

MEGAN BARRY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

December 20, 2017

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Vice-Chair Menié Bell, LaDonna Boyd, Eric Brown, Kailtyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Jenny Warren, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Quan Poole (city attorney)

Applicants: Kelly Frey, Charles Robert Bone, Tom White, Ed Clay, Dave Wachtel, Tom Anderson, Paul John Boulifard, Amy Brown, Steve Burt, Mitch Hodge, Preston Quirk, Ron Tolander, Adam Epstein, Nathan Weinberg,

Councilmembers: Freddie O'Connell, Nancy VanReece

Public: Joe Farrell, Michael Hayes, Terry Clements, Tim Dugan, Charles Robert Bone, Tom Turner, Steve Marr, Doug Sloan, Paula Middlebrooks, Stewart Winston, Frank May, Brian Taylor, Kayla Joslin, State Representative Harrold Love, Deddrick Perry, Randi Lesnick, Bill Kaiser, Chris Jackson, Jim Hagy, Adam Dread, Lois Lane, James Damato, W.B. Baker, Jr, Kim Kennedy, Margaret Darby

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: Items on the agenda may be removed or moved at this time. New items will not be added.

Ms. Zeigler noted that 1430B Greenwood was requested to be removed from the consent agenda and will be discussed at the end of the agenda.

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember O'Connell requested that the design guidelines for Second Ave and Downtown be deferred and that only the height recommendation be considered in the Broadway design guidelines. He explained the reasons for the request for additional height in a portion of the Broadway overlay. The parcels in question are vacant and activity there will increase business for everyone else. Activity under and on the bridge can be an economic asset. The additional height will serve as a transition between the historic buildings and the taller buildings outside of the district.

Ms. Zeigler clarified that the design guidelines will be heard at the February meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. November 15, 2017

Motion:

Vice-chairman Bell moved to approve the minutes and submitted. Commissioner Brown seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Tibbs explained public hearing and appeals processes.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: Items on the Consent Agenda will be voted on at a single time. No individual public hearing will be held, nor will the Commission debate these items unless a member of the audience or the Commission requests that the item be removed from the Consent Agenda.

b. 1430 B GREENWOOD AVE

REMOVED FROM CONSENT

c. 1438 ROBERTS AVENUE

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

d. 1621 FORREST AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

e. 1624 GARTLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction-outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren

f. 305 BROADWAY

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

g. 3614 RICHLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren

h. 1404 NORTH 14TH STREET

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

Staff member, Jenny Warren presented the cases for the consent agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve all consent items with their applicable conditions and with the exception of 1430B Greenwood. Commissioner seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

i. 312 E MARTHONA ROAD

Application: Historic Landmark Designation
Council District: 08
Overlay: Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Councilmember Van Reece is requesting a Historic Landmark for Hank Snow’s Rainbow Ranch which comprises approximately three acres at 312 E. Marthona Road in Madison, Tennessee. A National Register nomination has been researched and written by the Center for Historic Preservation at Middle Tennessee State University. All our information comes from that report.

The property is significant as the home, office and studio of country music singer-songwriter Clarence “Hank” Snow. It includes multiple buildings and structures. It is the best extant property most strongly associated with the productive significant career of Hank Snow, a member of the Country Music Hall of Fame. Snow began recording with the RCA Victor label in 1936. This relationship lasted continuously for forty-five years—a record not matched by any other recording star in 20th century popular music--and produced over 800 commercial recordings, many of which charted on both the radio and sales charts and influenced generations of country and Americana performers.

Staff suggests that the MHZC recommend to Council approval of a Historic Landmark overlay for 312 E Marthona Road and to use the existing design guidelines for Historic Landmarks to guide future alterations, finding the building meets section 5 of ordinance 17.36.120.

Councilmember VanReece provided more historic information about the site and stated that the neighborhood supports the project. She read a letter from a neighborhood who is also in support of the project.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart noted that this is a great example of the community coming together and enhancing the community.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to make the recommendation to council and approve the design guidelines. Vice-chairman Bell seconded.

j. BROADWAY DESIGN GUIDELINES

Application: Revision of existing design guidelines
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Ms. Zeigler recapped that the Downtown and 2nd Ave Design guidelines were deferred. The Broadway design guidelines, are deferred with the exception of the additional height proposed.

She explained that Councilman O’Connell asked Staff to look at where additional height might be appropriate about a year ago. They picked the two areas proposed based on the lack of historic context, the fact that new construction will be physically separated from historic buildings, the areas are a transition between the small scale of the historic area and the taller scale of buildings planned for just outside of the overlay, and an increase in height moving south of Broadway was a method already incorporated into the design guidelines.

The report includes public comment received for the earlier draft as well as the current draft and you have received public comment via email since the publication of the report.

Joe Farrell, part of the development team for a project just outside of the overlay spoke in favor of the alteration to the design guidelines.

Michael Hayes, CB Ragland, neighboring property owner spoke in favor of the project. He provided the addresses for the nearby properties his company owns. He explained that they have been working with Planning regarding heights south of Broadway for 15 years.

Terry Clements, representing the CVB, provided a letter sent to the Commission last month and stated his support of the project.

Tim Dugan, representing The District, spoke in favor of the project. They have discussed the height changes with the business and property owners they represent and they feel like the development at that location will help to build a “greater Nashville.”

Charles Robert Bone, a partner in Acme Feed & Seed, spoke in favor of the project. They have reviewed the design and feel it is appropriate.

Tom Turner, with the Downtown Partnership, spoke in favor of the project as it will activate the street level on First Avenue and under the bridge.

Steve Marr, MJM Architects and Real estate, spoke as a representative of one of the property owners that will benefit from the additional height. He said the project will fit into the character of the district. It will include a hotel and live entertainment venue that will be on a site that is currently a parking lot and located outside the National Register boundaries.

Doug Sloan, planning department director, explained that Planning worked with the developer to be sure that the street is activated with this project and that the activation continues from the current developments outside of the district, into the district. They were especially concerned about the connection with the bridge and the park beneath.

Paula Middlebrooks, a board member for Historic Nashville, Inc., spoke against the project stating that 18 stories so close to the 2-4 stories historic buildings will have a negative effect on the historic character of the district. She requested lowering the height.

Stewart Winston, lives in Hendersonville and spoke against the project. He recommended that the properties be removed from the district rather than allow so much additional height. There are multiple other properties where such height can be recognized. Smart developers have used loop holes to knock down historic buildings and this will be a huge loop hole that places a multi-dollar bullseye on the historic buildings.

Frank May, a neighboring property owner and owner of other properties in the district, said that the overlay is in place to protect the district from high-rises. He showed a drawing illustrating that the project will not be compatible. There is no way an economic project cannot happen and meet the design guidelines. There will be unintended consequences.

Commissioner Mosley clarified that they are not reviewing a specific project but rather a change to the design guidelines.

Commissioner Stewart said that the district has changed greatly and it’s hard to find the appropriate number of stories. Since the project is to the south, sun will still reach Broadway so he is comfortable with the 250’ distance back for some additional height.

Commissioners asked about clarification of the proposal and its potential impact. Ms. Zeigler corrected one of the graphics shown, stating that what is proposed is 18 stories, as noted in the staff report and draft design guidelines.

Chairman Tibbs said that since the proposed lots for the additional height are outside of the national register it could be appropriate.

Motion:

Councilman Stewart moved to the proposed changes to the Broadway design guidelines for Section III A and B, height for infill. Commissioner Boyd seconded and the motion passed with Vice-chairman Bell and Commissioners Mosley and Brown in opposition.

Councilmember Mayhall thanked those who spoke regarding the project. She said she understood and appreciated Mr. May's concerns and said that if there were other merchants who also had concern it would make a difference to her.

k. SECOND AVENUE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Application: Revision of existing design guidelines
Council District: 19
Overlay: Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Deferred

l. DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Application: Revision of existing design guidelines
Council District: 19
Overlay: Downtown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Deferred

v. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

None.

vi. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

None.

vii. VIOLATIONS

m. 119 3rd Avenue South

Application: Signage and Alteration
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for signage and rollup door at 119 3rd Ave South. 119 3rd Avenue South is a two-story commercial structure constructed c.1920. It is a contributing building to the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. The building is currently the home of the Johnny Cash & Patsy Cline Museums.

The application is to install a new projecting sign. The signage design largely meets the design guidelines except that there are exposed bulbs and that the building has already far exceeded the signage allotment on its 3rd Avenue South side.

Of all the signs on the front façade, only the Johnny Cash projecting sign received a permit from MHZC. The sign on the interior of the windows is not reviewed by MHZC. All other signs that you see in this image are in violation as they did not receive preservation permit and do not meet the design guidelines.

The façade is seventy-nine feet (79') long, and because it has a projecting sign, its allotment is one hundred and fifty-eight square feet (158 sq. ft). The current Johnny Cash projecting sign is forty square feet (40 sq. ft). The proposed Patsy Cline projecting sign is another forty square feet (40 sq. ft). So, the applicant must reduce all other wall signs so that they are less than seventy-eight square feet (78 sq. ft).

This sign was installed without a permit c. 2013; the sign is painted over a previously-existing painted sign. Since MHZC must review and approve all painting of masonry, it considers the entire painted area to be part of the sign. The sign is four feet (4') tall by seventy-nine feet (79') wide. Its total square footage is three hundred and sixteen square feet (316 sq. ft.). The building has already used its painted sign/mural allotment of one hundred and twenty-five square feet (125 sq. ft.) on the rear façade, so the sign size is counted towards the total signage allotment for the building.

As part of the approval of the Johnny Cash projecting sign in 2015, the owners were required to reduce the size of the painted wall sign to no more than one hundred and five square feet (105 sq. ft.) in order to bring the sign into compliance with the overall signage plan at that time. The projecting sign was installed, but the painted sign was not reduced in size.

Staff recommends that the sign be removed or reduced in size so that it fits within the total signage allotment for 3rd Avenue South.

The owner has installed a wall sign for the Patsy Cline Museum above a storefront entrance without a preservation permit. The sign does not meet the design guidelines, but the applicant has stated that they are willing to remove it.

The owner has also installed a shingle sign for the Patsy Cline Museum. The applicant has also agreed to remove this sign, which does not meet the design guidelines for shingle signs.

The owner has installed a painted wall sign on the side edge of the building without a preservation permit. The applicant did not submit information as to the size of the sign. Since MHZC reviews all painting of brick, the entire painted area is counted as part of the sign. Staff estimates that the sign is approximately two feet wide and twenty-four feet tall (2' X 24'), or forty-eight square feet (48 sq. ft.).

While this part of a building would not typically be an appropriate place for signage, there was signage at this location prior to the designation of the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Staff therefore finds that signage in this location could be appropriate if it were brought into compliance with the overall signage allotment for the building. Staff recommends that the painted sign be removed or reduced in size so that the total square footage of signage for the 3rd Avenue South side of the building is no more than one hundred and fifty-eight square feet (158 sq. ft.).

The previous occupant of the building had several large, painted signs that were painted prior to the historic preservation overlay and which added up to more than the current allotment for the building. Even though the signs were there 8 years ago, all new signage must be brought into compliance with the design guidelines, and that includes not exceeding the signage allotment for the 3rd Avenue South side. The Commission just last month determined that a building with a 1st Avenue North façade must meet the signage allotment stated in the design guidelines, even though there are currently older painted signs that are larger than the allotment allows. In addition, as stated previously, all painted areas count towards the signage allotment.

To recap, the existing signage on the 3rd Avenue South façade adds up to approximately 484 sq. ft., well above the signage allotment of 158 sq. ft. The main signs in question on this façade are the painted wall signs – the applicant has agreed to remove the vinyl Patsy Cline signs. Staff recommends that the painted signs be removed or reduced so that the total signage square footage on the 3rd Avenue South is not more than one hundred and fifty-eight square feet (158 sq. ft.). Staff also recommends that all paint be removed with the gentlest means possible, to be approved by MHZC staff.

Before I move on from the 3rd Avenue South façade, there is another violation on 3rd Avenue South. A rollup door was installed at an existing entryway. Section II.B of the design guidelines states that replacement doors should be compatible with the storefront. MHZC does not consider this style of door to be compatible on the front façade of a building and on historic buildings where there is no evidence of them historically. Enclosing an entrance does not meet design guideline II.B.1, which calls for “original doors, entryways, and related elements to be retained.” Secondary, narrow, recessed entrances are typical of historic buildings. The rollup door encloses this typical entrance

feature and dramatically alters the look of the recessed entrance. Staff finds that the roll up door does not meet Section II.B. of the design guidelines, and recommends its removal.

The applicant has stated that the rollup door was installed to prevent unwanted activity in the recessed entrance. Staff recommends alternative methods such as motion-detecting lighting or alarms, or placing the mechanicals for the door inside of the recessed entryway.

The rear façade of the building is visible from 4th Avenue South because of a parking lot. A wall sign has been added to the rear of the building without a preservation permit. The sign appears to be vinyl, which is not an appropriate material for signage.

For this building, the design guidelines allow for 78 sq. ft of signage on the rear, non-street facing side and murals are calculated separately. If the rear photographs are considered “murals” then the current painted signage leaves only three square feet (3 sq. ft.) of allotment remaining. The dimensions of the rear Cline sign were not provided but it is clear that it is more than three square feet (3 sq. ft.) and so its size does not meet the design guidelines for signage.

Staff recommends the approval of the new projecting sign with these conditions:

1. The following signs, installed without preservation permits, be removed:
 - a. The “Patsy Cline Museum” wall sign above the storefront on the 3rd Avenue South façade
 - b. The “Patsy Cline Museum” shingle sign on the 3rd Avenue South facade
 - c. The “Patsy Cline Museum” wall sign on the rear façade.
2. The “Johnny Cash Museum” painted sign above the second story windows on the 3rd Avenue South façade and the painted sign on side sliver of a façade on 3rd Avenue South be reduced in size so that, together, their square footage is no larger than seventy-eight square feet (78 sq. ft.). The applicant must submit drawings showing the size, location, & design of the new, reduced signs.
3. All removal of paint be undertaken in a way that does not damage the historic brick. MHZC staff to approve the paint removal method.
4. The projecting sign not have exposed bulbs.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed signage meets Section IV. of the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the roll-up door, finding that it does not meet Section II.B. of the design guidelines for rehabilitation of doors and entryways.

Staff further recommends that the signage and doorway violations be removed no later than January 30, 2018, providing 30 days for correction.

Kelly Frey, attorney for the property owner, explained that they would like to keep the existing signage sizes. This is a family-friendly location and an international destination stop. They agree to remove the shingle sign and temporary signs. He asked to defer into February because part of the project includes exposed lighting.

Brian Taylor, spoke in favor of the project, stating that it might be appropriate to ask for a deferral of the new sign. It is not a honky tonk, it is a destination. There are two businesses in the building. The new painted signage stays within the existing framing.

Kayla Joslin, Joslin Sign Company, asked that the projecting sign to be deferred until February when the design guidelines might be approved that allow for bare bulbs.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the applicant was allowed to keep the painted sign since it was existing. Mr. Poole explained that the signage is not historic and Ms. Zeigler said that the design guidelines require that existing signage needs to come into compliance.

Commissioners asked for clarification of their task and whether or not the project should be deferred. Mr. Poole suggested that at least the violation portions of the project should not be deferred.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the design guidelines were specifically written to encourage people to come up with a full signage plan if they had unused space that could accommodate a second business or already had multiple businesses. Commissioner Mosley stated that it is the applicant's duty to comply with the design guidelines and make a decision about which signage they wanted to keep so that the allotment is met.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to disapprove the project and requested the applicant come to the Commission with a full signage proposal with all dimensions to the February, 2018 meeting. Vice-chair Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously

Motion:

Vice-chairman Bell moved to disapprove the roll-up door, finding that it does not meet Section II.B. of the design guidelines for rehabilitation of doors and entryways. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Boyd voting in opposition.

VIII. MHZC ACTIONS

n. 400 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for signage at 400 Broadway, which is a circa 1870 brick commercial structure that contributes to the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. A rooftop addition and rear addition was approved by the MHZC in December of 2016, and is largely finished. Application is to paint a sign/mural on the rear addition. The mural will be approximately twenty-two feet wide by fifty-one feet tall (22' x 51'), or one thousand, one hundred and twenty-two square feet (1,122 sq. ft.).

The design guidelines state that "Generally, a painted sign should not be more than 125 square feet in size." The area where the new painted sign is proposed is approximately twenty-two feet by fifty-one feet (22' X 51'), or one thousand, one hundred and twenty-two square feet (1,122 sq. ft.). The sign/painted mural is significantly larger than the building's allotment of one hundred and twenty-five square feet (125 sq. ft.). The one hundred and twenty-five square feet (125 sq. ft.) of mural space is allotted for the entire building. The applicant has a preservation permit for another mural on the 4th Avenue North façade of the building; that sign, which has not yet been painted, is approximately eighty-six square feet (86 sq. ft.).

Staff recommends disapproval, finding that the signage's square footage to be larger than the one hundred and twenty-five square feet (125 sq. ft.) allotted in the design guidelines for painted signs for the entire building. Staff finds that the proposed sign does not meet Section IV. of the design guidelines.

Charles Robert Bone, representative of the applicant, made the argument that the proposal is not a sign and that signage must be painted on masonry; therefore the design guidelines do not apply. If the design guidelines do apply, the signage should be considered as a modification because it is on the rear, it's not on the front, it is a sign for the current occupant and does not have lighting. This is intended to be an exceptional piece of art, which does not include logos or branding.

Commissioner Jones noted that the large sign was an unintended consequence of allowing an addition that is not masonry. Ms. Zeigler explained that there are design guidelines for paint on masonry; however, what is proposed meets the ordinance's definition of signage which is:

"Sign" means any writing (including letter, work or numeral), pictorial representation (including illustration or decoration); emblem (including device, symbol or trademark); flag (including banner or pennant); inflatable structure; or any other figure of similar character, which is a structure or any part thereof, or is attached to, painted on, or in any

other manner represented on a building or other structure; and is used to announce, direct attention to, or advise. Therefore staff recommends that the mural meet the 125 square foot allotment.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove the project, finding that the signage's square footage to be larger than the one hundred and twenty-five square feet (125 sq. ft.) allotted in the design guidelines for painted signs for the entire building, specifically Section IV. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Brown seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

o. 209 SOUTH 5TH STREET

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 209 S 5th Street, which is a c. 1868 brick house that contributes to the historic character of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. The house and site are currently used as an event facility known as Ivy Hall. The applicant is proposing a side addition, and staff is recommending disapproval of the side addition.

The house and site have been altered some over the years. You can see from the Sanborn maps that the lot was historically smaller and there were other houses that faced South 5th Street on this block. The two houses next door to 209 South 5th were demolished sometime before the creation of the overlay in 1978. Two houses that were at the rear of the property, facing Fatherland (505 Fatherland and 507 Fatherland) were approved for demolition by MHZC in 1979, and their lots were incorporated into this lot.

The house's red brick was painted for the first time in the late 1970s, just prior to the enactment of the preservation overlay. The photo on the top left shows the house being painted and before the modern additions were added. Shortly after the creation of the historic overlay in 1978, MHZC approved a one-story side addition, shown with the arrow, to the house. Comparing the photos, it is evident that the two-story portion on the right side of the house was extended towards the rear during this time. Sometime before 1995, a greenhouse structure was constructed on top of the one-story side addition without a preservation permit. The applicant plans to remove the greenhouse structure, which staff finds to be appropriate. The one-story side addition is proposed to be retained.

Circa 1984, a brick wall with attached outbuildings was constructed around the perimeter of the site. Today, the site for 209 South 5th Street contains several outbuildings and is over forty-five thousand square feet (45,000).

Here is the proposed site plan, with the addition outlined in red. Even though the addition meets the base zoning setbacks, staff finds that it interrupts the rhythm of spacing along this section of South 5th Street. As the Sanborn maps show, historically there were two to three houses on this section of South 5th Street, all oriented towards South 5th Street. The side "ballroom" addition transforms the house and the lot into something they were not historically. Historically, this block had a collection of larger city homes on urban-size lots. The side "ballroom" addition prevents the historic rhythm of spacing of houses to be reestablished in the future with infill development. Further, it tries to make the house into a grand estate on an over-sized lot, which was not its historic intention.

Staff has added color to show how the proposed footprint is overly large compared to the historic house, and is particularly large for a side addition. Here, the red is the footprint of the house as shown in the 1897 and 1957 Sanborns. The yellow shows additions – the side addition was added in the 1970s. The rear portion was constructed sometime after 1957. The blue shows the proposed new side addition.

The addition's design is intended to be an extension of the 1970s side addition to the house. However, its long width and large footprint throws off the proportions of the historic house.

The side addition will have a total width of seventy-six feet, four inches (76'4"), which is almost twice the width of the historic portion of the house. Although the design guidelines do permit side additions on wide lots like this one, staff finds that the proposed side addition does not meet the guideline that side additions should be "narrower than half of the historic building width." In other words, if you follow the design guidelines, a new side addition should be about ten feet (10'), not the seventy-six feet (76') proposed.

The design guidelines state that side additions "*should set back from the face of the historic structure (at or beyond the midpoint of the building) and should be subservient in height, width and massing to the historic structure.*" The side addition attaches on to a 1970s side addition, and it matches the one-story height of the previous addition. While the addition is significantly shorter than the historic house, its massive width and footprint render the scale of the addition inappropriate.

Staff also finds that the two exterior stairs, one on the South 5th Street façade and one on the Fatherland façade are not appropriate. Historically, stairs were internal, or if they were utilitarian, were located on the rear façade.

Staff finds that the proposed flat roof does not meet the design guidelines, as the guidelines state that new construction should have a minimum roof slope of 6/12. Staff finds that the building's shape, which is a long rectangle, does contrast greatly with the historic house's shape.

There is an expanse of approximately thirty-five feet (35') on the front of the addition, facing South 5th Street, without a window or door opening. Staff finds that this expanse does not meet the design guidelines, which state that there should be a door or window opening every eight to thirteen feet (8'-13').

Although the applicant maintains that the addition will not be highly visible from the street because of the brick wall and the landscaping, staff counters that the brick wall was constructed in the 1980s and therefore is not historic. Both the brick wall and the landscaping could be easily removed, and if they were, the addition would be highly visible from both South 5th Street and Fatherland Street. In the past the Commission has not used fences/walls or landscaping when determining "visibility."

Staff recommends disapproval, finding that the proposed side addition does not meet Section III.B, specifically sections for additions, height, scale and roof form, of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Tom White, legal representation for the applicant handed out information. The concern is that they need ballroom space "within the historic structure." Staff has made the argument that the 1980 wall is not historic and can be removed. He claimed that the wall will never be removed. He explained the judge's decision regarding a BZA case that defined the wall as historic. He asked for a motion that the Commission does not have jurisdiction.

Ed Clay, owner of the property, appreciated the support of the councilmember and the state representative. He provided background on his business and investment. Their main focus with the design is to meet the design guidelines.

Dave Wachtel, part-owner of the property, stated that the project meets the design guidelines. He claims that the addition is smaller than the house and the lot is atypical. He provided information that he feels means the design guidelines have been met.

Tom Anderson, architect for the project, based on the sizes given to them for an atypical site.

State Representative Harrold Love said he has seen the plans and talked with owners and what they are representing. Senator Harper sent him an email stating that she also supports the project.

Dedrick Perry, 2615 Albion, is resident of Nashville. The addition will facilitate fundraising events, as well as events such as weddings. Friends of his have made their decision to move to Nashville after attending weddings at this location.

Randi Lesnick, CEO of Randi Events. The site is beautiful but there is not back-up for an outdoor wedding other than a tent, which doesn't meet everyone's budget. The wedding season could be expanded with the ballroom.

Bill Kaiser, Music City Events and Tents, provided information about his business and how they miss out on events because there is no rain plan.

Chris Jackson, Nashville Audio Visual, is in favor of the project because the business has raised awareness of the area. The addition will allow the business to have events all week long and cut down on neighborhood complaints.

Jim Hagy, Chef's Market in Goodlettsville. He has always admired the building and Ed is a strict vendor. An indoor space will be a great addition to the space. Rain is problematic.

Adam Dread, 1709 19th Ave S, has known the owner since the 1980s. He comes in his capacity as a former councilmember and to support the project. An indoor facility is required so that they can have more events. They are good neighbors and good citizens.

Lois Lane, 1817 Russell Street, spoke for the neighborhood association. Their goal is to preserve the residential and historic quality of the neighborhood which have been saved by the design guidelines. She said that they hope that they will uphold the design guidelines. Board members said that it would be a huge structure on S 5th Street and the large deck on the top which could add to the perceived height of the structure. She also expressed concern about increased traffic and the noise. Neighbors have either moved or gotten used to the current level of noise. They are concerned about expansion of the business, a commercial operation in a residential neighborhood.

James Damato, 800 Boscobel, explained that the application is an addition to a residential home but the other speakers have been talking about the value of the business. The design guidelines are for the residential character of the neighborhood. He supports the staff recommendation.

W.B.Baker, Jr, Fatherland Street, says he has watched it grow from a small place to a mansion. They enjoy the weddings and the owners are good people.

Mr. White reiterated that their legal position is that the judge has made a decision about the wall being historic and the business taking place within the historic structure.

Mr. Poole noted that the case reference was an appeal of the neighbors relating to a BZA case. Findings related to the wall were done by the BZA and their finding is not binding upon this commission. Their role today was to decide if the project fits within the design guidelines.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the proposal is an addition and the use issue is not something they have any say-so over. If you look at the facades of the existing house, the façade has plenty of ins-and-outs and doesn't meet the fenestration pattern of the historic building. The openings are not present, as they should be, because of the exterior staircase.

Commissioner Mayhall said the owners did a great job renovating the historic structure; however the addition is not in compliance with the design guidelines.

Commissioner Jones agreed with Commissioners Mayhall and Mosely. Commissioner Mosley said an addition didn't have to be at the rear. This project does lend itself to a rhythm of a separate structure with a connector between.

Commissioner Jones moved to disapprove the project, finding that the proposed side addition does not meet Section III.B, specifically sections for additions, height, scale and roof form, of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Mosley seconded.

Mr. White requested deferral to the next meeting. Ms. Zeigler asked for more direction for the applicant. Commissioner Stewart said he thought the height was appropriate but the exterior stair is not and he is concerned that a tent could be placed on top of the addition. The roof slope is also problematic as the form isn't consistent with this neighborhood.

Commission took a break at 4:34pm and returned at 4:47pm. Commissioner Brown left at 4:34pm.

p. 1915 BOSCOBEL STREET

Application: New construction-outbuilding/detached accessory dwelling unit

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member Melissa Sajid presented the case for 1915 Boscobel Street. The request is to construct a DADU at 1915 Boscobel Street. The 1.5 story house at this location was built circa 1920 and contributes to the Lockeland Springs-East End district. The house is located on a corner lot adjacent to Shelby Park, and the rear of the lot abuts Lillian Street, which functions as an alley at this location as there are no homes fronting that street. The DADU meets the design guidelines and ordinance for everything except eave height.

The overall height of the DADU is twenty four feet, ten and a half inches (24'10 ½") tall with an eave height of twelve feet, nine and a half inches (12'9 ½"), measured from grade. The design guidelines require that single story and one and one-half story outbuildings have a maximum eave height of ten feet (10') or not to exceed the eave height of the house, whichever is less. The proposed eave height not only exceeds the maximum eave height of ten feet (10') but also is greater than the eave height of the historic home which is approximately ten feet, nine inches (10'9"). In order to meet the design guidelines, the eave height of the outbuilding should not exceed ten feet (10'), and staff recommends approval with the condition that the eave height of the DADU not exceed ten feet (10'). Here are the front and right side elevations. The DADU will be clad in cement board siding with board and batten as a secondary cladding on the dormers.

While the eave height appears subordinate to those of the historic house, the eave height still exceeds the maximum of ten feet (10') per the design guidelines and the ordinance as well as the eave height of the house as measured from grade. In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the DADU with conditions.

Paul Boulifard, architect for the project, asked for leniency of the two and a half foot (2'6") reduction of the eave height. As an architect they try to balance client expectations, building code, structural requirements, and historic overlay. This client needs additional office and storage space. With the increase of eave height they will be able to maximize the upper-level square footage.

Amy Brown, property owner, said that their family has changed so they need additional space.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mayhall said that the guidelines are pretty clear about eave height. Commissioner Stewart said the site is unique because of its location next to the park and the massing is subservient to the main house. If the house wasn't surrounded by the park, he would be concerned but he sees reason for exception.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the detached accessory dwelling unit with the following conditions:

- 1. Eave height shall be reduced to ten feet (10');**
- 2. Staff approve pedestrian and vehicular doors, secondary cladding material, and roofing color prior to purchase and installation;**
- 3. The HVAC shall be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the DADU;**
- 4. New drawings shall be submitted reflecting the conditions, prior to issuance of a permit; and,**
- 5. Staff receive a copy of the filed restrictive covenant for the detached accessory dwelling unit prior to issuance of a permit;**

finding that with these conditions the detached accessory dwelling unit meets Ordinance 17.16.030. G and Section II.B.8 of the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded. The motion passed with Commissioner Stewart in opposition.

Commissioner Mosley empathized with the applicant and agrees that the location is different; however, monthly there are requests to not meet the guidelines and he is concerned about giving an inch in any situation. Commissioner Bell agreed.

q. 818 SHELBY AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for infill at 818 Shelby Avenue.

Proposed is a two story duplex on a vacant lot. The duplex will have a front to back orientation. There will also be a detached outbuilding at the rear of the lot.

The principal building will be thirty feet to thirty-three feet (30' to 33') tall with a sloping grade, with a foundation height not taller than three feet (3') at the lowest part of the lot.

It will be thirty-six feet (36') wide at the front and rear components, with the center section three feet (3') narrower. The total depth of the building will be seventy-two feet (72'), but the narrower center helps break up the massing. Also, the porches and gable projections of the units will be on opposite sides (left and right) which further helps break down the massing. Overall, Staff found the height and massing of the building to meet the design guidelines for scale of new construction.

On the west or right side of the building there will be a pair of round balconettes on the second story. This type of feature is not typical of historic houses nearby, but staff thought that because of their small size and location they wouldn't be greatly visible and wouldn't have a great impact.

There will also be a third-story roof deck on this side of the building. Staff does have concerns about the visibility of this feature, because roof decks are not typical of the historic context.

The materials and windows pattern are compatible and meet the design guidelines, although some specific material selections should be reviewed prior to construction.

Because Edgefield is a Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay, all appurtenances including paving, fences, and lighting will also need to be reviewed.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed infill and outbuilding with the following conditions:

1. The third-level roof decks is eliminated from the plan; and
2. Brick color, siding texture and reveal, roof color, and all the window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to construction; and
3. A paved walkway shall be added connecting the front porch and the sidewalk; and
4. Permanent landscape features including walkways, driveways, fences and retaining walls, lighting, and any other appurtenances shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to installation; and
5. The HVAC condenser shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street-facing elevation.

With those conditions met, Staff finds that the proposed infill and outbuilding will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, explained that the applicant's program needs has changed and so what is proposed is now a front-to-back duplex. They would like to request the retention of the rooftop terrace. There are several rooftop terraces in the area, including a multi-unit project nearby.

Commissioner Mosley agreed that the design is as minimally visible as a rooftop deck can be and asked for clarification of details. Mr. Hodge said there will be a fabricated metal cap at the top. Internal roof drains will take care of water, much like a shower.

Steve Burt, 321 S 11th Street, owner of the property, asked to keep the rooftop element, which they have made as invisible as possible. It will only be visible from the neighboring property, which he also owns. He showed a list of all the ones he found in the neighborhood but didn't hand it out. 940 Russell is one that is very discernible.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley said that staff struggles with inappropriate rooftops and as a rule it would be a preference to not have to deal with them.

Commissioner Jones said she understood the recommendation by staff and the concern about setting a precedent but she is not concerned about the balconies because of the design. It is recessed and does not add additional height to the building but it is not her intent to give everyone the possibility of 3rd floor balconies.

Chairman Tibbs said he agreed that it was appropriate, in this instance. Commissioner Mosley stated the balcony is in keeping with the general character and expectation of roof forms in the district.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the proposed infill and outbuilding with the following conditions:

- 1. Brick color, siding texture and reveal, roof color, and all the window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to construction;**
- 2. A paved walkway shall be added connecting the front porch and the sidewalk; and**
- 3. Permanent landscape features including walkways, driveways, fences and retaining walls, lighting, and any other appurtenances shall be approved by MHZC Staff prior to installation; and**
- 4. The HVAC condenser shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street-facing elevation;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed infill and outbuilding will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 1724 4th AVENUE NORTH

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 1724 4th Ave N, infill on the site of a noncontributing building that has been approved for demolition. The project is a duplex with attached carports. The front setback matches the neighboring building to the left, which is new construction, a few feet forward of the nearest contributing building's setback. Due to the odd size and shape of this lot, staff recommends the setback as proposed. The new building meets the design guidelines for orientation, roof form, rhythm and spacing of openings, and materials. Staff recommends having approval of roofing, windows, doors, and some porch materials that were not specified. The front-facing gable as proposed is one foot (1') taller than what is permitted, so staff recommends that this height not exceed thirty-five feet (35'). Staff also recommends shifting the enclosed bay to the other side of the porch. Due to the size of the lot, staff recommends approval of the attached outbuildings. The overall footprint of the outbuildings is eight hundred square feet (800 sq. ft.) so staff recommends the size be reduced to seven hundred fifty square feet (750 sq. ft.). The applicant has already agreed to these revisions and has submitted new drawings to that effect.

Commissioner Mosley asked for some clarifications of the drawing

Preston Quirk, architect for the project, stated he was available if there were any questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the following conditions:

1. **The ridge height is reduced to thirty-five feet (35’);**
 2. **The total footprint of carports does not exceed seven hundred and fifty square feet (750 sq. ft.);**
 3. **The projecting porch bay is moved to the right side of the structure;**
 4. **The finished floor height is consistent with the finished floor heights of adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
 5. **Staff approval of the color of the shingle and metal roof colors, trim, porch materials, railings, windows and doors prior to purchase and installation; and**
 6. **The HVAC is located behind the house or on a side facade, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- finding that with these conditions, the proposed addition meets Section III of the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

s. 2212 GRANTLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding

Council District: 17

Overlay: Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

2212 Grantland Avenue is currently a vacant lot. In June 2016, the MHZC approved a design for infill and a DADU on this lot, but those structures were not built. A new owner is proposing a duplex infill and outbuilding. The outbuilding will not be a DADU.

The lot is unusually wide at seventy-five feet (75’). The proposed infill and outbuilding meet all base zoning setbacks. Staff recommends the inclusion of walkways from the sidewalk to the front porches.

The proposed infill will be one and one-half stories with an eave height of approximately twelve feet, six inches (12’6”) above grade and a ridge height of thirty-two feet, three inches (32’3”) above grade. The house is a little taller and a little wider than historic houses in the immediate context. However, staff finds this to be appropriate because there are very tall houses on White Avenue, just one street behind, and because the lot is 25’ wider than a typical lot on this block.

The proposed infill is deep at ninety-nine feet (99’). However, because approximately forty feet (40’) of this depth is a true one-story form, staff finds that the overall scale of the house is appropriate. Staff finds that the known materials meet the design guidelines and ask to approve all final material choices prior to purchase and installation.

The applicant has proposed a one-and-a-half story outbuilding that will not be used as a dwelling unit. The outbuilding and the infill will be connected with covered breezeways that are four feet (4’) wide and open on both sides. The Commission has approved such breezeways in the past. Staff finds the outbuilding’s height, scale, dormers, roof, and materials to all meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Staff verify the construction height of the foundation and floor system in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new infill is compatible with the finished floor line of the historic houses on either side;
2. Walkways be added from the sidewalk to the two front porches;
3. The front doors be at least half glass, and staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;

4. Staff approve a stone sample;
5. Staff approve the roof shingle color and texture;
6. Staff approved the material of the floors and steps for all porches;
7. Staff approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to lighting, fencing, pathways, parking pads; and
8. The HVAC unit and other utilities be placed on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the infill meets Section III.B.2 of the Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Ron Tolander said he agreed with staff recommendations.

Motion:

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

1. **Staff verify the construction height of the foundation and floor system in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new infill is compatible with the finished floor line of the historic houses on either side;**
2. **Walkways be added from the sidewalk to the two front porches;**
3. **The front doors be at least half glass, and staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
4. **Staff approve a stone sample;**
5. **Staff approve the roof shingle color and texture;**
6. **Staff approved the material of the floors and steps for all porches;**
7. **Staff approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to lighting, fencing, pathways, parking pads; and**
8. **The HVAC unit and other utilities be placed on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.**

finding that with these conditions, staff finds that the infill meets Section III.B.2 of the Woodland-in-Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Boyd seconded.

t. 2008 NATCHEZ TRACE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 2008 Natchez Trace. Staff recommended disapproval of the proposal having found that the height, width, roof, and windows would not meet the design guidelines, but the primary concern is with the front setback. Staff acknowledged that it is not a simple site to build on because of grade and a stormwater crossing the site from the property to the South. Staff met with the applicant with Metro Stormwater on December 19th and got some guidance on to figure out what is possible. It was agreed that more detailed evaluation by an engineer with recommendations on how to handle the water issues is needed to better address the site and infrastructure.

Adam Epstein explained the issues with the site regarding storm water and grade. He has a 5-acre water shed, implied variance that they have to have a lined-ditch to replace. He wants to hear some discussion but asked for deferral.

Commissioner Stewart recommended some attention to the height and scale of the building, which is another reason for the recommendation of disapproval. Commissioner Mosley said that leeway has been given to front-setbacks before because of water issues. An engineer’s feedback will be useful. Chairman Tibbs agreed that a letter from an engineer will be useful.

The applicant requested deferral.

b. 1430 B GREENWOOD AVE

Application: New construction-infill (revision to previous approval)

Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for a revision to an approved infill design at 1430B Greenwood. 1430B Greenwood Avenue is a vacant lot. In September 2017, MHZC approved a design for infill development and for a garage on this lot. The applicant is now seeking approval to add a side bay to the previously-approved design, to add a rear chimney, and to alter window openings.

The lot is unusually with a triangle shape and just a small sliver of frontage along Greenwood. The front setback has not changed. The addition of the bay on the house's left façade will bring the house out to the 10' setback line. The chimney, which will be added to the rear, is not counted in setback measurements and therefore doesn't affect the rear setback. No changes to the rear outbuilding are proposed under this application.

The bay will bring the maximum width of the house to forty-eight feet, six inches (48'6"). The house is staggered in width so that at the front, it is thirty feet, eight inches (30' 8") wide. After a depth of twenty-seven feet, six inches (27'6"), the width expands to be forty-two feet, eight inches (42'8"). The proposed bay, which will bring the width to forty-eight feet, six inches (48'6"), is located approximately forty feet, six inches (40'6") back from the front of the house.

In the immediate area, the widths of houses at the front range from approximately twenty-nine feet to forty feet (29' - 40'). The front of the house meets this historic context, but the rear portions that expand to forty-two feet, eight inches (42'8") and forty-eight feet, six inches (48'6") do not meet this width. Staff, however, finds that the extra width is appropriate, in this instance, because of the unusual shape of the lot and the fact that the extra width will not even occur until behind the rear walls of the two adjacent historic houses. The proposed one-story bay will not occur until over one hundred and ten feet (110') from the front property line.

On the left is the previously approved front elevation and on the right is the proposed front elevation. The proposed revisions will not alter the previously-approved height of the house. The proposed revisions add a one-story bay on the back part of the left elevation. The bay will be six feet (6') wide and thirteen feet, two inches (13'2") deep. The bay will have a maximum height of thirteen feet (13') from grade. Changes to the front façade also include adding window transoms over one of the paired windows and changing the details of the gables. Staff finds that all of these changes meet the design guidelines.

Changes on the left façade include adding the bay and adding a rear chimney. The chimney at the back will be seven feet (7') wide and four feet, six inches (4'6") deep, although chimneys are not typically counted towards the overall footprint or size of new construction. The fenestration pattern on the rear façade has changed, but still meets the design guidelines. The chimney also meets the design guidelines. The fenestration pattern has changed on the right façade too, but staff finds that the new fenestration pattern still meets the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval with the 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. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
3. Staff approve a brick sample;
4. Staff approve the roof shingle color and texture; and
5. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Staff finds that the proposed application meets Section II.B for New Construction in the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Nathan Weinberg, applicant for the project, explained the reason for the alterations which was to make a sufficient living-space and dining room, add a fireplace and add some decorative features to the front.

Kim Kennedy, next door, stated that she is familiar with the design guidelines. When the project first came to the Commission, the neighbors presented 6-pages of information. Based on lack of discussion, she didn't feel heard. She does not agree with the additional width as what was approved was already greater than what is seen in the historic overlay. She claims it is too large to be bay; therefore it is another side addition, which will appear as a second side-addition. Staff's recommendation does not consider that the building will sit on a side alley and so the side of the home will be more visible than other interior lots. She asked them to discuss and consider precedent.

Margaret Darby, across the street, said this is the 3rd parcel she has been disappointed in. The variance permitted is too great. They worked hard to get the design guidelines and then to see projects that don't meet the design guidelines get approved is upsetting. She provided other examples of large projects approved. This one is similar in that it is an oversized lot. There is a rush to get as much money as possible out of a property and not meet the design guidelines. She is greatly disappointed in the process.

Nathan Weinberg rebutted that the proposed addition is to help the floor plan of the house. He noted that there are two additions, which the proposed addition respects. In addition, the addition is so far back it will not affect the street frontage. They made an effort to make sure that the house fits the neighborhood.

Chairman Tibbs said they always give leeway for unusual lot constraints, but this appears to be removed from consent because they may be giving too much. Commissioner Jones said some of the improvements better the project but she is concerned with the additional width, which will be highly visible because of the alley.

Commissioner Mayhall and Vice-chairman Bell expressed concern about the additional width, beyond what was previously approved.

Commissioner Stewart said that it is well-crafted design with unusual lot constraints. He is not sure that the addition is a dramatic departure from previously approved plans. The scale is different from the other homes. Commissioner Mosley noted that the two adjacent houses are thirty feet (30') in width and the proposed house meets that massing at the front but is unable to increase the depth of the home, because of the lot constraints, so it is logical to widen it towards the back of the lot.

Commissioner Boyd moved to approve the staff recommendation, which failed due to lack of second. Commissioner Boyd explained that the changes will help the building fit into the neighborhood better.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to approve with the conditions:

- 1. The width of the home not be increased;**
- 2. 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;**
- 3. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- 4. Staff approve a brick sample;**
- 5. Staff approve the roof shingle color and texture; and**
- 6. 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 application meets Section II.B for New Construction in the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

b. CLG TRAINING

Quan Poole, Metro Legal: Meeting Procedures
Deferred

Caroline Eller, Metro Historical Commission: What Makes an Old Building Historic?

X. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES

c. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

Meeting adjourned at 6:22pm.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 1/17/18