

JOHN COOPER
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC)

MINUTES
April 21, 2021

Commissioners Present: Chair Bell, Leigh Fitts, Mina Johnson, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart, David Price, Dr. Williams

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

Applicants: Chris Strickland, Brandon Williams, Jason Hitchcock, Cheyenne Smith, Ryan Terrell, Gerry Knab, Patrick Lowry, David Brawner, Brad Sayers, BJ Bush, Van Pond, Michael Noble, Julia Grissett, James Maciuk, Martin Wieck, Aaron Armstrong, Jeff Estep, Drew Sloss, James Dunn, Bernard Chang, Vincent Bruce, Kent McLaughlin, Kenny Winchell

Councilmembers: Brett Withers, Tom Cash

Public: Carol Ashworth, Kerry Conley

Chair Bell called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. All were in attendance at the beginning of the meeting, with the exception of Vice-chair Stewart who joined at a later time.

Motion: Commissioner Mayhall moved that the meeting agenda constitutes essential business of this body and meeting electronically is necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of Tennesseans considering the COVID-19 outbreak. Commissioner Jones seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

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

Chair Bell asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda. Ms. Zeigler said that the applicants for 1716 Greenwood, 1017 N 16th and 313 Broadway are asking to defer.

Motion: Commissioner Price moved to revise the agenda by deferring 1716 Greenwood, 1017 N 16th and 313 Broadway. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

I. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

a. March 17, 2021

Motion: Commissioner Williams moved to ratify the minutes for March 17, 2021. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Bell read information regarding the consent agenda and staff member Melissa Sajid read the consent agenda.

b. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

c. 1033 CHICAMAUGA AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021019248

d. 1405 JAKES AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 07
Overlay: Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020061

e. 1907 SHELBY AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020069

f. 2004 NATCHEZ TRCE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020209

g. 2207 18TH AVE S

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020221 and T2021020223

h. 1918 ASHWOOD AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding/DADU; Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020238 and T2021020314

i. 1406 5TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding; Partial Demolition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020248 and T2021020255

j. 1901 SWEETBRIAR AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding/DADU; Partial Demolition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020269 and T2021020280

k. 3709 CENTRAL AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander Sean.Alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020649

l. 1206 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander
PermitID#: T2021020654

m. 104 CRAIGHEAD AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition (Revision to previously approved)
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2020063057

Motion:

Commissioner Fitts moved to approve all consent items with their applicable conditions. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

n. CONSOLIDATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION ZONING OVERLAY

Ms. Zeigler began the presentation. The Historic Zoning Commission received funding from the Tennessee Historical Commission for this project which began in January 2019. The grant period ended on September 30, 2019. Multiple stakeholder meetings, community meetings and 6 public hearings have been held with the intent of

voting on the final product in March 2020, but that meeting was cancelled due to COVID. We deferred the case each month but did not receive additional public comment until the last two months.

In addition to meetings, staff created an email list of every email available in Metro's permitting software program for the last two years that was linked to a preservation permit and collected emails from public comments sent via email on other projects in recent years. This list was used to inform about community meetings, encourage people to take part in the online discussion board, and to let interested parties know when revisions were available on the website. Meetings were also promoted via social media. Offers were made to all relevant neighborhood associations for staff to attend a meeting they scheduled specifically for this topic or to attend a regularly scheduled meeting. A community meeting, the September 2019 public hearing, and this March 2021 public hearings all received mailed notices.

A Nashville.gov webpage dedicated to the project, which included a description of the project, links to the online discussion board, design guideline drafts, meeting notes, videos and links to additional resources has been available for approximately two and one-half years. A direct link to this page is available on the zoning commission's home page. An online discussion board ran from February to September 2019.

Metro Nashville has 22 neighborhood conservation zoning overlays, all with their own individual set of design guidelines that are largely similar. While having a set of design guidelines for each district worked fine when there were just a handful of conservation overlays, today, 22 separate documents of design guidelines is cumbersome. The idea is to consolidate the various design guideline documents into one document, while still preserving the important differences between the neighborhoods.

Unlike the adoption of the conservation overlays, which change zoning, the guidelines are not reviewed by Planning and Council, because they do not change zoning. Instead, the document is adopted by the Historic Zoning Commission only. The original document and all revisions must meet the Secretary of Interior Standards developed by the National Park Service.

This project is only for some neighborhood conservation zoning overlays and does not affect other types of historic zoning overlays. Neighborhood conservation zoning overlays not included as part of this revision, are Belmont-Hillsboro, Hillsboro-West End and Richland-West End. Initially the Elmington neighborhood said that they did not want to be included but would now like to be included but since they did not receive the notice, we proposing holding a public hearing for that neighborhood to join the consolidation at the May meeting, if it is adopted in April. No new overlays are a part of this proposal. No boundary changes are proposed. If you do not live or own in an existing conservation overlay currently, then this will not apply for you.

There are multiple goals for this project. One goal is to provide clearer direction for property owners and applicants. All the guidelines are almost the same as a set created decades ago. A lot has changed over the years in terms of how the Commission interprets the design guidelines and we think it will be useful to reflect those changes in the language of the design guidelines. Along those same lines, in the current guidelines, some sections are primarily italicized language and need to be updated. Italicized language is information added to the guidelines without a formal process to explain how the Commission has interpreted an existing design guideline. The goal is to make most of the italicized language formally part of the guidelines in this process.

Another goal is to address actions not contemplated when the guidelines were originally written.

We also think this project will make the process easier for applicants, particularly those repeat applicants who work in multiple neighborhoods, to better understand what guidelines are universal to all conservation overlays, and what, if any, differences there are for an individual neighborhood.

We propose to change the title of the consolidated design guidelines to clarify that it is for turn-of-the-century neighborhoods, roughly 1890s to 1950. These are the Nashville neighborhoods where Queen-Anne, Folk Victorian, Craftsman bungalows, Tudors, and minimal traditional houses are common. Last month you approved a new set of design guidelines that address the different styles, forms, and development patterns of mid-century neighborhoods.

The draft guidelines are divided into two parts. Part I is most of the guidelines and includes guidance that applies to all the districts. Part II includes a chapter for every individual district with any guidelines that may be specific to that district.

Staff member Melissa Sajid continued the presentation. The guidelines are reorganized, and some information is repeated in each section, so the user doesn't have to flip back and forth. It's this repetition that makes the draft guidelines look longer than the original guidelines.

New terms are added, and some terms are revised in the glossary section. This section will remain as italicized information which means that the terms are not actual guidelines.

The guidance for materials is now its own section and has been revised to provide a longer list of appropriate and inappropriate materials. Most of it remains italicized text—which means it can be updated without a formal review process. That is so the Commission can easily address whatever new materials might become available in the future.

Speaking of materials, there is language that increases the allowable maximum reveal for lap siding. By “reveal” we mean that portion of lap siding that is exposed once the pieces are lapped. The current practice, which has been in place for several decades, is for all lap siding to have a reveal with a maximum of five inches (5”). There is no record as to how the requirement was initially determined but it may have been considered an average or a typical reveal. Since historic siding comes in a variety of reveals, Staff recommends increasing the maximum to seven inches (7”), as that is a size that is readily available and still within the range of historic reveals. The draft also provides an explanation as to when even wider reveals might be appropriate.

The section for demolition was moved to the beginning of the document to emphasize that the review of demolition is the most important role of the Commission. The demolition section is fleshed out to reflect how the Commission has applied this section since the beginning of the overlays, specifically partial-demo and non-contributing buildings. The additional language follows the Commission's interpretation of this section since the guidelines were first created. For instance, demolition of non-contributing – or non-historic – buildings have always met the guidelines, but that guidance currently isn't clear.

In addition, there is language that would count removal of historic siding as partial demolition that required review. Currently replacement siding, windows, doors, and roofing are not reviewed. When all those materials are removed and the interior is completely gutted, the historic building is all but demolished. Siding, of all those materials that are not currently reviewed, was chosen to be reviewed in this draft since it is a character defining feature and provides some structural stability, which is lost when all other materials are removed. There was discussion previously about not including this review; however, the neighborhood that was the most concerned about it is no longer a part of the project. The public and commissioners have spoken for and against this change, so for those reasons it remains in this current draft.

State and local law requires that our design guidelines be based on the National Park Service's Secretary of Interior Standards. Those have changed slightly since our guidelines were created so that revision is included. We also added some language to explain the role of the Standards in the design review process.

Staff member Melissa Baldock continued the presentation. The drawing shown here is currently in all the neighborhood conservation zoning design guidelines and has been a source of confusion. It is often read as showing the only place where an addition can be constructed, which is not the case. Instead it is meant to show that if an addition is small enough to fit into that triangular area, then the addition would not need to be reviewed.

A related concern is that the text portion of the design guidelines, which attempts to state what is reviewed, is confusing in that one section states that the design guidelines only apply to areas that are visible from the public right-of-way and the next section states that public facades are more carefully reviewed than others. Since the establishment of the first overlay, the Commission has interpreted these sections-- and the drawing-- as a review of all sides of any new construction but applying a less stringent review of those facades that are not publicly visible.

The proposed solution is to remove the image, revise the text and add a list of actions that would not require review.

In terms of additions, guidance for solar panels and skylights has been added, again following how the Commission has looked at these two features in the past.

There is new language to stress that additions that are taller or wider are only appropriate if all other solutions have been exhausted and in certain conditions. When the first few such additions were approved, it was never the intent to allow all additions to be wider or taller, which is how applicants have interpreted the italicized language. The existing guidelines state that additions could be up to four feet (4') taller if going taller was the only option; the new guidelines will allow additions to be two feet (2') taller, in some instances.

Ridge raises are something the Commission came up with many years ago that allows for an extra two feet (2') feet of height on an existing side gable home but there wasn't much guidance as to what conditions would warrant such an addition, so that has been added. The requirement that the ridge raise be inset two feet (2') from the side walls and extend no taller than two (2) vertical feet has not changed in the revised guidelines.

New language clarifies the difference between a rooftop deck that is above a roof's eave and an upper level deck. The draft states that rooftop decks are not allowed on historic buildings and provides guidance for including them as part of an addition, if desired.

There is language to stress that in terms of new construction, the focus is on form, massing, and scale, rather than architectural style.

The draft adds clarity for how "context" will usually be determined. Context is how the Commission determines if a request is what is called—appropriate—for the district. The "context" for an addition is the building which the addition is being attached too. Text clarifies that it's the existing building's features and form that provide context for additions. So, when considering the appropriateness of an addition, the commission is looking solely at the historic house and not at what other historic houses in the area may look like.

Staff member Sean Alexander continued the presentation. For infill—a new primary building in an existing neighborhood-- the context is the immediate surrounding neighborhood. New text clarifies that in most cases the context for infill will be the “block face.” Using context far away from a proposed project has been a concern voiced by numerous neighborhoods over multiple years. The Commission will retain the ability to define “block face” in situations where that is unclear or expand the context beyond the block face where the immediate context is not considered relevant.

The draft provides clarity on how building types relate to zoning. The building types should be consistent with the types in the immediate vicinity, no matter how the lot might be zoned. For instance, let’s say an area is zoned commercial but has a residential building type. If there were a vacant, a new building might have a commercial use, but its building type would still need to be similar to the residential building types.

Most guidelines had italicized information for multi-unit developments. Again, italicized text is not actual guidelines. We’ve removed that language, as multi-unit development can result in encouragement of demolition of historic buildings; alterations and additions that are not appropriate for the historic building; or require infill that is not appropriate for the district. Where multi-unit developments are appropriate, the site is usually so unique that the italicized design guidelines are of little use. Staff recommends addressing each of these requests on a case-by-case basis.

The language for outbuildings has been rewritten to allow for minimum and maximum sizes, roof slopes, and setbacks for all sites rather than basing the dimensions on the historic building. This could mean that an outbuilding is taller than a principal building if the principal building is short; however, the outbuildings should be set back enough on the lot that the additional height shouldn’t be evident from the street. This will allow people to use outbuildings in all the ways people do now, that they didn’t historically. They are no longer just about housing cars and garden equipment but also serve as apartments, guest rooms, home offices and studios and playrooms, among other uses and where zoning allows.

Specific guidance and dimensions for additions is given. This is largely communicated via drawings, rather than text alone.

We’ve also added clarification as to how measurements are taken and how setbacks are determined.

Moving on to Part II. Part II, is all the individual chapters for each district, where language specific to each district was collected from the current design guidelines.

All the maps have been revised. The boundaries have not changed, just the graphics of the maps so that they all have a consistent look since they were originally created at different times.

There are very few changes recommended for individual districts. One is to clarify in the Bowling House district that if a two-story building is appropriate, then it should have a hipped roof. It’s been a policy but not officially part of the design guidelines.

Recently, property owners in the Cherokee Park neighborhood asked that stone be included as a potential primary siding for infill. Currently the design guidelines only allow for brick.

Several years ago, the Commission found that rear-attached garages could be appropriate because of the lack of a rear alley and other reasons, so that guidance has been added as italicized information.

New “short histories” have been added to Greenwood and Maxwell Heights design guidelines. This doesn’t change any actual design guidelines.

Recently the Greenwood neighborhood stated that they wanted all infill to be capped at 1.5 stories so that has been added.

In the Lockeland Springs-East End design guidelines, there were references to MDHA’s design guidelines for Five Points Redevelopment District, to keep an applicant from having to reference two different documents when planning a project in Five Points. The language has been removed since the MDHA district has expired. The draft also includes some italicized information, that has been followed for about 8 years or more, as un-italicized guidance.

Recently, the Woodlawn neighborhood requested clarification on attached and detached garages and that has been added.

In summary, staff recommends approval of the September 2019 draft with the changes noted in the attached draft finding that the project meets section 17.40.410 of the Code and of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and with an effective date of May 21, 2021, the day after the May public hearing.

Chair Bell thanked staff for the presentation and inquired if any public comment had been received. Ms. Zeigler responded that this month staff received twenty-one (21) emails in favor of the project. Last month and this month’s emails were posted on the website and the comments still has access to the sharepoint with all other comments received throughout the project.

Carol Ashworth, representing the 12 South neighborhood, and Kerry Conley, 2045 10th Ave South, spoke in favor of the project.

Councilmember Withers spoke in favor of specifics of the project such as the ability to have wider siding reveals, reviewing the removal of historic siding, and flexibility for outbuildings. He said that he hoped the Commission will consider the MDHA redevelopment design guidelines even though the redevelopment district has expired.

Commissioner Mayhall and Johnson thanked staff and the community for undertaking such a large task and a project everyone can be proud of. In answer to Commissioner Johnson’s question, the three districts that are opting out will continue with their existing design guidelines and so will continue to have issues with the sections of the guidelines that are not clear. Ms. Zeigler explained that the neighborhoods that have opted out can join the consolidation at a later date, if interested. Like all the other districts, they would have their own chapter where they could add guidelines specific to their district.

Commissioner Jones said she attended the stakeholder meetings and can see that comments from the public have been incorporated into the draft. She spoke in favor of the project. Commissioner Fitts agreed and stated that she has seen social media where people are concerned about loss of historic fabric. She stressed that adoption of an overlay is a grassroots effort so for those neighborhoods interested in a new overlay, they should organize and contact staff.

Commissioner Price said the revision will clear up contradictions and make more sense. He specifically supports the guidance to review historic siding, after a house around the corner from him collapsed. Commissioner Mosley and Mayhall spoke in favor of the project. Commissioner Williams said he is encouraged by the commitment to the preservation of historic homes embodied in the language.

Motion: Commissioner Williams moved to approve the September 2019 draft with the changes noted in the attached draft finding that the project meets section 17.40.410 of the Code and of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and with an effective date of May 21, 2021, the day after the May public hearing. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

o. 606 8th AVE S

Application: Designation

Council District: 19

Overlay: Historic Landmark

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

p. 700 8th AVE S

Application: Designation

Council District: 19

Overlay: Historic Landmark

Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the cases for 606 and 700 8th Ave S together, as the applicant is the same and they are part of the same development project. The applicant requests Historic Landmark Zoning Overlays for 606 8th Ave S, The G. P. Rose- G. & S. Distributing Company Building, which you may know as the Downtown Antique Mall and 700 8th Ave S, the John Deere Plow Company Building which you may know as the Voorhees Building. Landmarking these two buildings is part of a larger campus-type development that will include new construction around the buildings.

606 8th Avenue South was constructed c. 1945-1946 as a warehouse for the G. & S. Distributing Company, although parts of the structure may date to the 1880s when it served as a grain warehouse for G. P. Rose grain company. Right after the end of World War II, it was used for many post-war government and veteran services

700 8th Avenue South dates to 1937 and represents a part of Nashville's commercial history and the region's agricultural history. Constructed for the John Deere Plow Company, the building embodies the architectural qualities and construction techniques of functional commercial and industrial structures of the 1930s. It is significant for its architecture, and association with the John Deere company, one that has had a decades long impact on farming techniques nationwide.

Ryan Terrell, developer, said he is available if there are any questions.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the project was brought to the Downtown Code Review Board and he saw it at that time. Commissioner Fitts applauded the applicant for applying.

Motion:

Commissioner Fitts moved to recommend approval of the 606 8th Ave S as a Historic Landmark to Council, finding the area to meet criteria 1 and 3 of section 17.36.120 and to adopt the existing Historic Landmark guidelines to apply to this property, finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

q. 945 S DOUGLAS UNIT #4

Application: New Construction – Infill

Council District: 07

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021012245

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the case for infill at 945 S Douglas. In 2018 the Commission approved an SP for the site at 945 S Douglas. Nineteen houses are planned for the development. The Commission approved specific ridge and eave heights and widths for each unit, and recommended approval to the Planning Commission. The SP was approved. The applicant is returning to this Commission for final design approval of each unit. You have already approved units 1-3. Today, we will look at unit #4

This unit was approved at one-and-a-half stories with a maximum ridge height of thirty-five feet (35') and an eave height of twelve feet (12'). The width here was approved at forty feet (40'). As designed, the ridge height is about thirty-three feet (33'), the eaves are just below twelve feet (12') and the width matches the forty-foot (40') limit.

The proposed height meets all of the parameters. Staff finds that the proposal is appropriate in terms of height, massing, materials and roof form. It is consistent with the site plan approved for the SP, and there are no design issues.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the proposed house with standard conditions as seen here.

Martin Wieck, architect, was present. There were no requests from the public to speak.

MOTION:

Commissioner Price moved to approve with the following conditions:

- 1. Staff shall review and approve the stone and brick, the roofing color, porch roof material, porch floor/step material, doors, garage doors and walkway material, prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- 2. The HVAC shall be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within five feet (5') of the front corner or on the rear or rear-side within five feet (5') of the rear corner;**

finding that the proposed infill meets the conditions of the part I SP approval for massing and Section III of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. VIOLATIONS/ ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVALS/ SHOW CAUSE

r. 726 MCFERRIN AVE

Application: New Construction – Infill Revision

Council District: 05

Overlay: Maxwell Heights Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Jenny Warren jenny.warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2020040967

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the case for a revision to a previously approved infill project in Maxwell Heights. The Commission approved this project in January 2021. Typically, staff can administratively approve small revisions to projects that the Commission has approved. However, this revision involves increasing the massing of the proposed mixed-use structure in a sensitive area where it was stepping down in height and stepping back away from the street, in an effort to transition to the lower-scaled residential area next door.

Because the adjacent historic context along McFerrin Avenue is one and one-and-a-half story houses with pitched roofs, staff had requested that the height of the development taper down to one story as it approaches this context. The design was approved as such, with some tapering in both height and inset from the street.

The two-story flat roofed design steps down and back to transition toward the heights, setbacks and massing of the one and one-and-a-half story houses with pitched roofs along this street. These design elements were very carefully negotiated with the applicant, in an attempt to help ease the overall height and massing transition.

The applicant is now requesting to pull the second story massing closer to the residential context and to pull it forward, closer to the street. This will increase the width of the second story central bay by about three feet (3'), decrease the width of the one-story section from about seven feet (7') to about four feet (4') and decrease the inset of the second story section.

These adjustments of two and three feet (2'-3') might sound minor overall on a project of this size, but in this sensitive location, these few feet represent the loss of nearly half of the inset that was provided on the side and a third of the recess from the street.

Staff recommends disapproval of the requested massing revisions, finding that the revisions do not meet sections II.B.1.a and b. of the design guidelines for the Maxwell Heights Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay, for height and scale.

Brandon Williams, applicant, said that they are requesting a minor change to make the units more livable. The height and width will remain the same. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Fitts said the previous solution was a better transition to the residential neighborhood but the new revision accomplishes the same purpose.

Commissioner Price agreed with staff and noted that there is a similar project coming later on the agenda. He appreciates the work done on the first solution and feels it is still the best solution. Commissioner Johnson said the original design was well done but the proposed revision will be overwhelming to the historic district. As a compromise she offered that the transition of the corner remain as previously approved and that midway into the project, it may be able to bump out further. Commissioner Mosley and Jones said that although it seems minimal it does change the look and feel for the purpose of increasing space. Since it is new construction, they are not trying to work around existing conditions.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove the requested massing revisions, finding that the revisions do not meet sections II.B.1.a and b. of the design guidelines for the Maxwell Heights Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay, for height and scale. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Fitts in opposition of the motion.

[Vice-chair Stewart joined the meeting at 3:25 p.m.]

s. 313 BROADWAY

Application: New Construction—Violation
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020665

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

t. 1408 B BOSCOBEL ST

Application: New Construction—Violation/Setback Determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021020667

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for a rear deck/carport which encroaches into the twenty foot (20') rear setback has been constructed without a permit. The deck itself (materials and design) does not require MHZC review as it is a rear addition that cannot be seen from the street and is located within the triangular area, shown in the design guidelines, as not requiring a permit. A permit from the Codes Department is required. As constructed, the deck intrudes into the twenty foot (20') rear setback by ten feet (10'). In an historic overlay it is the MHZC that makes setback determinations.

The Commission's ability to reduce setbacks is so that it can easily address historic conditions. This property has no existing historic conditions. A similar request at 1406 Boscobel Street was denied in August 2020. Staff does not see a compelling reason for the deck to be allowed within the setback and finds that the proposal does not meet Section II.B.3. of the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the setback determination, finding that the deck does not meet Section II.B.3 of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Staff recommends that the unpermitted structure be removed within sixty days (60 days) of the Commission's decision.

James Dunn, owner, explained why they designed the project as they did. He asked that the process with Codes be exhausted. He noted that there is no historic context and that his neighbors are in favor of the project.

The Commission received four emails in favor of the project and there were no requests to speak.

Commissioner Mosley asked how setbacks are measured. Mr. Hoffman said that the rear setback is measured from the rear property line.

Commissioner Fitts asked about the side property lines and Mr. Hoffman said that it matches the width of the house. Ms. Zeigler clarified Codes requirement for a twenty foot (20') setback.

Commissioners said that they had not received the document referenced by the applicant; therefore, commissioners and staff discussed the possibility of deferral and the applicant agreed.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to defer until next month’s meeting, with the agreement of the applicant. Commissioner Johnson seconded. Commissioner Mosley added that new information had not been viewed by the Commissioners. The motion passed unanimously.

u. 1807 WOODLAND ST

Application: New Construction—Violation/Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021021238

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for 1807 Woodland Street, which is a contributing home in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The historic porch roof was altered as part of renovations that were undertaken in 2020-2021.

Historically the porch roof was the shed roof form seen here. Staff finds that the original roof form was a character-defining feature of the house, and that its removal meets section III.B.a for inappropriate demolition. Additions are generally approved at the rear of buildings, so the new porch roof does not meet section II.B.10 for additions, as it is not compatible in scale with the historic porch roof.

Staff recommends disapproval of the new construction, finding that the project does not meet Sections II.10. a. and b. for additions and III.B.1 for Demolition in the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Staff recommends that the applicant submit to-scale drawings indicating major measurements and materials to replicate the original porch configuration within sixty (60) days of the Commission’s decision and to restore the original form within an additional thirty (30) days.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the recent pictures do not show some of the decorative trim that the older photographs show. He asked whether reintroduction of these features was required as well or if the applicant only needs to reverse the porch changes.

Mr. Hoffman clarified that the violation was limited to the porch roof form.

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

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to disapprove the new construction, finding that the project does not meet Sections II.10. a. and b. for additions and III.B.1 for Demolition in the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay and to require the applicant submit to-scale drawings indicating major measurements and materials to replicate the original porch configuration within sixty (60) days of the Commission’s decision and to restore the original form within an additional thirty (30) days. Commissioner Williams seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

v. 1716 GREENWOOD AVE

Application: Partial Demolition Revision
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2020008160

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

VI. MHZC ACTIONS

w. 3616 A WESTBROOK AVE

Application: New Construction - Infill and Outbuilding

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021020203 and T2021020212

Staff member ,Jenny Warren, presented the case for infill on a vacant lot in Richland-West End. The Commission disapproved an application on this lot last year. The applicant has revised based on feedback at that hearing.

The context includes one and one and a half story houses ranging in height from about seventeen to thirty-two feet (17'-32'). Houses on comparably sized lots range in width from about twenty-nine to forty-four feet (29'-44').

The height and width of the proposed structure fit within these parameters. One small issue is that the front dormer needs to inset by two feet (2'). The applicant has agreed to this revision.

Staff finds that the proposal is appropriate in terms of height, massing, materials and roof form. The depth of the structure was at issue in the previous application, as the house and outbuilding were connected via an enclosed hallway underneath the pool. The applicant has pulled these structures apart, which staff finds to be appropriate.

The design meets all setback requirements. A garage is planned for the rear yard, off the alley. The design and location meet all of the design guidelines. In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the proposed house with the condition that the dormer be inset two feet (2') and the standard conditions as seen here.

Project architect Julia Grissett said they had no objections to the conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to approve the project with the following conditions,

- 1. The dormer on the front elevation shall be inset by two feet (2') from the wall below;**
- 2. 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;**
- 3. Staff approve the final the brick, doors, garage doors, windows, the roofing color, stone and the material of the driveway and walkway, prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- 4. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s);**

finding that the proposal meets Section II.B.1 of the *Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

x. 3800 CENTRAL AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021020229

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for a one-story addition that includes an attached garage at 3800 Central. Attached garages do not meet the design guidelines.

In addition, the footprint of the addition more than doubles the footprint of the lot. Staff has been working with the applicant in the past, and they have submitted a new round of drawings that meet the conditions of the staff recommendation.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The garage be fully detached within a minimum distance of twenty feet (20') between the addition and the garage;
2. The addition's footprint be no larger than one thousand, seven hundred, and seventy-five square feet (1,775 sq.ft.);
3. At least one double hung window remain in the gable field;
4. The concrete block foundation be split faced;
5. Staff approve all windows, doors, and roof shingle color prior to purchase and installation;
6. There be no wall spaces deeper than thirteen feet (13') without a window or door opening; and
7. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the midpoint of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner or on the rear or rear-side within 5' of the rear corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s).

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed addition meets Sections II.B. and III.B. of the design guidelines. And again, since the publishing of the staff recommendation, the applicant has sent revised drawings that include these recommendations.

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

Motion:

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

1. **The garage be fully detached within a minimum distance of twenty feet (20') between the addition and the garage;**
2. **The addition's footprint be no larger than one thousand, seven hundred, and seventy-five square feet (1,775 sq.ft.);**
3. **At least one double hung window remain in the gable field;**
4. **The concrete block foundation be split faced;**
5. **Staff approve all windows, doors, and roof shingle color prior to purchase and installation;**
6. **There be no wall spaces deeper than thirteen feet (13') without a window or door opening; and**

7. **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the midpoint of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner or on the rear or rear-side within 5' of the rear corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s).;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed addition meets Sections II.B. and III.B. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Johnson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

y. 1017 N 16TH ST

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012234

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

z. 2005 (2003) EASTLAND AVE

Application: New Construction - Infill and Outbuilding
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2021012280 and T2021012281

Staff member Jenny Warren presented the case for infill on a vacant lot in Eastwood. As a quick clarification, the lot sits between #2001 and #2005. Currently the address for this lot is also #2005, but it will likely become #2003.

The context includes one and one and a half story houses ranging in height from about eighteen feet to just under twenty-nine feet (18'-29'). And ranging in width from about twenty-eight to thirty-two feet (28'-32').

The ridge will be approximately twenty-eight feet, seven inches (28'7") and will match that of the house next door at #2005. The proposed foundation and eave heights are compatible with the immediate context. The proposed width will be about thirty-two feet (32') at the front and will match that of the house to the left.

Staff finds that the proposal is appropriate in terms of height, massing, materials and roof form. The design meets all setback requirements.

A garage is planned for the rear yard, off the alley. The design and location meet all of the design guidelines.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the proposed house with standard conditions as seen here.

Aaron Armstrong, applicant, said they are excited to build on this lot.

Ms. Zeigler noted that public comment had been received. Councilmember Withers sent an email. He writes:

I wanted to write a quick note in support of the infill application for the vacant lot at 2003 Eastland Avenue. I am glad that a project is coming forward for this parcel in an area where housing is needed. At one point in time several years ago, an expansion of the Eastwood neighborhood conservation overlay had

been delayed by a prior Council Member due to uncertainty about what belonged on this vacant parcel since there are two-story mixed use and townhome complexes nearby. Ultimately the Overlay expansion went through that helps to shape infill in this midblock location surrounded by contributing structures on either side and mostly contributing structures across the street.

Since Eastland Ave forms the shared boundary between the Eastwood and Lockeland Springs neighborhoods, both groups have traditionally works to ensure that any new infill closely matches the scale of the immediately surrounding historic houses, which in this block of Eastland are fairly modest and relatively close to the street.

I agree with the staff recommendation that while this proposed building is as tall and as wide as the largest contributing homes in that block, the cross-gable form, low eave height, traditional porch structure and overall simple or clean lines help it to blend in well with the surroundings. It will complement the historic rhythm, spacing and roof shape patterns of this block without distracting from the contributing structures themselves, notably the one to the left at 2001 Eastland that is an architecturally distinctive house in the area.

I appreciate the architects' work in bringing a thoughtful proposal to this highly visible parcel with heavy foot traffic. I encourage the Commission to support the staff recommendation.

There were no callers.

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Staff shall approve the final roofing color, porch floors and steps, windows, doors, garage doors and driveway and walkway materials prior to purchase and installation; and,**
- 3. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s);**

finding that the project meets Section II.B of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines. Commissioner Fitts seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

aa. 0 (201) N 11TH ST

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021006689

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for infill. This is an application to construct a new mixed-use building, with a corner commercial component and a row of six attached townhouses. The building will address North 11th Street and Forrest Avenue, and both components of the building will have three-stories.

The Five Points area of East Nashville included one and two-story commercial buildings historically, with heights and widths consistent with the two-story primary street-facing form of the current proposal. Townhouse forms are

not common in this area historically; however the proposed development is near the edge of the overlay where the context transitions from residential to institutional and commercial.

The commercial component will have two-story front wall, twenty-six feet six inches (26'6") tall at the parapet, with a third story stepped back ten feet (10') from the two street-facing facades and eight feet from the north façade. The third story will have a flat roof, thirty-six feet tall. The townhouse component will also have a two-story street-facing façade twenty-six feet (26') tall, with a third story stepped back ten feet (10') from the street-facing façade and from the right side façade.

Staff finds that the stepping in of the third story from the two primary facades, and from the north and east facades where the building is adjacent to historic residential buildings, helps to keep the height compatible with the surrounding context.

As the townhouses extend one hundred, forty feet (140') along Forrest Avenue, the façade is broken into six units, each articulated into several smaller sections – helping to break up the scale of the building.

The primary building materials will be primarily brick and cement-fiber siding, with aluminum storefront type doors and windows. Additional information is needed on material selections, including colors and textures – staff asks to be able to approve those administratively.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed mixed-use infill at the corner of North 11th Street and Forrest Avenue (Parcel 083-09-0-088.00), with a condition that Staff shall review the brick selection, siding reveal and texture, metal colors, and the materials of the front stoop stairs and railings. Meeting that condition, Staff finds that the project meets the design guidelines for New Construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Jason Hitchcock, architect for the project, thanked everyone for their involvement.

There were no callers and Commissioners received three emails in opposition.

In answer to Chair Bell's question about public involvement, Mr. Hitchcock said that he had worked with Councilmember Withers. Councilmember Withers provided background as to why the parcel is unique and he explained the plans for the lot that had been worked out with neighborhood involvement when the MDHA redevelopment district was created.

Commissioner Fitts said she understands the community wants commercial on the corner but is struggling with the lack of a smooth transition between the proposed and the residential portions of the neighborhood. Commissioner Jones agrees with Commissioner Fitts but also understands Councilmember Withers background on the lot.

Commissioner Mayhall said she drove by the site this morning and she received a commercial feel for this area so was in support of the project as proposed. Commissioner Price has also driven and walked the site and read the six-hundred-fifty (650) comments on the neighborhood's Facebook page. The context is varied and there is precedent for this type of development on this transitional lot.

Commissioner Johnson considered from a Planning point of view as well. Bringing the building to the street, and providing parking on the lot, fits the neighborhood planning policy. Setting back the third story helps it to fit into the context. If they can create more greenspace it has potential to fit into the historic context.

Chair Bell offered that it might look daunting in the residential context and when the neighborhood is used to a lot being vacant. She asked that the edges be softened, potentially with greenspace, and stated it is too vertical for the historic context.

Commissioners asked questions to clarify the recommendation and the project.

Vice-chair Stewart said we are returning to a time where we have mixed-use projects in residential neighborhoods.

Motion:

Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve the proposed mixed-use infill at the corner of North 11th Street and Forrest Avenue (Parcel 08309008800), with a condition that Staff shall review the brick selection, siding reveal and texture, metal colors, and the materials of the front stoop stairs and railings; finding that the project meets the design guidelines for New Construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Johnson seconded and the motion passed with Commissioners Fitts and Jones in opposition.

bb. 920 B ACKLEN AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill and Outbuilding

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021020083 and T2021020095

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 920 B Acklen, which is a revised design for infill on the left-most lot of a larger lot that was divided into four parcels. The Commission has approved the designs of two-story houses on three of the other neighboring lots and those houses are under construction and some are largely finished.

Here is the design for the infill, which is similar in height and scale to the other infills approved next door and also similar to the height and scale of neighboring historic houses.

Here is the design for the outbuilding, which meets all the design guidelines for outbuildings.

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. Staff approve the masonry samples, all windows and doors, the roof shingle color and texture, and the walkway driveway material prior to purchase and installation; and
3. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s).

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed infills meet Section III. of the design guidelines.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, was present but declined to present.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

1. **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**

2. **Staff approve the masonry samples, all windows and doors, the roof shingle color and texture, and the walkway driveway material prior to purchase and installation; and**
3. **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s);**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed infills meet Section III. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

cc. 0 MANILAAVE

Application: New Construction – Infill; Setback Determination

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021012128

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for infill of a two-story house with an attached garage on a vacant lot.

The house will be two stories with a gabled-ell form, with a side-gabled primary massing and a gabled projections to the front and rear. The front projection will come five feet forward of the primary mass then have a six foot deep shed-roofed porch. The rear gable will project ten feet (10'), and will be two-stories with a side-facing garage at the first story. Attached garages are not typical, but this lot is not served by an alley and has a unique shape and steep slope, complicating the ability to have a detached garage.

The house will be thirty-four feet (34) wide, which is six to ten feet wider than a typical historic house in the area, but this lot is three times the width of a typical lot.

The house will be thirty-three feet, eight inches (33'8") tall from the finished floor, with an eave height of 20 feet. With a foundation height shown on the plans, the total height will be thirty-five feet (35') tall from grade. This is taller than historic houses in the immediate vicinity, and taller than a recently constructed house on the adjacent lot to the left. That house was approved to be thirty-three feet (33') tall from finished floor, and the lot for the current proposal appears to fall more steeply to the front which will result in a taller exposed foundation and the appearance of an even taller structure.

Staff recommends that the plans be revised to show the grade of the lot accurately, and that the height of the building is revised to be no taller than thirty-three feet (33') from grade at the front, as was approved by the Commission for the house next door.

The front setback will align with the adjacent house, and the side setbacks will be greater than typical of the area because of the lot size.

The house will include an attached garage at the rear. The rear wall of the garage will have a setback of eighteen feet (18'). This setback would meet the bulk zoning requirements for a typical outbuilding, but because the garage is attached it falls under the setback requirement for primary buildings, which is twenty feet (20'). The lot is atypically shallow at only one hundred, one feet (101') deep, and the house isn't particularly deep, but there would not be sufficient space to have a detached outbuilding behind the house with adequate space between the house and garage. For that reason, staff finds the proposed rear setback to be appropriate for the attached garage.

The proposed materials are generally appropriate, with the condition that staff approves the window and door selections as well as the roof color and garage door selection.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed infill at 0 Manila Avenue (Parcel 083-01-0-439.00) with a reduced rear setback with the following conditions:

1. The plans are revised to show the grade of the lot accurately;
2. The height of the building is revised to be no taller than thirty-three feet (33') from grade at the front;
3. Staff approves the window and door selections as well as the roof color and garage door selection; and
4. The HVAC and utility connections are administratively approved.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposal meets the design guidelines for New Construction in the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Brad Sayers, applicant, said they have determined a way to reduce the height and will address that with staff.

Commissioners received an email in advance of the meeting from an adjoining property owner in opposition of the setback determination.

Staff and Mr. Sayers answered Commissioner's questions regarding height.

Vice-chair Stewart said it is a sensitive construction for a unique site.

Motion:

Vice-chair Stewart moved to approve the proposed infill at 0 Manila Avenue (Parcel 083-01-0-439.00) with a reduced rear setback with the following conditions:

- 1. The plans are revised to show the grade of the lot accurately;**
- 2. The height of the building is revised to be no taller than thirty-three feet (33') from grade at the front;**
- 3. Staff approves the window and door selections as well as the roof color and garage door selection; and**
- 4. The HVAC and utility connections are administratively approved;**

finding that with those conditions met, the proposal meets the design guidelines for New Construction in the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Johnson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

dd. 1416 A and B BOSCOBEL ST

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021020234

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for a duplex infill at 1416 Boscobel St. The 1400-1600 blocks of Boscobel Street have little historic context, and many two to three story modern homes were built on the block prior to the expansion of the overlay. Given the lack of context the guidelines state that infill may be up to two stories on these blocks. Staff finds that the height and scale of the proposed infill meets the design guidelines for this block of Boscobel Street.

The infill meets all base zoning setbacks. The plan proposes a driveway from Boscobel Street with a twelve foot (12') wide curb cut, which meets the design guidelines. The driveway then widens to forty feet (40') in front of the house to accommodate parking. Typically, driveways should extend at least to the midpoint of the house and not include front yard parking. However, staff finds that the driveway and parking pad can be appropriate in this case given the lack of historic context on this block of Boscobel Street. Truncated driveways and front yard parking pads are very common on the 1400 block, and the property at 1416 Boscobel Street is a fairly shallow lot with a depth of approximately one hundred twenty-two feet (122') that also has no alley access. Given the unique lack of historic context, lack of alley access, and appropriate curb cut width, staff finds that the driveway and parking pad can be appropriate in this particular location.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with conditions as set forth in the staff recommendation.

Vincent Bruce, applicant, was present but declined to present. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. The front setback should be consistent with the buildings to either side, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of all unknown materials as well as the windows prior to purchase and installation;**
- 4. Staff approve the brick color, dimensions and texture; and**
- 5. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house, and utility meters shall be located on the side of the building, within 5' of the front corner. Alternative mechanical and utility locations must be approved prior to an administrative sign-off on building permit(s);**

finding with these conditions, the project meets Section II.B of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

ee. 305 BROADWAY

Application: Installation of ATM

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2021020197

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the case for installation of an ATM within an alcove on Broadway.

The Commission required the removal of this ATM, sitting on the sidewalk, last year. It has been removed as per the Commission decision. In 2004, the Commission determined that ATMs were specifically allowed inside a building OR 'in an alcove not on the primary façade'. The intent was to ensure that ATMs would not be installed in prominent locations along historic facades and that they would not damage or obscure original or historic materials or spaces.

The applicant would like to install a new ATM within the recessed first floor. Staff finds that this could be appropriate for several reasons:

First, the ground level of this property has been altered, the recessed entry is not historic. Therefore, no historic materials or spaces would be impacted by the installation of the ATM in this location. Second, the proposed location is set well off of the sidewalk; it is recessed about eighteen feet (18'). As a result of this recess, the ATM will not alter the rhythm of the street or openings.

Staff recommends approval of the ATM finding that it is consistent with Section III of the design guidelines for new construction, and the intent of the Commission's 2004 interpretation of ATMs.

Kenny Winchell, applicant, read the staff recommendation. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to approve the ATM finding that it is consistent with Section III of the design guidelines for new construction and meets the intent of the Commission's 2004 interpretation of ATMs. Commissioner Vice-chair Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.