

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 21, 2018

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

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

Applicants: Adam Epstein, Joshua Goldman, Kelly Frey and Brian Taylor, William Smallman, Allison Thies, Mitch Hodge, Steve Burt, Joseph Spicer, Brian Schaffer, Lucas Chestnut, Manuel Zeitlin

Councilmembers: Burkley Allen

Public: Kayla Joslin, Lindsey Moffatt, Lance Thomas, Anne Zuberer

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:02 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 2805 27th and 2519 Blair are removed from the consent agenda and will be placed at the end of the agenda. 934 McFerrin and 422 Broadway are deferred at the request of the applicant.

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

There were no councilmembers present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. January 17, 2018

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Boyd seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Tibbs explained the 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. 1707 FORREST AVE

Application: New construction-addition; setback determination

Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

c. 109 LINDSLEY PARK DR

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

d. 2805 27TH AVE S

REMOVED FROM CONSENT

e. 2519 BLAIR BLVD

REMOVED FROM CONSENT

f. 210 LEONARD AVE

Application: New construction-addition; Partial demolition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Whitland Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

g. 3624 CENTRAL AVE

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander

h. 215 CARDEN AVE

Application: New construction-addition, Setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Whitland Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Consent items were presented by Paul Hoffman.

Motion:

Vice-chairman Bell moved to approve all consent items with their applicable conditions with the exception of 2805 27th Ave S and 2519 Blair Blvd. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

None

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

i. 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 infill at 2008 Natchez Trace.

He presented a summary of the application accompanied by slides. He described the new building to be partly one story and partly two stories, with a deeper setback than is typical of the block because of a drainage ditch in the front yard. The building will be forty feet wide with an attached garage at the rear. The deep setback will reduce the perceived scale, and it also forces the house further back on the lot precluding there from being more space between the two buildings.

The building will be thirty three feet tall, which is compatible with surrounding context which includes two story houses. The materials will be brick and half-timbering, which is also compatible with the surrounding context.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal for New Construction in the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor heights shall be consistent with nearby historic buildings, to be verified by Staff during construction; and
2. Exterior materials, including brick samples for color and texture, roof color, as well as the window and door selections and the material of the paved walkway and parking area shall be administratively approved; and
3. The HVAC units shall be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

With those conditions met, Staff finds that the proposed design will meet the design guidelines for the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Adam Epstein, applicant for the project, was available for questions.

Commissioner Stewart said the design fits the historic context.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the project for New Construction in the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay with the following conditions:

1. **The finished floor heights shall be consistent with nearby historic buildings, to be verified by Staff during construction; and**
2. **Exterior materials, including brick samples for color and texture, roof color, as well as the window and door selections and the material of the paved walkway and parking area shall be administratively approved; and**
3. **The HVAC units shall be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house;**

finding that with those conditions met, the proposed design will meet the design guidelines for the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

j. 422 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler

Project was deferred at the request of the applicant.

VI. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

None.

VII. VIOLATIONS

k. 622 SHELBY AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding/Detached accessory dwelling unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case. 622 Shelby Avenue is a c. 1920 Brick bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

In December 2017, Historic Zoning Commission staff learned that the owner had purchased an installed a pre-made residential outbuilding structure on the lot without a preservation permit. The structure is currently one hundred and sixty square feet (160 sq. ft.). The applicant may add a covered deck, increasing the footprint to two hundred and thirty-four square feet (234 sq. ft.). The historic Zoning Commission must review and approve all outbuildings larger than one hundred square feet.

The approximate location of the outbuilding is outlined on the aerial photo. The outbuilding meets all base zoning setbacks. It is 8' from the west side property line, 24' from the east side property line, and 18' from the rear property line. The outbuilding is approximately 12' tall, with an eave height of 8', well below the maximums for outbuildings and DADUs. The structure's height, scale, location, and setbacks all meet the design guidelines and DADU ordinance. However, its materials do not.

The windows in the outbuilding do not meet MHZC's standards for windows. The windows are vinyl, and MHZC does not typically approve vinyl windows. In addition, the windows have grills between the glass, and MHZC typically requires that windows with a grid pattern have fully simulated divided lights. MHZC recommends that the windows be replaced with windows that meet MHZC standards.

The cladding material is a T-1-11 siding, which MHZC does not approve.

In the past, MHZC has required applicants in similar situations to install battens over the scoring that is intended to make the material look like vertical board. Staff recommends that the applicant be required to install battens over the scoring.

Staff recommends approval of the detached accessory dwelling unit with the following conditions:

1. The windows be replaced with windows that meet MHZC standards for materials and configuration;
2. Battens be installed over the scoring of the cladding;
3. The applicant provide drawings showing the design of the new covered deck

(Ms. Baldock noted that the Staff Recommendation online indicates a fourth condition, that the applicant submit a restrictive covenant, but that Staff has already received this document, so the condition has been met and thus removed from the present recommendation.)

With these conditions, staff finds that the detached accessory dwelling unit meets Ordinance 17.16.030. G. and Section III.B.2.h. of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. The 4th condition has been fulfilled.

Joshua Goldman, owner of the property, explained that he purchased the building 2017 and came in to get permits. He claimed it would not be visible because of location and fencing. He believes it should be permitted as-is because of its small size, visually consistency and because it meets all other requirements of the ordinance. He read portions of the design guidelines.

Chairman Tibbs asked if there was any plan to cover the piers (concrete blocks).

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Vice-chairman Bell and Chairman Tibbs expressed concern about the lack of foundation material. Ms. Zeigler explained that historically buildings were sometimes on piers and so they did not have concern about that as much as the other issues which have been what everyone else has been required to do. Commissioner Nielson expressed concern about the fact that pre-fab buildings are not typical of the neighborhood, the fence is not a permanent installation, and that the Commission needs to follow the same requirements as have been required for other similar projects.

Commissioner Stewart said that a number of accommodations have already been made since the building does not meet the DADU ordinance in terms of being similar to the historic building. Commissioner Mosley was concerned that a more permanent foundation would not be appropriate for this utilitarian design and he agreed with Commissioner Stewart's comments.

Commissioner Stewart explained that the battens are there to make a material that is expressly not allowed by the design guidelines look more like a traditional material.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the detached accessory dwelling unit with the conditions that:

- 1. The windows be replaced with windows that meet MHZC standards for materials and configuration;**
 - 2. Battens be installed over the scoring of the cladding; and,**
 - 3. The applicant provide drawings showing the design of the new covered deck**
- finding, that with these conditions the detached accessory dwelling unit meets Ordinance 17.16.030. G. and Section III.B.2.h. of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

I. 119 THIRD AVE S

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

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 119 3rd Avenue South, which is the home of the Johnny Cash & Patsy Cline Museums. In December 2017, the Commission voted to disapprove the multiple signs installed without permission on the 3rd Avenue South and the rear facades, and requested that the applicant return to the Commission at the February 2018 MHZC public hearing with a plan for bringing the signage on both facades into compliance with the design guidelines. The applicant has submitted information for bringing the signage size allotment into compliance for the 3rd Avenue façade, but not for the rear façade.

At the November 2017 MHZC meeting, the Commission also voted to disapprove a roll-down security door on the 3rd Avenue South façade. The owners were given until January 30, 2018 to remove the security door. As of two hours ago when I drove by the building, the roll-down security gate has not been removed.

I will first go through the signage plan for the 3rd Avenue South façade. On this façade, the painted "119" sign is an address sign and not reviewed. The "Café" sign is behind the storefront glass, and is therefore not reviewed by MHZC.

The applicant intends to retain the Johnny Cash projecting sign and the painted sign on the side sliver of the façade. The projecting sign was approved by MHZC, and its retention is appropriate. The painted sign on the side was installed without a preservation permit. 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 finds that retaining this sign is appropriate.

The applicant intends to remove the Patsy Cline shingle sign and the Patsy Cline vinyl wall sign. Staff finds that these signs do not meet the design guidelines, and therefore their removal is appropriate.

The applicant is proposing a second projecting sign for the Patsy Cline Museum. The projecting sign meets the design guidelines for size and location. However, its illumination is not appropriate. The sign has exposed bulbs, which is explicitly not permitted in the design guidelines. In addition, the bulbs are proposed to be on a one second flasher. The design guidelines allow for blinking or flashing lights only on Broadway, and not on the other streets in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Because of the illumination, staff finds that the proposed new sign does not meet the design guidelines.

The applicant proposes to paint over the painted sign at the top of the building in black paint. Although the Commission would not typically permit the painting of brick in this location, staff finds that removing the existing sign by painting it with black paint is appropriate in this instance because this part of the building was painted black prior to the establishment of the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

The applicant proposes to install an illuminated wall sign to replace the painted letters. Although the sign references the building's address rather than the building's establishments, staff finds that MHZC must still review it and that its square footage would count towards the overall allotment. It is not located where a typical address number would be, and in addition, there is already a painted address number near the entryway which is not counted towards the overall allotment. Lastly, address numbers are not typically this large and are not typically illuminated.

The proposed sign is two feet (2') tall and seven feet, two and five-eighths inches (7'-2 5/8") wide, or approximately fourteen square feet (14 sq. ft.). The numbers will be illuminated with a reverse channel letters to give a halo glow to them. The design guidelines state that "A wall sign shall be located lower than the window sills of the top floor for multi-story buildings." In this case, the wall sign is above the window sills of the top floor. Staff finds the location to be appropriate, in this instance, because there was signage in this location prior to establishment of the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay and because the signage references the building address, not its establishment. Staff finds that the proposed wall sign meets the design guidelines.

The proposed signage would be less than the 158 sq. ft. allotted in the design guidelines.

The applicant did not submit any information regarding a plan to bring the signage on the rear façade into compliance with the design guidelines. The vinyl Patsy Cline museum was installed without a preservation permit. The sign appears to be vinyl, which is not an appropriate material for signage. In addition, the sign's placement above the top floor's window sills does not meet the design guidelines.

For this building, the design guidelines allow for seventy-nine square feet (79 sq. ft.) of signage on the rear, non-street facing side. The images of Johnny Cash are considered to be murals and are not counted towards the overall signage allotment. The "Johnny Cash Museum" painted sign is thirty feet by two feet, six inches (30' X 2'6"), or seventy-five square feet (75 sq. ft.). The current painted signage leaves only four square feet (4 sq. ft.) of signage allotment remaining for this facade. The dimensions of the rear Cline sign were not provided, but it is clear that it is more than four square feet (4 sq. ft.) and so its size does not meet the design guidelines for signage.

Because the applicant has not indicated any inclination to bring the signage on the rear into compliance with the design guidelines, staff finds that the proposed signage plan for 119 3rd Avenue South does not meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed signage, finding that new projecting sign's illumination and the building's overall signage square footage do not meet Section IV. of the design guidelines. Staff recommends that the applicant return to the Commission at its March 21, 2018 public hearing with a proposal to bring the signage on the rear of the structure into compliance with the design guidelines.

Staff further recommends that the applicant immediately removed the security door on the 3rd Avenue South façade, as previously required by MHZC.

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, noted that Councilman O'Connell sent written comment stating that the "119" not be approved.

Vice-chairman Bell asked about the painting of the brick.

Kelly Frey, attorney for the property owner, separated the project into 3 parts. They are not contesting the rollup door and will remedy the violation. He asked for approval of the Cline sign and painted sign as presented. He disagreed with Staff on what the Councilmember said. He claimed that the salvage sign was historic signage. They would like to keep the signage painted as-is. He said they would remove the vinyl signs on the front and back but not until they have approval of another project. It would be putting jobs at risk.

Brian Taylor, representing the applicant, said that the purpose of the Commission is to preserve character. Signage is important. The "119" proposal was to make a point that it the proposal is not visually pleasing. The owner will remove all vinyl signs. He wants to keep the rollup door as an issue but they want to fix it. He asks that they grandfather the existing sign because it was there. There is a modification in the design guidelines for exception design and this is exception compared to what was there before. It is the most profitable of any business in the city or in the state.

Commissioner Mayhall asked if the reason for taking off the top sign was so that they can put up Cline sign up.

Baldock explained that the painted Cash sign was not analyzed because it was not included in their application as something they wanted to keep but it was discussed and disapproved in December.

Kayla Joslin, Joslin Signs, said that the bare bulbs have been disapproved but were approved for the Cash sign. She stated that she agreed with Commissioner Mayhall about flashing signs. It is not fair that the design guidelines will not be approved as it will be on the May agenda.

Mr. Taylor returned to restate what Mr. Frey said that the Councilman wants what they are proposing today.

Commissioner Stewart said the painted sign for the salvage company was different because there was no projecting sign at that time. He said that they hear that there is not enough signage but he is sure that a tourist wouldn't say that more is needed. They don't want to open it to unlimited signage and he proposed that the top painted sign be painted to match the brick, rather than the proposed black.

Ms. Zeigler explained that the Cash sign was permitted in error and so shouldn't be used as a reason to allow for signage that doesn't meet the design guidelines. She also explained that painting the sign out was an attempt to assist with a violation several years ago and so staff's direction was continuing the earlier direction.

Commissioner Mayhall said that all the signage makes the building look like one big sign.

Commissioner Mosley said that the red herring arguments don't hold water and they cannot parse it out. The project either meets the design guidelines or doesn't. He doesn't feel the need to find a solution for an issue that has been self-imposed. It is not unique or "exceptional" and the bottom line is the project doesn't meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the proposed signage, finding that new projecting sign's illumination and the building's overall signage square footage do not meet Section IV. of the design guidelines and that the applicant immediately remove the security door on the 3rd Avenue South façade, as previously required by MHZC. Commissioner Brown seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Boyd in opposition.

VIII. MHZC ACTIONS

m. 934 MCFERRIN AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Project deferred at the request of the applicant.

n. 1514 CLAYTON AVE

Application: New construction-infill; Demolition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for demolition and new construction at 1514 Clayton Avenue.

Prior to the meeting, you received an email with additional comments and exhibits from the applicant. This is a request to demolish a non-contributing house and to construct two-story infill. The existing house was built in the 1950s and does not contribute to the character of the Belmont-Hillsboro NZCO. Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition.

At 50' wide, the site is the narrowest lot on Clayton Ave between Belmont Blvd and Granny White Pike. The site is served by an existing front parking pad; the applicant wants to reduce the size of the parking pad and use it for the infill. Historic homes on this block face of Clayton Ave are either accessed via the improved rear alley or driveways that extend to the middle of the house or beyond. While there are some existing front yard parking pads, these appear to be in addition to a driveway or alley access. In the past, the Commission has not allowed front yard parking as it typically does not match the historic context. Staff finds that the proposed front yard parking pad is inappropriate since there is an improved alley available to the site and recommends that the site either be accessed via the improved alley or a driveway that extends to the rear of the infill. The plan meets all required base zoning setbacks, and the front setback will be similar to the front setbacks of the two adjacent historic homes.

The proposed infill has a two-story form, which does not meet the immediate historic context. While there are two-story houses on nearby streets, the block of Clayton Avenue between Belmont Boulevard and Granny White Pike/12th Avenue South, where this site is located, has a strong historic context of one and one-and-a-half stories historic homes. The two-story houses on this block are not historic. The proposed height is approximately 28' tall from grade. The height of historic homes on this block of Clayton Avenue range from 19' – 28' in height. While staff finds that the overall ridge height could meet the historic context, the two-story massing with a 20'3" tall eave height does not meet the historic context and the design guidelines.

The width of the house is approximately 34' in the front, with a maximum width of 37'8". While this width might be appropriate for a one-and-a-half story house, staff finds it is not appropriate for a two-story structure. Most lots on this block of Clayton Avenue are 60' wide with a collection of 54' wide lots. The width of houses on the 54' wide lots range from 36'-42'. While staff finds that the proposed building width could meet the historic context, the two-story form does not meet the historic context and the design guidelines.

The cladding materials include brick and fiber cement board siding. Not all of the windows on the side elevations of the infill meet the design guidelines. A number of windows are not twice as tall as they are wide, and therefore do not meet the historic proportion of windows. Also, there are expanses of wall that do not include a window but should in order to meet the design guidelines. Paired windows should have 4" – 6" mullions between them. Also, there is a window that is situated too low on the wall to meet the historic rhythm of openings.

The primary roof form is hipped with a 4/12 pitch. The design guidelines state that an infill's roof slope should match those roof slopes of the immediate context and should be between 6/12 and 12/12. While the design guidelines also state that two-story homes should generally have a hipped roof, staff finds that a two-story form is inappropriate for the immediate historic context at this location. Therefore, staff finds that the low-sloped 4/12 pitch for the hipped roof does not match the historic roof forms of the immediate context and therefore does not meet the design guidelines.

Here are some context photos. On the top from left to right: 1516 Clayton Ave (contributing), 1514 Clayton Ave (the site of the proposed infill), 1512 Clayton Ave (contributing); On the bottom: 1513 Clayton Ave – contributing, across the street. On this side from top to bottom: 1407 Clayton Ave (contributing), 1405 Clayton Ave (contributing)

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the existing house, finding that its demolition meets Section V.2 for appropriate demolition and does not meet section V.1 for inappropriate demolition.

Staff recommends disapproval of the new construction, finding that the proposed infill does not meet Sections II.B.1.a. (Height), II.B.1.b. (Scale), II.B.1.f. (Orientation), II.B.1.e. (Roof Form), and II.B.1.g. (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings) of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

William Smallman, applicant, said he felt like he followed the design guidelines well but Staff told him that the Commission is using the immediate context for but the word “immediate” is not in the design guidelines. The guidelines say “surrounding context.” He provided examples of other projects that have been approved that he feels are similar to his proposal. He does not have issues with the windows or the addition of a walkway. He went through as many staff reports as he could find and he found 9 houses and every one that was approved were taller than what he has proposed. He would like a non-arbitrary decision.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the window heads on the front which is only 4” and may be too thin to meet structural requirements. Mr. Smallman said that it is a frieze board but he is open to changing. He is open to making changes with the exception of the two-story form.

Lindsey Moffatt, is chair of the neighborhood association’s zoning committee. She asked that the Commissioner support the staff report. She said that in the past, the neighborhood has asked for the context to be tightened. The house he referred to was in 2011 and was one of the homes that resulted in the neighborhood asking for a tighter context to be used. They also object to a parking pad in the front yard.

Lance Thomas, 1518 Ferguson, spoke in opposition to the project as it doesn’t meet the design guidelines.

Councilmember Allen, said that the proposal is a lovely design that would fit well on Belmont Boulevard but not here. One of her first discussions when becoming a councilmember was to talk to staff about the area used for context. They asked that context be defined to “surrounding” buildings. She said the Commission and staff had been considering that surrounding context in the last few years and they are thankful for that. A two-story house in a 1-story area has the potential to make a big impact.

Mr. Smallman said that he worked hard to follow the design guidelines. He cannot participate in closed-door meetings.

It is up to the Commission to interpret the word “surrounding” and the word “immediate” does not have to be included in the design guidelines, as suggested by the applicant.

Vice-chairman Bell explained that they have taken a tighter view on the context over the years. If a two-story building doesn’t lend itself to the contributing environment, that is when they have that consideration and they have gotten clearer on that. Commissioner Jones said she appreciated the applicant’s research but that the nature of a commission is that they have the ability to interpret and have no control over what the commission might have approved years ago. As she looks at the adjacent buildings they are small one and one and one-half story buildings therefore two-stories is not appropriate.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the demolition of the existing house, finding that its demolition meets Section V.2 for appropriate demolition and does not meet section V.1 for inappropriate demolition and to disapprove the new construction, finding that the proposed infill does not meet Sections II.B.1.a. (Height), II.B.1.b. (Scale), II.B.1.f. (Orientation), II.B.1.e. (Roof Form), and II.B.1.g. (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings) of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

o. 2008 CEDAR LANE

Application: New construction-infill; setback determination

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Jenny Warren

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the case for 2008 Cedar Lane. The house at 2008 Cedar Lane is a non-contributing structure that sits on a dead-end street in the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. A staff permit has been issued for its demolition, though this permit has expired.

The house originally sat on a 112ft wide lot, one of the largest on the block, but the owner subdivided the lot in 2011. There are now two lots, the one seen here in yellow is 50ft wide and the subject lot, in pink, is 62ft wide. These are the narrowest lots on the block. The carport on the side of the existing house extends over the new property line. As you can see, the subject lot is also exceptionally deep, at 392ft. It is one of five such lots on the block.

This block of Cedar Lane contains one-and-a-half story houses on wide lots with significant side yards and generous front setbacks. There are two newer non-contributing structures in the immediate vicinity – one is an apartment building at the end of the street, and the other is just east of the subject lot. These two newer structures are not used to establish historic context.

The applicant is proposing a new single family residence and an outbuilding. The total footprint of the dwelling plus the outbuilding will be about 3,667sq ft. Staff has concerns about the overall massing of the house. The combined height, width and depth create a house that is too large for the historic context, particularly given the narrow lot.

First, let's look at the height. The proposed design is one-and-a-half stories tall, which is appropriate for the context. The proposed eave heights are about 12-13ft, depending on grade. The ridge height is about 30' 10" from finished floor height at the front door. The tallest historic house on the block is 31ft tall and is a bit of an outlier with all of the other historic examples ranging from 21-29 feet tall. The 31ft tall house is two doors down from the subject property. Between that house and the end of the block there are two newer non-contributing structures that are 32ft high, one smaller historic home and these two buildable lots. Staff is concerned that this could become a pocket of newer houses that are all taller than the historic context. The impact of the additional height would be further exacerbated by the slope of the topography, with these taller houses sitting at a higher grade than the shorter houses across the street. Staff finds that building a new house as tall as the tallest historic house is not appropriate in this case, given the overall proposed massing.

In terms of width, the proposed infill will be 42ft wide. All of the historic houses on the block are wider and range from 47-75ft wide. However, upon evaluation, Staff realized that nearly all of the other lots with historic houses are 100ft wide and the average width of historic houses is about 57.5ft. The historic houses occupy about 60% of the lot width – allowing for wide side yards and a distinctive streetscape and rhythm of spacing. If the current 62ft wide lot followed this pattern, the house would be about 37.5ft wide. There is no magic number or percentage, however, given the typical wide yard-to-house ratio seen on this block, Staff finds that the proposed width is inappropriate and does not proportionally match the historic context for rhythm of spacing.

The proposed depth of the house is considerable. It is 95ft 4in, including the covered rear patio, but not the proposed garage. The average depth of historic houses on the block is 55ft. Staff finds that given the depth of the lot, the proposed house depth could be appropriate, but only if the width and height at the street are well within the historic context. Given that the proposed width and height both push the limits in terms of historic context, and that exceptional depth is proposed, Staff finds that the proposal does not meet Sections II.B.1a and b of the design guidelines for height and scale.

And I just wanted to show you the final elevation – here is the rear elevation. A few final notes on the house: the proposed setbacks of the house are all appropriate, with the front being set back approximately 90ft from the street, lining up with the houses on either side. The known materials include fiberboard lap siding, an architectural shingle roof, and wood windows. Staff finds that the known materials are appropriate.

Now moving on to the outbuilding: the height, square footage, design, roof, dormer and materials all meet the guidelines. The only exception is that the Commission typically requires two separate garage doors for a street-facing 2-bay garage. There are two setback issues with the garage: The first has already been resolved. But just quickly, the garage is 749sq ft and sits just over 3ft from the side property line. Outbuildings above 700sq ft must sit at least 5ft from the side property line. The applicant has already agreed to shrink the footprint of the outbuilding to less than 700sq ft so that it may sit 3ft 1in from the side property line without a setback determination. Second, the guidelines require a 20ft separation between the house and an outbuilding. The applicant is proposing a 9ft separation, with a covered breezeway connector, as indicated by the red line. The Commission has allowed outbuildings to sit closer than 20ft when there are site constraints, but in this case, with a lot depth of nearly 400ft, there is no such constraint. Last spring, the applicant was advised by Staff to place the outbuilding in roughly the same location as historic outbuildings on the block, which this proposal does. This is the ideal location, however the outbuilding should still be 20ft from the house. The non-conforming condition is being created by the depth of the house and relative narrow width of the lot. In this instance, the house should be less deep, or the outbuilding should be moved further back into the lot.

In conclusion, Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed infill and outbuilding, finding that the primary dwelling does not meet Sections II.B.a, b, and c for height, scale and rhythm of spacing and that the outbuilding does not meet Section II.B.i.2 for appropriate location and setbacks and Section 17.16.30.G.4 of the ordinance.

William Smallman, applicant, handed out a packet of information. He said that he didn't want to move the garage because he doesn't want lose the line of sight to see his children in the rear yard and he claimed he was given direction by staff to place the garage where he did. He is worried that an empty lot is being used as precedent but there may not be anything on that lot. As long as he lives there, he may not build anything on that lot. He provided research and calculations to make the argument that the proposal is appropriate.

Lindsey Moffatt, chair of the neighborhood association's zoning committee, said that the overlay was passed with more than 70% in support. There are many new neighbors that may not recognize the value of the overlay. It is a desirable neighborhood because of the preservation of its historic character. Neighbors did not know that this was happening and so were not able to attend. She read comments from the Foxmans.

Councilmember Allen stated that the neighbors have not had an opportunity to discuss the project and she thinks that continued work with the neighbors could alleviate some concern.

Mr. Smallman said he does not want to defer but would prefer a vote today and work with neighbors on changes. He feels the recommendation is arbitrary.

Commissioner Mosley said that the project passes the sniff test on the surface and he struggles with the miniscule adjustments that have been proposed. He doesn't feel that it contrasts greatly.

Commissioner Jones agreed that an empty lot should not be used for disapproval but the fact that the lot was subdivided to be two narrow lots. If this lot is filled up with house and the adjoining lot is too then you have a condition that is not compatible. The depth of the proposal is too large for the neighborhood and adjacent properties.

Commissioner Mosley said he is struggling with reasons to nitpick it since it does not contrast greatly. Commissioner Nielson said that there isn't a reason to require the 20' separation between the outbuilding and primary building.

Commissioner Stewart said that the house will contribute nicely to the neighborhood and he doesn't see a reason to not have the garage meet the 20' separation requirement.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve with the conditions that the outbuilding be in compliance with the design guidelines in terms of the 20' separation and staff approve location of HVAC, materials, and roof color. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a break at 4:22pm and returned at 4:33pm. Commissioner Mayhall left the meeting during the break.

p. 1104 ORDWAY PLACE

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

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

q. 1507 FATHERLAND ST

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

Staff member Sean Alexander, presented the case for 1507 Fatherland Street., an application to construct an addition to a one story historic house. The addition will include a two story component. The addition will be at the rear matching the width of the existing building, with an alcove on the left to give it physical separation between the old and new.

The addition will have a front-gabled roof form, matching the form and pitch of the original roof. The new ridge will be parallel to the existing but offset by 4', which puts a large section of wall space outside the silhouette or shadow line of the historic house. The design guidelines say that when it is necessary for an addition to be taller, it may be up to 4' beyond the shadow line of the house, with a roof that is hipped or clipped to reduce visibility.

Staff finds that the lot is typical (nothing preventing a more appropriately scaled addition). Also the proposed addition would not have a clipped gable and it would extend more than 4' beyond the shadow line of the house. Also, the depth of the addition would extend to approximately 10 from an existing outbuilding. The guidelines require there to be 20' between a principal building and outbuilding.

The materials and window pattern of the proposed addition would be compatible with those of the existing building.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed two story addition to the historic house at 1507 Fatherland Street, finding that the scale of the addition is not compatible and that it does not meet the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Allison Thies, property owner explained the reasons for the proposal. Craig Kennedy, architect for the project, said he was looking for design guideline clarification. The property is unique in that it is front-facing gable. They are willing to make adjustments to the design. He believes the addition is necessary and subordinate. He showed other projects he thought were appropriate. Adding a clipped gable would not be appropriate for the style of home.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley said the addition was akin to a "camel-back" addition and there may not be enough house to accommodate the proposal. The proposal is a good approach but are there other solutions, such as bringing more of the addition forward. Mr. Alexander said that the camel-back is typical in other cities but not here and he doesn't think that the Commission has approved such in the past.

Chairman Tibbs said there may be too much addition for the house but applauded all the effort that went into it. Commissioner Stewart agreed that there is more change than the house and lot can take and that it will be highly visible from the street. A one-story proposal would take away most of the objections to it.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the proposed two story addition to the historic house at 1507 Fatherland Street, finding that the scale of the addition is not compatible and that it does not meet the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 816 SHELBY AVE

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 816 Shelby Avenue, a new infill and detached outbuilding. The outbuilding may be used as a DADU.

The principal building will be a two story house, 33' tall including a 2'-3' foundation as the grade falls to the right on the lot. Surrounding historic houses are between 21' and 36' tall. The house will be 36' wide with a small round bay projecting 3' on the left side toward the rear. The surrounding context is 28'-38' wide. Staff finds the height and width of the proposed house to be appropriate.

The new house will have an 8' deep full-width front porch. Above the porch, there will be a semi-circular bay projecting 3' from the center of the second story façade. Staff finds the scale of this bay to be greater than that of similar features on historic buildings.

The setbacks of the proposed building, as well as the roof shape, window pattern, and materials will be compatible with the surrounding context. Staff asks that roof color and window selections shall be approved prior to construction.

There will also be a two-story outbuilding at the rear of the lot. The location, scale, and materials of the outbuilding are compatible with surrounding outbuildings.

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

1. The finished floor level is consistent with nearby historic buildings, to be verified by Staff during construction; and
2. The depth of the round projecting bay shall be reduced to two feet (2'); and
3. 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
4. A paved walkway shall be added connecting the front porch and the sidewalk; and
5. 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
6. 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 DADU outbuilding will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Mosley made the point that the further the bay goes back on the house it could change the way the building meets the roof line.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, said they agreed with all the conditions with the exception of the second-level bay. They added it to a full-width porch so it is less like a heavy projection. To narrow it down to 2' means that they lose two windows and the effect of it is lost. The bay is what gives the otherwise common four-square form some character.

Steve Burt, property owner, reiterated that he would like to keep the bay and agrees to all other conditions. He held up pictures of bays and turrets in the neighborhood.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley noted that some buildings in the neighborhood are grander than the immediate context for this neighborhood. The bay will be unique but is not inappropriate. When segmenting a circle there is a certain width to the windows and if there are not enough segments there are not enough windows to show the circle. He does not want to tinker with the proportions

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor level is consistent with nearby historic buildings, to be verified by Staff during construction;**
- 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;**
- 3. A paved walkway shall be added connecting the front porch and the sidewalk;**
- 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;**

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

s. 1411 FORREST AVE

Application: Demolition; New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Sean Alexander

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 1411 Forrest, an application to demolish a non-contributing house and construct a new one and one-half story house.

The new house will be 30' wide and 27'-6" tall. The floor height will be approximately 3', with a 2'-4" exposed foundation and an 8" thick porch floor. Staff finds the height and scale to be appropriate, and that the setbacks of the building will be compatible with the surrounding historic houses.

The roof form, window pattern will be compatible with surrounding historic houses. The materials will include cement-fiber siding, asphalt shingle roof, and a split-faced block foundation. Staff would ask to approve specific material selections prior to construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application to demolish the existing house and construct a new house, with the following conditions:

- 1. The exterior materials shall be administratively approved prior to receiving a Preservation Permit; and**
- 2. The HVAC location, paving, and other appurtenances are administratively approved prior to receiving a Preservation Permit.**

With those conditions met, Staff finds that the project will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Lockeland Springs East-End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Joseph Spicer, applicant, was available for questions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson to approve the application to demolish the existing house and construct a new house, with the following conditions:

- 1. The exterior materials shall be administratively approved prior to receiving a Preservation Permit; and**
- 2. The HVAC location, paving, and other appurtenances are administratively approved prior to receiving a Preservation Permit;**

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

t. 913 GILMORE AVE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 913 Gilmore. 913 Gilmore is an application for infill on this currently vacant lot. Staff approved demolition of the noncontributing building on the site in September 2017.

The proposed new residence will meet base setback requirements, it is centered on the lot with side setbacks of 6 feet, and 54 feet from the rear. The front setback will be in line with the adjacent homes. Staff recommends including a front walkway to the street, to meet the guidelines for orientation

The structure is one and a half stories, with two story sections viewed from the sides. The ridge height is 31 feet 6 inches from grade. Staff finds that this meets the historic context, where contributing houses are one and a half stories, with height from 19 to 33 feet. It will be 38 feet wide, which is also in the range of the context, where historic houses have widths from 26 to 40 feet.

The materials meet the design guidelines and have been approved previously, with the condition of staff approval of windows, doors, and a few other materials that were not listed. The proposed outbuilding meets the design guidelines and setback requirements.

Brian Schaffer, applicant, said he agreed with all conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the application 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 has final approval of the masonry, windows, doors and garage doors, trim, porch materials, walkways, driveway, and roof color;**
- 3. A front walkway is added from the porch to the street, to be indicated on a revised site plan; and**
- 4. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**

finding the application meets Section III for New Construction in the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Vice-chairman Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

u. 514 MONROE ST

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

514 Monroe Street is a vacant lot located within the National Register of Historic Places development zone. Application is to construct duplex infill and an outbuilding on a vacant lot. The front wall of the infill will line up with the front wall of the two story house next door at 518 Monroe, and will be just a few inches forward of the front wall of the house at 512 Monroe. The lot is 50' wide, and the house will be thirty-three feet (33') wide at the front. Staff finds that the width at the front meets the design guidelines. After a depth of approximately thirty-eight feet (38'), the house widens on both sides to be a total of thirty-seven feet (37') wide. Staff finds this to be appropriate because the extra width is pushed back significantly from the front of the house. The house will have a depth of approximately ninety-six feet (96'). Although deep, there are several nearby houses that are about as deep.

Although the infill will be a duplex, its front façade is designed to make it appear as a single family house. There will be one doorway behind a stoop facing Monroe Street. The proposed infill will be two stories with a maximum height of thirty-four feet, five inches (34'5") from grade. In the immediate vicinity there is a mixture of one and two-story structures, and the design guidelines allow for infill to be as tall as thirty-five feet (35') tall. The infill is primarily brick, and all of the known materials meet the design guidelines.

Staff does recommend that the gutter system not run down the front façade, and it visually dissects the structure into two parts. The front entrance is not the true entrance to the duplex units. The primary entrances to the two residential units will be on the side facades, approximately twenty-nine feet (29') back from the front façade. The entrances on the side will have the appearance of secondary or side entrances, even though they will be used as the primary entrances. Side yard patios on either side of the structure will bring residents to the side entrances.

While staff finds this to be appropriate, staff recommends that the roof covering over the side patio only cover the entrance, not the entire patio. This will help ensure that the perceived orientation of the house remains towards Monroe Street.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The roof overhangs/patio coverings on the side façade only cover the entrances to the residential units;
3. Staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
4. Staff approve a brick sample;
5. Staff approve a stone sample;
6. Staff approve the material and design of the front stoop railing;
7. Staff approve the material for the front stoop stairs and railing;
8. Staff approve the material of all walkways and driveways;
9. Staff approve the metal roof color, dimensions and texture;
10. Staff approve the roof shingle color, dimensions, and texture;
11. A walkway be added from the sidewalk to the front stoop;
12. Staff approve the location of the HVAC unit;
13. The middle gutter on the front façade be removed;
14. Staff approve the material and design of all fencings; and
15. Staff approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to, lighting, walkways, gutters, gates, etc.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed project meets Sections III. and IV. of the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Lucas Chestnut, applicant, said they evaluated the neighborhood to design their concept. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley noted that there was a home with a similar orientation approved previously.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the following conditions:

1. **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
2. **The roof overhangs/patio coverings on the side façade only cover the entrances to the residential units;**
3. **Staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
4. **Staff approve a brick sample;**
5. **Staff approve a stone sample;**
6. **Staff approve the material and design of the front stoop railing;**
7. **Staff approve the material for the front stoop stairs and railing;**
8. **Staff approve the material of all walkways and driveways;**

9. Staff approve the metal roof color, dimensions and texture;
 10. Staff approve the roof shingle color, dimensions, and texture;
 11. A walkway be added from the sidewalk to the front stoop;
 12. Staff approve the location of the HVAC unit;
 13. The middle gutter on the front façade be removed;
 14. Staff approve the material and design of all fences; and
 15. Staff approve all appurtenances, including, but not limited to, lighting, walkways, gutters, gates, etc.
- finding that with these conditions, staff finds that the proposed project meets Sections III. and IV. of the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

d. 2805 27TH AVE S

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for 2805 27th Ave S., a c. 1940s brick bungalow that contributes to the historic character of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. In July 2017, MHZC staff issued an administrative permit to demolish a side bay which extended over the property line. In November 2017, MHZC reviewed and approved a design for an addition with an attached garage on the site. This application represents a revision to that design. There is no alley access for the site.

The addition meets all base zoning setbacks. It will be inset appropriately. On the left elevation, after the inset, the addition extends eleven feet, six inches (11'6") wider than the historic house. The design guidelines allow for additions to be wider when the historic house is less than thirty feet (30') wide and shifted on the lot. In this case, the historic house is just twenty-eight feet (28') wide and is shifted on the lot so that it is five feet (5') from the right side property line and approximately eleven feet (11') from the left side property line. The wider part of the addition is no taller than the historic house and is pushed back over seventy feet (70') from the front wall of the house and twenty-four feet from the back corner of the house. Staff finds the wider portion to be appropriate and to meet the design guidelines. The addition's depth will be approximately forty-seven feet (47'). The addition will approximately double the footprint of the historic house, which staff finds to be appropriate.

The historic house is one story in height, and the addition will be one story above a basement level. The infill includes an attached garage where the addition is wider than the historic house. The design guidelines state that attached garages can be appropriate when they are located at the basement level and when they are located in areas where an outbuilding would have been historically. In this case, the garage is located at the basement level. Since this lot lacks an alley, historically an outbuilding would have had garage doors facing the street and would have been located to the side of the historic house. In fact, the existing outbuilding, which is to be demolished, is located in the approximate area as the proposed attached garage. From the street, the attached garage will have more of an appearance of a separate garage structure. Staff finds that the proposed attached garage meets the design guidelines.

The addition's foundation height will match that of the historic house. Where the addition ties into the historic house, its eave height matches that of the historic house and its ridge height is approximately one foot, six inches (1'6") lower than the historic house's ridge height. After a depth of eleven feet (11'), the eave height rises to be one foot, six inches (1'6") taller than the historic house. Staff finds this to be acceptable because it is over forty-eight feet (48') behind the front wall of the house. The maximum ridge height will match that of the historic house. The proposed materials match those of the historic house, and the known materials are appropriate, with staff's final approval of all final material choices.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
2. Staff approve a brick sample;

3. Staff approve a stone sample;
4. Staff approve the roof shingle color, material, and texture;
5. Staff approve the material and design of the rear deck railing; and
6. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section II.B. of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Manuel Zeitlin, applicant for the project, said they are back with changes in order to accommodate the concerns of a neighbor.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

1. **Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
 2. **Staff approve a brick sample;**
 3. **Staff approve a stone sample;**
 4. **Staff approve the roof shingle color, material, and texture; and**
 5. **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- finding with these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section II.B. of the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

e. 2519 BLAIR BLVD

Application: New construction-addition; Setback determination; Partial demolition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for 2519 Blair Blvd.

This is a request to construct a rear addition to 2519 Blair Blvd, which was built c. 1931 and contributes to the character of the H-WE neighborhood. The request also includes a side setback determination and alterations to the historic house that are considered partial demolition.

The proposed addition is located to the rear of the house and is inset appropriately. A right side setback determination has been requested for the right side to reduce the setback from 5' to 4'. Although the addition is no wider than the house, the right property line is at an angle. Staff finds that the right side setback determination is appropriate as the addition will be no closer to the property line than the existing house. The proposed addition adds approximately 1500 SF, which neither more than doubles the footprint or the depth of the existing house.

The addition is located at the rear and extends 2' taller than the historic house. Here is the right side façade. The additional height is located fort-five feet (45') from the front of the house, which meets the requirement that the additional height be located at least forty feet (40') behind the front wall. Staff finds the additional height to be appropriate since it is no more than two feet (2') and meets the distance requirement for additional height. Since the primary roof form is a side gable, a ridge raise would be possible at this location. The proposed design, however, provides an alternative to a ridge raise which not only maintains the existing ridge line of the historic house but is much less visible from the street.

The addition will complement the historic house, with windows that are compatible with the style, rhythm, and proportion of the existing windows while incorporating modern elements such as fiber cement panel siding and a flat

roof form with crickets at the rear of the addition. The addition will be distinguished from the original by stepping in from the side walls before continuing back and by the change in materials.

The request also includes alterations to the historic house that are considered partial demolition. There are three changes that are proposed. The first is to replace the existing center metal column on the front façade with a new column to match the other two existing porch posts. Staff finds that this is appropriate as metal porch posts were not typically used during this period of construction and is likely not original to the house.

The house currently includes two dwelling units with one unit accessed via exterior stairs to a second-level door. The applicant proposes to remove the existing exterior stairs and second level door on the left side façade. According to the 1931 Sanborn map, this house was not originally a duplex, so the exterior stairs and second level door are not original to the house. Therefore, staff finds removing these elements to be appropriate.

The applicant proposes to relocate the second unit entrance to a proposed side door on the right side façade. To accommodate the proposed side door, the applicant proposes to convert an existing window opening to a door and to install a new metal overhang and walkway to access the entrance. Staff finds that changing the window opening to a door on the right side façade could be appropriate since the location and width of the proposed door opening are similar to that of the existing window. The Commission has permitted roof overhangs that do not include posts to the ground since this type of alteration is removable. Furthermore, a setback determination is not needed for the side stairs or the roof overhang as the Zoning Code permits these setback obstructions.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the proposed addition, setback determination, and partial demolition at 2519 Blair Boulevard with the following conditions:

1. Staff approve the final details, dimensions, and materials of the windows, doors, masonry, walkway material, roof color, trim, front porch post, porch floors, porch steps, and porch railings prior to purchase and installation; and
2. The HVAC be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house if relocated or added.

Manuel Zeitlin, applicant for the project, stated that he agreed with all conditions. They are returning with a new proposal so that they can meet concerns of the neighborhood. They are no longer asking for a reduction on side setback or adding the rear porch. They are also reducing the massing of the rear addition.

Councilmember Allen thanked the applicant for the efforts he has gone to address neighborhood concerns.

Anne Zuberer, 2521 Blair Blvd, asked for a disapproval of the current plan. It is a 1.5 story home with an apartment upstairs and the proposal is to turn the house into a large duplex and there is nothing in that scale in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Mosley expressed concern over the size of the addition and agreed with the applicant's desire to lower the square footage of the addition.

Commissioner Jones said the addition is too large for the historic home.

Commissioner Boyd and Brown said they agreed with the staff report.

Commissioner Stewart said the design is appropriate for the context. It could be better if it is smaller; however, it is hard to know without seeing the design. Commissioner Mosley feels that it contrasts significantly with the context, which would be a reason for disapproval.

The applicant requested to defer.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Zeigler reminded everyone that the deadline for the Preservation Awards is March 9th.

X. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES

ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

The meeting adjourned at 6:10pm.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON MARCH 21, 2018.