ST**  
Application: Demolition; New Construction—Infill  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068830

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

**u. 2809 ACKLENAVE**  
Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2020068609

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for 2809 Acklen Avenue, which is a one-and-a-half story brick Tudor Revival house constructed c. 1930. It contributes to the historic character of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The applicant proposes to re-open the front boxed entry which was enclosed sometime between 2007 and 2009. Staff finds this partial demolition to be appropriate because it is

restoring an historic condition.

The addition is inset just eighteen inches (18") on both the first and second level. Staff is recommending that both stories be inset a full two feet (2'), as is typically required for a two-story addition with taller eaves like this one. The upper level dormers project out eighteen inches (18") to line up with the side walls of the house. The Commission typically requires that dormers be inset two feet (2') from the side walls of the historic house. Staff therefore recommends that the upper level dormers be inset at least two feet 2' from the side walls of the historic house.

The historic house is located approximately three feet, three inches (3'3") from the side property line. The main wall of the addition is inset one foot, six inches (1'6") from the side wall of the house, which means that it will be just four feet, nine inches (4'9") from the side property line. In addition, the upper level projecting dormer will encroach on the side setback, as it will be just three feet, three inches (3'3") from the side property line. Although the Commission has approved side setback determinations for additions when the addition does not extend wider than the house in the past, staff finds in this instance that the side setback determination does not meet the design guidelines. Staff is recommending that the addition be inset two feet (2') on both sides because it has a taller eaves and a two-story form. In addition, staff is recommending that the dormers not project out from the addition's side walls. If both conditions are met, a setback determination is not needed.

Staff recommends a approval with the following conditions:

1. The side walls of the addition be inset two feet (2') from the side walls of the historic house;
2. The dormers be set in two feet (2') from the side walls of the historic house;
3. Staff approve a masonry sample, all windows and doors, and the roof shingle color prior to purchase and installation; and
4. The HVAC shall 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.

Van Pond, architect for the project, described the existing house and conditions. The rear addition was designed to accommodate the details of the existing house. He considers the eave to be one-and-a-half stories which would allow for just a one-foot setback. The projecting dormers break up the long roofline so they would like to keep them.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Vice-chair Stewart and Commissioner Mosley agreed it was a well-done project, but full approval would set a dangerous precedent.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to approve with the following conditions:**

1. The side walls of the addition be inset two feet (2') from the side walls of the historic house;
2. The dormers be set in two feet (2') from the side walls of the historic house;
3. Staff approve a masonry sample, all windows and doors, and the roof shingle color prior to purchase and installation; and
4. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;

**finding that with these conditions, the proposed addition meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines.**

**Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously**

v.	<b>1809 RUSSELL ST</b>
Application:	New Construction—Infill
Council District:	06
Overlay:	Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Melissa Sajid <a href="mailto:Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov">Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov</a>
PermitID#:	T2020068703

Staff member, Melissa Sajid presented the case for 1809 Russell St. The historic house at 1809 Russell Street was severely damaged by the March tornado, and MHZC staff issued an emergency demolition permit in early April. As proposed, the infill meets all the design guidelines. The height and scale are appropriate for the historic context. In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill with the conditions set forth in the staff recommendation.

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

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to approve the proposed 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. The front setback shall be consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. MHZC staff shall review the final selections for all materials prior to purchase and installation;**
- 4. The front porch posts shall include caps and bases;**
- 5. The site plan shall be revised to show a walkway connecting the front porch to the sidewalk;**
- 6. If a driveway from Russell Street is proposed, the site plan shall be revised to show the driveway extending to at least the midpoint of the infill; and**
- 7. The utility connections and HVAC units shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street facing façade;**

**finding that with these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for new construction in the Lockeland Springs East-End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Johnson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

<b>w.</b>	<b>2807 27TH AVE S</b>
Application:	New Construction—Addition
Council District:	18
Overlay:	Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
Permit ID#:	T2020068721

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for an addition at 2807 27<sup>th</sup> Ave South. The house located 2807 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue South is a c. 1930, two-story brick house that contributes to the historic character of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The Commission approved a rear addition as well as the demolition and reconstruction of the non-historic porte cochere in 2017. The house sits approximately one hundred and fifteen feet (115') back from the front property line, which is unusual for the street. There is no rear alley.

The application is to construct a covered porch addition that attaches to the rear of the existing porte cochere. An existing single-story shed will be removed or demolished with this project. The footprint of the shed is less than one hundred square feet (100 sq. ft.); outbuildings with a footprint of one hundred square feet (100 sq. ft.) or less are not reviewed in historic zoning overlays.

Since the house is less than thirty feet (30') wide and shifted on the lot, a wider rear addition could meet the design guidelines. However, staff finds that the addition does not meet the design guidelines as proposed for several reasons.

The new addition ties into the existing roof of the porte cochere, and a wall that includes a sliding glass door would be constructed at or next to the rear corner of the historic house. This design creates a situation where the new construction would obscure the existing rear corner of the historic house.

In addition, a porte cochere is an element that is open as it was intended to allow for vehicles to pass through; adding a wall as shown here would close off this element and move it closer to an attached, front-loaded garage, which would not meet the design guidelines in this case since it would not be located at basement-level.

In order to meet the design guidelines, staff recommends that the new addition be detached from the existing porte cochere and shifted back approximately nine feet (9') to where the 2017 addition comes back out to match the width of the historic house, shown here with the red box. With this condition, the porte cochere would remain intact as an open element, and the historic rear corner that was preserved with the 2017 addition would remain intact. The result would be an appropriate wider rear addition that is designed so that if it were to be removed in the future, the historic house's historic integrity would not be affected.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions set forth in the staff recommendation including the condition that the addition be detached from the porte cochere and shifted approximately nine feet (9') back to where the 2017 addition matches the width of the historic house.

Mark Thomas, representing the applicant, said the goal of the project is to cover an existing patio by continuing the existing roofline of the porte cochere. They have no usable covered space in the back. It is not possible to move the porch back, as proposed by the staff, as it does not meet what the owners had in mind and does not fulfill security concerns.

Commissioner Stewart said he understood what the applicants were hoping to accomplish; however, there is a charge to follow the guidelines adopted by the neighborhood and the Secretary of Interior Standards which include preserving features like porte cocheres. Commissioner Johnson agreed that the addition would destroy the historic character of the building.

**Motion:**

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

- 1. The addition shall be detached from the porte cochere and shifted approximately nine feet (9') back to where the 2017 addition matches the width of the historic house;**
- 2. Staff approve the final details dimensions of all materials prior to purchase and installation; and**
- 3. If relocated, the HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**

**finding that with these conditions, the project meets Sections II.B. and III.B.2. of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously, and the motion passed unanimously.**

<b>x.</b>	<b>924 CARUTHERS AVE</b>
Application:	New Construction—Infill
Council District:	17
Overlay:	Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Melissa Baldock <a href="mailto:Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov">Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov</a>
Permit ID#:	T2020068590

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for infill at 924 Caruthers Avenue, which currently has a house constructed c. 1954 that does not contribute to the historic character of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Staff issued an administrative permit for the house's demolition in October 2020. The applicant proposes a 1.5 story duplex infill. It meets all the base zoning setbacks. Staff recommends that walkways be added from the sidewalk to the front entries.

The infill's height of twenty-eight feet (28') and width of thirty-five feet (35') meet the immediate context. Staff recommends the vertical division of materials seen on the front façade be removed so that the materials are continuous, and the infill has a cohesive main form. Overall, the infill's height, scale, roof form, fenestration pattern, setbacks and rhythm of spacing, and orientation to meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the infill 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. Walkways from the sidewalk to the front entries be included;
3. The vertical divide in the materials on the front façade be removed;
4. Staff approve the front and rear porch floor and steps, the roof shingle color, all windows and doors, and the walkway and driveway materials prior to purchase and installation; and
5. 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 infill meets Section III. of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Ms. Baldock informed the commission that the applicant stated he agreed with all conditions and did not wish to speak unless Commissioners had questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the infill 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. **Walkways from the sidewalk to the front entries be included;**
3. **The vertical divide in the materials on the front façade be removed;**
4. **Staff approve the front and rear porch floor and steps, the roof shingle color, all windows and doors, and the walkway and driveway materials prior to purchase and installation; 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 proposed infill meets Section III. of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Vice-chair Stewart seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

y.	<b>405 S 10TH ST</b>
Application:	New Construction- Infill
Council District:	06
Overlay:	Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov
Permit ID#:	T2020068669

Staff member Jenny Warren presented the case for 405 S 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The existing house at 405 S 10<sup>th</sup> Street does not contribute to the historic character of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Staff issued a demolition permit for the structure in September. This application is for the construction of a duplex structure. Outbuildings show on the site plan, but no elevations were submitted, and these structures are not being reviewed today.

South 10<sup>th</sup> Street marks the western boundary of the overlay. The subject lot is on the east side of 10<sup>th</sup> Street, between Fatherland Street and Shelby Avenue. As you can see, the entire east side of this block consists of non-contributing ranch houses. And across the street, in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Overlay, the buildings are also non-contributing. There is no historic context on this block.

In 2019, the Commission approved this duplex infill on this same block. Staff used this structure as guidance for what would be appropriate here.

The massing is similar to the previously approved project, but staff is concerned because no foundation or grade is indicated. The addition of one to three feet (1'-3') of foundation height could push this ridge and eave height to be taller than the recommended parameters. Staff suggests that revised elevations are submitted showing a appropriate foundation height, a ridge no higher than thirty-one feet (31') from grade and eaves no taller than twenty feet (20') from grade.

The elevations include a change of material at the front which gives the appearance that the second level is taller than the first level. This is not consistent with historic precedent. Staff recommends that the change of material be shifted higher on the façade, such that the two levels appear equal, or the first level is slightly taller. Also, the squared windows on the side elevations should be revised to be vertically oriented.

In conclusion, Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. Revised elevations shall be submitted prior to permitting which show the impact of the grade on the design. These plans should show appropriate foundation height and the overall height from grade on the front elevation should not exceed thirty-one feet (31') at the ridge and twenty feet (20') at the eaves;
2. The finished floor height be kept low, consistent with a typical historic finished floor height, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. Staff approve the final materials including roofing color, brick sample, doors, windows and porch floor and post materials prior to purchase and installation;
4. The change of material shall be shifted higher on the façade, such that the two levels appear equal, or the first level is slightly taller;
5. Staff approve the HVAC location; and,
6. The windows on the side elevations be revised so that they are generally twice as tall as they are wide.

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

The applicant was present for questions but did not present. There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

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

1. Revised elevations shall be submitted prior to permitting which show the impact of the grade on the design. These plans should show appropriate foundation height and the overall height from grade on the front elevation should not exceed thirty-one feet (31') at the ridge and twenty feet (20') at the eaves;
2. The finished floor height be kept low, consistent with a typical historic finished floor height, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. Staff approve the final materials including roofing color, brick sample, doors, windows and porch floor and post materials prior to purchase and installation;
4. The change of material shall be shifted higher on the façade, such that the two levels appear equal, or the first level is slightly taller;
5. Staff approve the HVAC location; and,
6. The windows on the side elevations be revised so that they are generally twice as tall as they are wide;

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

<b>z.</b>	<b>409 S 10TH ST</b>
Application:	New Construction - Infill and Outbuilding
Council District:	06
Overlay:	Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov
Permit ID#:	T2020068821 & T2020068840

Staff member Jenny Warren presented the case for 409 S 10<sup>th</sup> Street. This is a proposal for an infill duplex with an outbuilding located at 409 S 10<sup>th</sup> Street two doors down from the previous case. This non-contributing house has already been demolished. As mentioned in the previous project, S 10<sup>th</sup> St has no historic context.

In terms of height and scale, setbacks, proportion of openings, known materials, roof form and orientation, the proposal meets the guidelines. The grade is indicated appropriately on the plans. As with all infill, staff should verify the foundation height in the field and should approve the materials prior to purchase and installation.

The outbuilding meets all the guidelines except for the footprint. The maximum allowable square footage is one-thousand (1,000) square feet. With the front porches, the square footage just exceeds this at about one-thousand and twelve (1,012) square feet. Staff recommends that the footprint be reduced to no more than one thousand (1,000) square feet. This could be accomplished by reducing the size of the porches, removing them or converting them to bracketed awnings as opposed to having posts-to-the-ground.

In conclusion, Staff recommends a approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height be kept low, consistent with a typical historic finished floor height, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. Staff approve the final materials for both the primary structure and the outbuildings, including: the siding material, trim, masonry, roofing color, porch floors, porch posts, doors, garage doors and windows;
3. Staff approve the HVAC location; and,
4. The maximum square footage of the outbuilding, including the covered porches, should not exceed one-thousand square feet (1,000 sq. ft).

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

The applicant was present for questions but did not present. Ms. Warren noted that the applicant agreed with all conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Jones moved to approve the project with the following conditions:**

1. **The finished floor height be kept low, consistent with a typical historic finished floor height, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
2. **Staff approve the final materials for both the primary structure and the outbuildings, including: the siding material, trim, masonry, roofing color, porch floors, porch posts, doors, garage doors and windows;**
3. **Staff approve the HVAC location; and,**
4. **The maximum square footage of the outbuilding, including the covered porches, should not exceed one-thousand square feet (1,000 sq. ft);.**

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

<b>aa.</b>	<b>1900 OAKHILL DR</b>
Application:	New Construction—Infill and Outbuilding/Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District:	06
Overlay:	Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead:	Melissa Baldock <a href="mailto:Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov">Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov</a>
PermitID#:	T2020068672 and T2020068697

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented 1900 Oakhill, which is currently a 1950s ranch duplex that does not contribute to the historic character of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. A demolition permit for the structure was issued in November 2020. The applicant proposes infill and a DADU on a vacant lot. The setbacks meet the base zoning setbacks and the historic context. The infill will be one-and-a-half stories. Its height of approximately twenty-eight feet (28') and width of thirty-five feet (35') meet the historic context.

Directly behind 1900 Oakhill is the 1900 Block of Holly that suffered tremendous damage in the March tornado. The infill for 1900 Oakhill is consistent with the height and scales of the infill approved on this block of Holly.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The infill's finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic house, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. Staff approve the final selections of the windows, doors, roof shingle color, and masonry for the infill prior to purchase and installation; and
3. Staff approve the location of the HVAC units and all utilities.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay and 17.16.30.G., the DADU ordinance.

Ms. Schneider was available for questions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Johnson said it was great to see non-contributing houses being changed to houses that fit into the neighborhood better.

**Motion:**

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

- 1. The infill's finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic house, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Staff approve the final selections of the windows, doors, roof shingle color, and masonry for the infill prior to purchase and installation; and**
- 3. Staff approve the location of the HVAC units and all utilities;**

**finding that with these conditions, the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay and 17.16.30.G., the DADU ordinance. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

Meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 12/16/2020