

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

February 15, 2017

Commissioners Present: Vice-chairman Bell, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ann Nielson, Cyril Stewart
Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Macy Amos (city attorney)

Applicants: Ashley Rose, Brian Layton, Brett Diaz and John McWaters, Kate Sparrow, Juri Hall, Mr. Lever and Ms. Joslin, Charlie Rankin, Randy Rayburn, Duanne Cuthbertson, Lynn Taylor, Preston Quirk, Will Jenner, Jeff Casella

Councilmembers: None

Public: Lance Thomas, Rebecca Ratz, Rich Valuzat

Vice-chairman Bell called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m. She read aloud information regarding the schedule of the meeting and the process for appeals.

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

None

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. January 18, 2017

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved for the consent agenda to be heard before the overlay recommendation.

Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Vice-chairman Bell read notes about the meeting procedure and process for appeals.

III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTION

a. 906 BRADFORD AVE

Application: Historic Bed & Breakfast

Council District: 17

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

The property owners are requesting a Historic Bed and Breakfast overlay for 906 Bradford. No exterior alterations are planned so your role in this process is to confirm it is a historic building. One of the qualifications is that it be listed in the National Register. This one is-- as a contributing building in the Waverly Place NR.

The owners put together a history of the property, which is in your staff report.

Finding that the property qualifies as a historic building and because no exterior alterations or signage is requested, staff advises the Commission to recommend approval of the proposed Waldkirch-Cox House Historic Bed & Breakfast Homestay to the Metro Council with the condition that the applicant obtain a permit for the new use from the Codes Department.

Ashely Rose, owner of the property, explained she was involved with obtaining the NCZO that includes her property. She provided some information about the history of the home and development of the neighborhood.

There was no public comment.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the recommendation. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

b. 1508 LILLIAN STREET

Application: New construction-outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit; setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

c. 1706 ORDWAY PLACE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

d. 2000 BENJAMIN ST

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

e. 1218 FORREST AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding-detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

f. 1001 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Historic Landmark
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

g. 1904 SWEETBRIAR AVE

Application: New construction- outbuilding and setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

h. 1108 GARTLAND AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit) and setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

i. 917 CARUTHERS AVENUE

Application: New construction-outbuilding (detached accessory dwelling unit)
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

j. 2011 18TH AVENUE SOUTH

Application: New construction- outbuilding and setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Vice-chair Nielson read the process for consent agenda. Staff member Melissa Sajid read the items on consent.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve all consent agenda items, including 2115 Westwood, which was under “previously deferred items” with their applicable conditions. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

The items below were deferred at a previous MHZC meeting at the request of the applicant.

None

VI. MHZC ACTIONS

k. 2502 ASHWOOD AVE

Application: Violation correction
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 2502 Ashwood Ave. 2502 Ashwood Avenue is a c. 1930 weatherboard bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. In July 2016, MHZC staff issued administrative permits to construct an outbuilding, to demolish an existing addition, and to construct a new addition with a two-foot (2') ridge raise. In late December, MHZC staff noticed that the addition was being constructed not according to the approved plans. The applicant constructed the addition with a four foot (4') ridge raise, which does not meet the preservation permit for the project, nor the design guidelines. Applicant is seeking to have a revised version of the addition approved.

The applicant is proposing to bring the ridge raise back down so that it is no taller than two feet. Further back, the addition will increase in height to be an additional two feet taller than the ridge raise. The peak height of the addition occurs at a point 38' feet back from the front of the historic house. The design guidelines state that “additions to single story structures may rise as high as 4' above the shadow line of the existing building at a distance of 40' from the front edge of the existing building.” This taller portion would be two feet forward of what is typically allowed.

Staff recommends that the taller portion of the addition be pushed back two feet (2') so that it does not occur until forty feet (40') from the front wall of the house, as per the design guidelines.

Brian Layton, said he agreed with staff but there is a side dormer that is 38' back from the rear of the house which was the reason for the design.

There was no public comment.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that:

- 1. The peak of the taller portion of the addition be located forty feet (40') back from the front of the house;**
 - 2. Staff approve the roof color, all windows and doors, and the materials of the rear stair and railing; and**
 - 3. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- finding the proposed addition meets Section II.B. of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Stewart seconded. The project passed with the Chairman voting in favor of the motion and Commissioner Jones voting in opposition.**

I. 1206 FERGUSON AVE

Application: Violation correction
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for 1206 Ferguson Avenue.

This item was reviewed by the MHZC previously, it was an addition that was approved to include a two-foot (2') ridge-raise on a historic house at 1206 Ferguson Avenue. The applicant seeks after-the-fact approval to retain and complete a ridge-raise addition that has been constructed one foot (1') taller than it was approved.

The approved front and side elevation of the plans we shown with a partial ridge raise, extending a portion of the front roof slope up and to the rear, increasing the height two feet taller than the existing building. Further back the rear portion of the addition rises another two feet.

Drawings depicting what has been built were shown, with a wider portion of the existing ridge altered and the height of the ridge raises one foot taller than what was approved, approximately 3 feet taller than the historic roof.

The guidelines allow for ridge raise additions on historic buildings up to two feet, and no ridge raises taller than that have been approved.

John McWaters, architect for the project explained the reason for the request. Brett Diaz, applicant for the project and general contractor explained that they didn't know there was an issue until their inspection and the additional height was due to the floor depth requirements. It was not done to grab additional height and he showed photographs of the project under construction. They asked to keep the ridge raise.

Lance Thomas spoke in opposition, providing a list of additions approved on Ferguson. The two that used ridge raises did not exceed 2'. He is concerned that allowing for 3' would set a precedent for future projects.

Commissioner Stewart explained that the 2' ridge raise is an agreement that they have with the neighborhood and since they have not allowed such in the past it would set a precedent.

Mr. Diaz was invited back for a 2-minute rebuttal of public comment. He explained that the ridge raise proposed did not extend the full extent that it could and so he didn't feel it would set a precedent and the square footage was minimal.

Commissioner Stewart noted that the issue was not square footage but height.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed addition to 1206 Ferguson Avenue with the conditions that:

- 1. HVAC and other utilities be located at the rear of the house, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house;**
- 2. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows, doors, garage doors, roof material and color, and trim prior to purchase and installation; and,**

3. Staff approve new masonry for color, dimensions and texture. Finding the proposed addition meets the design guidelines for additions in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

m. 506 MONROE STREET

Application: Violation correction
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for 506 Monroe Street which is a brick one-story building constructed in 2005. The form is residential but the property is zoned MUN.

In January 2017, Staff found that a painted sign was added to the front wall and a mural was added to the right side-wall without a Preservation Permit. The applicants are requesting to keep the sign and mural as-is.

The design guidelines allow for painted signs so staff recommends approval of the small painted sign next to the front entrance. The intent was for painted signs to be on wood or metal—not directly on the brick—however, this is not a historic building.

In the case of the mural, there are no design guidelines specifically for murals but there is for paint and alterations. The design guidelines for “alterations” focus primarily on historic buildings, which this building is not. For these reasons Staff used a combination of the design guidelines for “alterations” and for “new construction” in order to determine the appropriateness of the mural.

The design guidelines in multiple places and in multiple ways state that alterations and new construction should be “compatible” with the historic character of the district. Historically, there are no known murals on residential forms.

The painting of masonry (1.1.3 and 1.3.5.3) is generally not allowed because of the damage that paint can cause historic brick; however, as previously stated, this is not a historic building. The design guidelines for new construction require that new materials and material colors “not contrast conspicuously with those of adjacent historic buildings” (2.4.2) and further provides guidance on brick color in section 2.4.5, where it states that multi-colored brick is not permitted and traditional brick colors should be used. In the past, the painting of masonry, both new and historic, has been discouraged because it changes the texture of masonry and mortar. The design guidelines also state that alterations to be done on public facades shall be more carefully reviewed than non-public facades (1.1.1). In this case, it is not the entire building that has painted but a secondary façade that is slightly recessed from the first bay of the building.

Since the building is not historic, the paint does not cover the entire building, and the mural is located on a secondary façade, beyond the first bay of the house Staff recommends approval.

Kate Sparrow, applicant, said she is new to Nashville and recognized that public art is important to the city so she hopes it is approved.

There was no public comment.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the signage finding that it meets section 8 of the design guidelines and to approve the mural finding that it meets the design guidelines for alterations and new construction

since the mural is located on the secondary façade, beyond the first bay, of a non-contributing building. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

n. 2202 NINTH AVENUE S

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding; setback determination

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 2202 9th Avenue South. 2202 9th Avenue South is a c. 1930 brick bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The curvilinear streets of the Waverly Belmont neighborhood create an unusual lot shape for this site. The rear lot line cuts at a sharp angle across the back of the lot.

The applicant is proposing to construct a rear addition and an outbuilding (which will not contain a dwelling unit). The outbuilding will have a footprint of 781 sq. ft., which is appropriate since the lot is larger than 10,000 sq. ft. The out building does require a rear setback determination. For outbuildings that are larger than seven hundred square feet (700 sq. ft.) in footprint, base zoning requires that the outbuilding be a minimum of twenty feet (20') from the rear property line. In this instance, the rear property line is skewed significantly so that the back left corner of the outbuilding is proposed to be ten feet (10') from the rear property line. The location of the garage door that faces the alley will be approximately 16' from the rear property line. The back right corner of the lot will be about 75' from the rear property line.

Staff finds that the proposed reduced rear setback is appropriate for several reasons. Historically, outbuildings were located on or close to the rear property line. The shorter rear setback allows for more space between the historic house and the outbuilding, which is appropriate. Since outbuildings less than 700 sq. ft. have a base zoning rear setback of 10', if the outbuilding were eighty-two square feet (82 sq. ft.) smaller, it would meet the base zoning setbacks. In addition, because of the slanted lot line, only approximately eight feet (8') of the thirty-four feet (34') wide outbuilding will be less than twenty feet (20') from the rear property line. Staff recommends approval of the outbuilding's setback determination. The outbuilding will have an eave height of 11' and a ridge height of 23'8", which meet the design guidelines.

The drawings for the addition in the staff recommendation show that the applicant plans to remove and relocate window openings on the side facades. MHZC staff considers this to be partial demolition. Staff finds that the removal of all three windows is not appropriate, and staff recommends that the applicant retain the original window pattern to the greatest extent possible. The applicant has indicated a willingness to work with MHZC staff on the issue.

The addition is inset at the back corners of the house, and it is long and skinny. Staff finds the depth of the addition to be appropriate because the addition is only one story and is several feet shorter than the historic house. The addition's narrowness also keeps its massing and scale appropriate. The historic house has a footprint of approximately thirteen hundred square feet (1,300 sq. ft.), and the proposed addition will add approximately one thousand and forty square feet (1,040 sq. ft.) of footprint to the house.

Mr. Uri Hall, architect for the project, stated that he agreed with all conditions with the exception of the windows. They will retain two of the three and only replace the window on the rear.

Motion:

Commissioner moved Stewart to approve the project with the following conditions: the applicant retain the front two windows proposed to be removed; the siding have a maximum reveal of five inches (5"); staff approve a stone sample; staff approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation; and the HVAC be located on the rear, or on the side, beyond the midpoint of the house; finding that with these conditions, the proposed project meets Sections III and IV of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood

Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

o. 306 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented the case for 306 Broadway, an application for a new projecting sign, requesting a modification from the Commission for both rotation and flashing elements.

The sign meets the design guidelines for its size, materials and location. The allotted sign area for this building is 56 square feet. The proposed sign is basically that exact area, so would max out the building's allotment for signage. Two signs on the storefront are approximately 27 square feet, so Staff recommends that they be removed prior to installation of the new sign. The Commission has approved rotating signs on Broadway. Recent examples of rotating signs include:

312 Broadway, not yet installed, a 3 by 3 foot rotating element. 429 Broadway, a two-foot rotating section. 325 Broadway, two feet. 318 Broadway, a five foot tall rotating sign, 101 Broadway, a rotating section at the top of the sign of 5 ½ feet. And 400 Broadway, approved in 2013, approximately 4 feet of the sign rotating.

So this is the largest rotating sign that has been proposed, and Staff finds that this is too large an area to be permitted in its entirety. As flashing is also proposed, staff's recommendation is that the rotation be eliminated and the sign to be a static one.

The sign is proposed to have flashing on the barrels on the sides. The district design guidelines allow for blinking, flashing, chasing or sequential lighting as a modification approved by the Commission. As only small portions of signs have been approved with moving lighting, Staff recommends that only one string of the barrels be permitted to flash or chase.

Where it is permitted, the chase or flash should not be less than three seconds.

Adam LeFevor explained how the sign is proposed to work. The top two barrels will be on and then the middle two and then the bottom two. They do not have issue with conditions 3 and 4. He noted that the "B" at Boot Barn fully rotates and is 5' tall and there is slightly taller at 11'. Due to the fact that they are within the design guidelines they ask for approval. Ms. Joslin, with Joslin signs, stated that people come to Nashville for the Broadway experience and this one will not stick out any more than any other sign. It will be a classy sign.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart said that they have set a precedent with only portions of signs rotating with the exception of the "B" which is half the size of the proposed. He feels the recommendation is within keeping with what they have approved in the past.

Ms. Mayhall feels the proposal is in keeping with the present character of Broadway. Ms. Jones expressed concern with the entire sign rotating and feels it is too much.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the projecting sign with the conditions that:

- 1. The rotation is eliminated;**
- 2. Only one side of the sign's barrels be permitted to flash;**
- 3. The flashing sequence has no less than three seconds duration; and,**
- 4. The existing exterior signage is removed or the size of the proposed sign is reduced so that the total square footage of both new and remaining signage does not exceed fifty-six square feet (56 sq. ft.);**

finding the proposed signage to meet Section IV of the Broadway Historic Preservation Historic Preservation Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded. The motion passed with Commissioner Mayhall in opposition and Chairman Bell voting in favor of the motion.

p. 904 GILMORE AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for 904 Gilmore Ave, a proposal to build a rear addition to a one-story Victorian era house. The house has a pyramidal main roof, with a gable front projection and some smaller hipped components on the sides and rear, with a wrap-around front-corner porch.

The proposed addition will tie into the rear of the roof, stepped in from the main roof and extending back with a cross-gable and side dormers. The addition adds thirty-eight feet of depth, of which about half is a rear screened porch. The total added is less than 2/3 of the house.

Again the roof of the addition is not taller than the existing roof at the peak, but because the addition has a cross-gable it will be visible behind the pyramid roof on the historic house, but the Commission has found this can be compatible if the addition is situated far enough back from the front.

This addition does have a component that is wider, however, but only at the first story so the wider portion is not the same as the portion of roof visible beyond the silhouette of the existing house. For this reason, and because the primary width of the house is less than thirty feet, staff finds that this meets the guidelines for widths of additions.

Charlie Rankin, architect for the project, stressed that the success of accommodating a second story on the house is critical to the addition. There are several features of the existing house and previous additions that made planning of the addition challenging.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed addition to 904 Gilmore Avenue with the condition that the window and door selections are approved by MHZC Staff prior to purchase, finding the project meets the applicable design guidelines for the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

This recommendation is for the design of the building based on the proposed use.

q. 1400-1402 ORDWAY PLACE

Application: New construction-infill and detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for 1400-1402 Ordway, noting that public comment was disseminated via email. The house at 1402 Ordway Place was constructed c. 1925 and is a brick bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The house currently sits on a double lot. The address is two different lots that historically have been deeded together. At the back of the lot that faces 14th Street is a detached garage.

The applicant would like to reestablish the existing lot line. In doing so, the existing house at 1402 Ordway will sit less than five feet (5') from its right/west side property line. The Historic Zoning Commission must approve the new side setback for the existing house at 1402 Ordway Place in order to reestablish the lot line. The bulk of the house will be situated approximately *two feet, six inches (2'6")* from the new right side property line. However, a one-story side bay will sit less than one foot (1') from the side property line.

Staff finds that the proposed right side setback is appropriate in this instance for several reasons. Historically, it was not uncommon for historic houses to sit less than five feet (5') from the side property line. In fact, in the immediate vicinity, there are some houses that are between five and seven feet (5' – 7') apart, like what is proposed here.

Across the street, 1403 and 1405 Ordway are very close together, likely closer than six feet. If the infill at 1400 Ordway Place is constructed so that there is a minimum of six feet (6') between the infill and the side bay of the historic house and seven feet, six inches (7'6") between the infill and the bulk of the historic house, the historic rhythm of spacing of houses along the street will be retained. Staff therefore finds that the right side setback for 1402 Ordway Place meets design guidelines.

The new infill proposed at 1400 Ordway also requires a setback determination. The applicant is proposing to situate the house approximately six feet, six inches (6'6") from the 14th Street side property line. Base zoning requires that houses on corner lots like this one be a minimum of ten feet (10') from the side street property line. Staff finds that a side setback change could be appropriate here because the house needs to sit a minimum of six feet (6') from the interior-side property line in order to meet fire code for the distance between two houses, whereas base zoning would typically allow only a five foot (5') setback. In addition, there are neighboring historic houses that have side setbacks less than ten feet (10') from their 14th Street property lines. For instance, the house across the street at 1401 Ordway has a side porch that is approximately eight feet (8') from the side property line, although the bulk of the house does meet the ten foot (10') side setback. 1401 Gartland, which is across the alley, behind 1400 Ordway, has a 14th Street setback of between five feet, ten inches (5'10") and six feet, three inches (6'3"). Because of the historic context, staff finds that the 14th Street setback of six foot, six inches (6'6") meets the design guidelines.

The proposed infill will have a front setback that is approximately two feet, six inches (2'6") forward of the historic house next door at 1402 Ordway. Staff recommends that the house be pushed back on the lot so that the front wall of the infill lines up with the front wall of the historic house at 1402 Ordway.

The applicant intends to increase the size of the existing outbuilding at the rear of the lot and to convert it to a detached accessory dwelling unit. The DADU requires a rear setback determination. Base zoning requires outbuildings with footprints greater than seven hundred square feet (700 sq. ft.) to be located twenty feet (20') from the rear property line. The applicant intends for the new DADU to be situated eight feet (8') from the rear property line. Staff finds that the proposed rear setback change to be appropriate for several reasons. The existing structure is situated less than twenty feet (20') from the rear property line, and if the existing structure is reused, no changes will be made to the existing footprint or location. If the applicant determines not to use the existing structure, an eight foot (8') rear setback would still be appropriate. Historically, outbuildings were located close to or even on the rear property line. An eight foot (8') rear setback is more historically appropriate than a twenty foot (20') rear setback, and also allows for more space in between the principal structure and the outbuilding. Staff finds that the rear setback for the DADU meets the design guidelines and the DADU ordinance.

The infill's proposed height is approximately thirty-one feet, nine inches (31'9") tall from grade. By comparison, the historic house next door is approximately thirty feet (30') tall from grade, and neighboring houses are between twenty-six and twenty-eight feet (26'-28') tall from grade. Staff recommends that the height be reduced so that it is no more than thirty feet (30') tall from grade. Staff finds that the front dormer's width of thirty feet (30') is too out of scale for the infill and the historic context and recommends that it be reduced in width by several feet. Staff also recommends that the applicant work with staff to enlarge the two square windows in the shed portion of the front dormer.

The front dormer is only inset one foot (1') from the wall below. The design guidelines state that front dormers should be inset a minimum of two feet (2') from the wall below, as historically, front dormers were modest in size and were setback two or more feet from the wall below. The Commission has been consistent in requiring that front dormers be inset two feet (2') from the wall below, and staff recommends that this front dormer follow that guideline.

The side facades contain several window openings that do not meet the historic proportion of window openings. Historically, most window openings were vertically-oriented, and the Commission has therefore discouraged horizontal window openings on front and side facades. On the side facades, staff recommends that the applicant use vertically oriented windows of a least four square feet (4 sq. ft.) in lieu of the horizontal windows. The use of some square windows may be appropriate, depending upon the location and visibility.

The applicant intends to increase the size of the existing outbuilding at the rear of the lot and to convert it to a detached accessory dwelling unit (DADU). The design and scale of the garage meet the design guidelines and the

DADU Ordinance with one exception. It has a height of 25'9", whereas the design guidelines limit the height to no more than 25'. With the condition that the DADU be reduced to be no taller than twenty-five feet (25') from grade, staff finds that the DADU meets the design guidelines and the DADU ordinance.

Duane Cuthbertson, applicant for the project, stated that they agreed with all conditions except for the first one regarding the front setback. They feel the proposed setback maintains the slightly varied setback of the street. Lining up with 1042 Ordway, the one with the greatest setback, will cause issues with the project as a parking pad will be needed for the dwelling above the garage.

Randy Rayburn, owner of the project, noted that other projects have side setbacks that are far less than what they were proposing.

Rebecca Ratz, 1409 Gartland, said that a 1' interior setback for 1402 Ordway is inappropriate and that decisions shouldn't be made based on a few exceptions in the neighborhood. The existing HVAC units will be over the property line. If new owners put up a fence that would cause issue for the neighbors.

Commissioner Stewart asked if Staff had determined the average front setback for the block. Ms. Baldock stated that although Codes may look at the average, we typically look at the homes to either side.

Commissioner Stewart said the house will be more attractive than the vacant lot, what staff has done with the owner is appropriate.

Mr. Cuthbertson said they are not asking for a 1' setback as it is what is there. The HVAC has been considered and will be worked out with easements. He explained that they submitted a survey with 4 homes on the lot which is what they used to determine the front setback.

Mr. Stewart asked why the rear yard cannot be reduced by 2'. Mr. Cuthbertson said their intent is take away the garage door on the north side but a parking pad will be needed, off the existing curbcut, for parking for the dwelling unit in the garage and they would like to maintain some rear yard,

Commissioner Nielson asked for clarification of the drawings.

Commissioner Jones stated that the proposed front setback was appropriate since it met the average and there was no home to the right to provide context.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the staff recommendation which failed due to lack of a motion.

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

- 1. The infill's front wall line shall not be less than the average front setback of the four adjacent homes;**
- 2. The infill's overall height be reduced so that it is no more than thirty feet (30') tall from grade;**
- 3. 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;**
- 4. The infill's front dormer be reduced in width and be inset two feet (2') from the wall below;**
- 5. The applicant work with staff on the proportions of the square window openings on the middle section of the infill's front dormer and on replacing the horizontal window openings on the side facades with square or vertically-oriented windows;**
- 6. Staff approve following materials prior to purchase and installation: a brick sample, shingle sample, all windows and doors, walkway material, the DADU's stoop railing and steps, and the infill's front porch floor, steps, and railings;**
- 7. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- 8. A front walkway be added from the Ordway Place sidewalk to the front porch;**
- 9. The DADU's height be reduced to be no taller than twenty-five feet (25'); and**
- 10. Staff receive a copy of the filed restrictive covenant for the DADU;**

finding the proposed project meets Section II.B. of the Lockeland Springs-East End NCZO design guidelines and the DADU Ordinance 17.16.030. G. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 2200 GRANTLAND AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 17

Overlay: Woodland-in-Waverly Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 2200 Grantland Ave. This is an application for new construction on this corner lot, where the previous building was approved for demolition last year. The proposed new home is one and a half stories with a ridge height 27 feet from grade. It is 33 feet wide, with portions as wide as 35 feet. Contributing buildings on Grantland range up to 29 feet in height and 39 feet in width. It will be compatible with the context for height and scale. It has a front-facing gable with a side-gabled portion in the middle. The building will be clad in smooth-faced fiber cement siding with five inch reveal. Other materials include wood trim, stone veneer and architectural shingles, which have all been approved previously. Some of the window sets do not show mullions between them, so Staff recommends 4 to 6 inch mullions between double and triple windows. Staff also recommends having final approval of windows, doors, roofing color, and masonry. There is a set of windows toward the front of the right side that are 1 and a half times as tall as they are wide. Farther back is a pair of horizontal windows that might not be appropriate in every location on a building, but as these are in a less visible location close to the neighboring home, Staff reviewed that they were compatible. The proposed structure meets setback requirements and the design guidelines for rhythm of spacing. A new walkway will be added to Grantland Avenue and a concrete driveway and parking pad to the rear of the lot, accessible by the alley. No other landscape features were indicated. If other site features are intended, staff recommends having approval of those prior to their installation.

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

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve with the conditions:

- 1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Double and triple windows have a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion between them;**
- 3. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- 4. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on the right side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- 5. Staff approve the roof color and masonry color, dimensions and texture;**
- 6. Any appurtenances, including fences and other permanent landscape features, shall be approved by MHZC prior to purchase and installation.**

finding the project meets Section III.B.2 for new construction in the Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

s. 1616 DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 6

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member, Melissa Sajid presented the case for 1616 Douglas Ave.

This is a request to construct a new single-family residence at 1616 Douglas Ave. This case was deferred at the December 2016 meeting at the request of the applicant. Since then, the applicant has worked with staff to address staff's concerns about the proposed infill. A permit was issued in December 2016 to demolish the non-contributing house that was located on site.

The plan before you meets the design guidelines for height, scale, setbacks and rhythm of spacing, materials, roof shape, and orientation. As proposed, the infill is oriented to Douglas Avenue with parking off the alley at the rear and from an existing curb cut to the right of the proposed infill on Douglas Ave.

The structure is one and one-half stories and will have a maximum height of twenty-three feet, six inches (23' 6") with an eave height of nine feet, eight inches (9' 8") at the front. The overall height is similar to the historic houses located to either side of the proposed infill, which are 1-1.5 stories with an overall height of up to 23'.

Here is the right side elevation and also the left side elevation. Staff recommends that the horizontal window on the left side elevation be revised or removed to meet historic proportions per the design guidelines. The applicant has agreed to this condition and has submitted a revised floor plan; however, a revised left side elevation is also needed. And here is the rear elevation.

Here are context photos of historic homes in the vicinity. The photo at the top left is the historic home located to the left of the subject property and the photo on the lower right is the historic house located to the right of the site.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill with conditions, as set forth in the staff recommendation, finding that the request meets the design guidelines. And the applicant has agreed to the conditions.

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

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart 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 final details, dimensions and materials of roof color, windows, doors, and walkway material prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- 3. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- 4. Staff approve the masonry color, dimensions and texture; and**
- 5. The horizontal window on the left side elevation shall be revised or removed to meet the design guidelines;**

Finding the project meets Section II.B. of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unaniomusly.

t. 3707 KATHERINE ST

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 07

Overlay: Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member, Melissa Sajid presented the case for 3707 Katherine Street.

This is a request to construct a new single-family residence at 3707 Katherine Street. The site is currently a vacant lot that is being created from the rear of two existing lots that front Stratford Avenue. One of the lots, 1126 Stratford Ave, includes a historic house, and no changes are proposed to the historic home. Rather than creating a whole new lot in addition to the existing two lots, the subdivision, which has been approved by Planning, shifts around lot lines in order to address multiple easements on the vacant lot that fronts Stratford Ave that makes new construction difficult. The existing stormwater and water line easements are shown here, and the lot for 3707 Katherine St is outlined in blue. Also, here on the photo of 1126 Stratford Ave you can see stormwater infrastructure that is located in one of the easements.

The plan before you meets the design guidelines for height, scale, setbacks and rhythm of spacing, materials, roof shape, orientation, and proportion and rhythm of openings. As proposed, the infill is oriented to Katherine Street with parking from a proposed curb cut to the left of the proposed infill on Katherine Street. The lot does not have alley access.

The structure is one story and will have an average height of twenty feet (20') from grade, which takes into account a cross-slope located on the site and an eave height of eleven feet, ten inches (11' 10") at the front. The overall height is similar to the historic houses located at 1126 Stratford Ave and 3703 Katherine St, which staff finds to be appropriate for the proposed infill.

The building width on the site plan is shown as thirty-seven feet, four inches (37'-4") wide at the front while the floor plan shows a building width of thirty-six feet (36'). The applicant has confirmed that the building width shown on the site plan is what is proposed. Staff recommends that the floor plan be revised to show the accurate building width before the preservation permit is issued.

The new infill will be thirty-seven feet, four inches (37'-4") wide at the front setback. The width of historic homes in the immediate vicinity ranges from twenty-four to thirty-four feet (24'-34') wide. While the width of the infill is wider than the historic context, staff finds that it is appropriate as the lot is wider than other lots at sixty-eight feet (68') wide. In addition, the new lot is not as deep as the standard lot in the area and is even further truncated by a twenty foot (20') wide easement located at that the rear of the property.

Here are context photos of historic homes in the vicinity. The photo at the left is the historic home located to the left of the subject property and the photo on the right is the historic house located to the right of the site, at 1126 Stratford Ave.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill with conditions, as set forth in the staff recommendation, finding that the request meets the design guidelines.

Lynn Taylor, designer for the project, said the 4" was a mistake and she will resubmit new drawings.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that:

- 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. Prior to issuance of the preservation permit, the floor plan shall be revised to include the accurate building width;**
 - 3. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of the roof color, front porch posts and base, front porch railing, deck railing, windows, doors, driveway and walkway material prior to purchase and installation;**
 - 4. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house; and**
 - 5. Staff approve the masonry color, dimensions and texture;**
- finding that the project meets Section III of the *Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

u. 1826 WILDWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member, Melissa Sajid presented the case for 1826 Wildwood, noting that public comment was forwarded via email and a revision to an earlier letter was provided as a printed copy at the beginning of the meeting.

This is a request to construct a new single-family residence on the rear of the lot, facing Rosewood Ave. The house located at 1826 Wildwood Avenue is a one and one-half story minimal traditional house that contributes to the historic character of the district. A rear dormer addition and deck were approved administratively in September 2016 for the historic house at 1826 Wildwood Ave. No changes to the historic house are proposed with this application.

The applicant proposes to construct a new single-family dwelling facing Rosewood Avenue. The property is zoned R8, and zoning has determined that two dwelling units may be permitted on the property. The lot is unique in that it has frontage on both Wildwood Avenue and Rosewood Avenue. Properties oriented to Wildwood Avenue are located within the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay while properties oriented to Rosewood Avenue are not in a historic zoning overlay. There is no historic context on that block of Rosewood Avenue.

An apartment building is located across the street from the site on Rosewood Avenue and is shown in the top photo, and infill that was constructed c. 2007, prior to the overlay, is located to the left of the site and is shown on the bottom photo. Rosewood Avenue terminates to the right of the site, which you can also see in the bottom photo.

In addition, the lot slopes down approximately eighteen feet (18') from Wildwood Avenue to Rosewood Avenue. Given the unique site conditions, staff found it appropriate to review the new construction as infill rather than an outbuilding even though it is a second building on the lot.

As proposed, the infill is oriented to Rosewood Ave with access from a curb cut off Rosewood Ave as there is no alley access to the site. The plan meets all base zoning setbacks, and the front setback will be consistent with the existing house located to the left of the site on Rosewood Ave.

The proposed infill is one and one-half (1.5) stories at the front with an overall height of approximately thirty-one feet, seven inches (31'-7") and a foundation height of six feet, seven inches (6'-7"), measured from grade. Staff finds that the overall height and foundation height proposed are appropriate in this case as it is comparable to the two existing homes located to the left of the site. In addition, the proposed structure will not be taller than the historic house at 1826 Wildwood Avenue when taking into account the change in grade on the site and will unlikely be visible from Wildwood Ave.

The building width is fifty-four feet, six inches (54'-6") at the front, which includes a thirteen foot (13') wide porte-cochere on the left side that will accommodate one vehicle. With the porte-cochere, the new construction is unlikely to read as the full width from Rosewood Avenue. In addition, the new construction will not be visible from Wildwood Avenue given the significant slope on the site.

While attached, front-loaded garages are generally inappropriate in historic zoning overlays, staff finds that, in this case, the proposed porte-cochere located on the front of the house could be appropriate for several reasons. The proposed porte-cochere is open on the front and left side so that it is not a fully enclosed front-loaded garage. Also, the new construction is oriented to a street where there is no historic context, and the homes next door include fully enclosed, attached, front-loaded garages at the basement level. The significant change in grade on the site makes it difficult to locate parking to the rear of the new construction, and the opening is only one-bay in width which minimizes its visual impact. For these reasons, staff finds the proposed porte-cochere to be appropriate in this case.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill with conditions, finding that the request meets the design guidelines.

Mr. Quirk, explained that the building will address a dead-end street that is not in the district and the grade drops significantly towards the back of the lot. The client discussed the potential of a second house with staff prior to purchasing the lot. He explained the how the grade and context drove the design decisions.

Ms. Jones asked if it was because of the depth of the lot that allowed for two homes. Mr. Quirk said the zoning allowed for two units and it was an unusual condition with a double-fronted lot.

Rich Valuzat, 1907 Wildwood, said he can see the rear of the house at 1826 Wildwood. This new structure will require the removal of trees. The houses will not meet the scale of buildings in the neighborhood, specifically the foundation. It will be looming over the lot. He questioned the legality of allowing two homes on the lot.

Ms. Amos responded stating that the zoning allows for two lots. Vice-chair Bell added that they do not have any authority over the base zoning.

Commissioner Stewart stated it was a good solution for the lot and compatible with the projects on Rosewood and within the overlay.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the conditions that:

- 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 final details, dimensions and materials of roof color, porch floors, trim, driveway and walkway material, windows, and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- 3. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house; and**
- 4. Staff approve the masonry color, dimensions and texture;**

Finding the project meets II.3.B of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

v. 1300 DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for a duplex at 1300 Douglas Ave, noting that the Councilman Withers wrote in support of the project. 1300 Douglas Avenue is a large corner lot where a non-contributing building was recently approved for demolition. In the immediate vicinity there are several other large corner lots, two with two-story houses and two with one or one and one-half story houses that are wider than a typical mid-block house.

The proposal for consideration today is a new duplex, side-by-side units sharing a center wall. The width of the building's primary mass as proposed is thirty-six feet, with sections toward the middle of the building stepping out two feet on each side for a total width of forty feet.

The building will be two-stories tall, with a total height from grade to be thirty-two feet, six inches.

The depth of the building will be seventy-six feet in total, the rear third and front porch as just one-story.

Comparing the scale of the proposal to the surrounding context: the height is consistent with nearby two and one-half story houses and the width is consistent with the large one and one-half story houses nearby. However the scale of a building being simultaneously this tall and this wide would be greater than the surrounding historic houses. Staff recommends reducing the primary width to thirty-four feet and the width at the bays to thirty-eight to be more like the scale of the historic buildings nearby.

Will Jenner, architect for the project, stated that they agreed with all conditions.

There was no request from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to recommend with the conditions that:

- 1. The primary and total width of the building are reduced two feet (2') to thirty-four feet (34') and thirty-eight feet (38') respectively; and**
- 2. The roof color, windows, and door selections are approved by Staff prior to purchase and that the vertical trim board is removed from the front façade;**

finding the project meets the design guidelines for the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW

w. 1401 HOLLY STREET

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 1401 Holly Street, noting that the Councilmember is in support of the project. This property at the corner of South 14th Street and Holly Street is the site of the Holly Street Day care center, comprising three buildings on two lots. A non-contributing building facing S 14th, which resembles a red one-room schoolhouse. Under the siding and other changes was a concrete block commercial building const. between 1944 and 1951.

The other two buildings are historic houses facing Holly Street.

The proposal is to enlarge the non-contributing building that faces South 14th Street, with a rear addition. The applicants are also seeking to combine the two lots and rezoning for Specific Purpose to allow the expansion of what's currently a non-conforming use. That's not a review for MHZC, but obviously the project depends on all of the approvals occurring more or less together. The MHZC usually reviews just the massing of a project needing a rezoning at before it goes to the Planning Commission, and then once it's been rezoned we'll review the project again in detail. However since we have all the details already we reviewed the entire project. If these plans are changed or not approved elsewhere in the process, we'd require them to come back for design review.

This site plan shows the entire campus of the day care campus, just to be clear the orientation is rotated so that Holly Street is now to the right. It's important to mention that infill between the two houses would be ideal, and in fact the applicant met with me last year to discuss that before discovering a combined sewer/stormwater line cutting diagonally through the lot that makes that impossible. And so, they've proposed an addition that is roughly the same width as the non-contributing building, but it's shifted out to the right of the building's footprint.

The side elevations were shown. The addition will gain a story in the basement, but you see here that the roof of the addition is roughly the same height as the existing (a few inches taller). There is a pyramidal elevator overrun that rises taller, but the element is minimal, set far back, and on the alley elevation set in from the side of the building.

On the lower image the silhouettes of the contributing houses are in dashed lines, but this building is actually set well behind the buildings. It's actually more than one hundred feet back from Holly Street. Because of the distance and the manner and degree the façade is broken up by articulations, projections, and window placement, Staff finds the scale to be compatible with the context.

The rear elevation and section to the front elevation of the addition. Here again, Staff finds the scale of the addition compatible with the building and the surrounding context.

Chairman Bell reinforced the fact that the SP would not allow for the contributing buildings to be demolished.

Chairman Nielson asked questions about the reason for the SP, which was answered by Jeff Casella, applicant. Mr. Casella stated that he agreed with all conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the application to enlarge the non-contributing building at 1401 Holly Street with the conditions that:

1. The applicant shall return to the MHZC for approval of any changes made or required by the Planning Commission, or if the SP rezoning is not approved; and
2. Staff shall approve the brick, metal roof colors, window and door selections, masonry, and pavers prior to purchase and installation.

finding the project will meet the applicable sections of the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

x. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

Ms. Zeigler presented information about the Old House Fair on March 4.

Meeting ended at 4:32pm

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 3/15/17