

DAVID BRILEY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES November 19, 2018

Commissioners Present: Vice Chair Cyril Stewart, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, David Price, Brian Tibbs
Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Jenny Warren, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Susan Jones
Applicants: John Root, Teri Preston, Matthew and Jennifer Morgan, Duane Cuthbertson and William Smallman, Van Pond, Jeff Reed and Mitch Hodge, Alex Sherling, Michael Ward, Chris Wright, Kaitlyn Smous, Jesse Wilmoth and Dallas Caudle
Councilmembers: None
Public: Sonya Link

Due to Chairman Bell's absence, Vice-chairman Stewart led the meeting. The meeting called to order at 2:03 p.m.

Vice-chairman Stewart and Commissioner Tibbs read information about the amount of time people have to speak, the process of the consent agenda and the process for appeals.

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Zeigler informed the Commission that the applicant for 1117 McKennie has requested a deferral and 1414 Calvin has been removed from the agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the revised agenda. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

None present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. October 17, 2018

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to accept the revised minutes. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Staff member, Jenny Warren read the items for the consent agenda and there were no requests to remove items from consent.

b. 1407 GREENWOOD AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock melissa.baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018069877

c. 217 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018069993

d. 1724 LINDEN AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070004

e. 928 MONTROSE AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070036

f. 1910 19TH AVE S

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding/Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070047 and T2018070053

g. 1803 CEDAR LN

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070248

h. 1404 N 14TH ST

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman paul.hoffman@nashville.gov
Permit ID: 2017077941

i. 1503 CLAYTON AV

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding/Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman paul.hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070473

~~j. 1414 CALVIN AV~~

~~Application: New Construction—Addition~~

~~Council District: 6~~

~~Overlay: Lockeland Springs East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay~~

~~Project Lead: Jenny Warren jenny.warren@nashville.gov~~

~~PermitID#: T2018070385~~

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to approved all items on consent with their applicable conditions and with the exception of 1414 Calvin Avenue. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

k. HISTORIC LANDMARK INTERIOR

Adoption of design guidelines

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, explained that an ordinance to create a new type of overlay, Historic Landmark Interior, is in the works. The commission is only asked to adopt the design guidelines. When the new overlay is actually applied to a property, there will be another opportunity to address the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to accept the design guidelines as presented. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VI. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

l. 1406 5TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2018062966

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for infill at 1406 5th Ave N. The addition at 1406 5th Avenue North was presented at the October 2018 public hearing, but the applicant deferred before the Commission made a decision. According to the Germantown Historic District National Register nomination, 1406 Fifth Avenue North was constructed circa 1850 and is a “one-story brick raised cottage with a daylight basement”. However, the structure could date back as early as the 1830s, making it one of the earliest houses in Germantown. The applicant is proposing a rear addition and a front porch addition.

The applicant is proposing a rear addition that is eight feet, four inches (8’4”) taller than the historic house. The historic zoning commission approved this same addition in 2015, under the old design guidelines, but the addition was never constructed. The site plan shows a DADU. The DADU was originally approved in 2016, and in February 2018, MHZC re-issued the permit, finding that the DADU met the new Germantown Design guidelines and the DADU ordinance. The part of the addition that is eight feet, four inches (8’4”) taller than the historic house was approved by the Commission in 2015. The one story porch that is wider than the historic house was approved by the Commission in 2016, as was the front porch addition.

The existing partial width front porch was constructed in 2008 and is therefore not historic. The 1914 Sanborn map and a 1970s photo show the house as having a full-width front porch. The applicant proposes to construct a full-width front porch, with a footprint matching that of the porch shown on the 1914 Sanborn map. Although the house

did not originally have a full-width porch, it did have one added that remained long enough to have historical significance of its own. For this reason, staff finds that reconstruction of a full-width porch to be appropriate.

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing addition at the rear of the house. Staff finds that the existing addition does not contribute to the historic character of the historic house at 1406 Fifth Avenue North and to the Germantown Historic Zoning Overlay as a whole. Staff finds that its demolition meets the design guidelines.

The Commission approved the rear addition that is eight feet, four inches (8'4") taller than the historic house in 2015. (Staff recommended a condition that the addition not be more than five feet (5') taller than the historic building.) That permit has since expired. In October 2017, MHZC adopted revised design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Staff re-examined the proposed project under these new guidelines.

The applicant is proposing a rear addition that is eight feet, four inches (8'4") taller than the historic house. The addition is inset two feet (2') on both sides, which is appropriate. It will increase the footprint of the existing structure by approximately six hundred and fifty square feet (650 sq. ft.), after the non-contributing additions are demolished.

Examining the proposed addition under the current Germantown design guidelines, staff finds that its insets, width, depth, and footprint meet the design guidelines. The height of the addition, however, does not meet the current design guidelines. The previous Germantown design guidelines did not discuss situations when additions could go taller than the historic house; they did not provide a maximum additional height or parameters for when taller additions would be appropriate. Many of the other MHZC design guidelines for residential neighborhood conservation and historic preservation zoning overlays state, in italicized print, that an addition may extend up to four feet (4') taller than the historic house at a distance forty feet (40') back from the front of the house. In the 2015 staff recommendation, staff recommended that because the addition was more than fifty feet (50') back from the front of the house, the addition should be limited to being five feet (5') taller than the historic house. However, the Commission approved the addition to be eight feet, four inches (8'4") taller because of the slope of the lot.

The current design guidelines now state, in italicized print, that "*when a taller addition is the only option,*" additions can be up to four feet (4') taller than the historic house at a point forty feet (40') back from the front of the house. Staff finds that an addition that is taller than the historic house could be appropriate for this lot because of the slope of the site.

The site is steeply sloped upwards towards the back of the lot; there is a difference of about ten feet (10') from the front of the lot to the rear. The lot's ground is rock, making it difficult and expensive to dig and level the slope. However, staff is not supportive of the proposed height of the addition which is a two-story addition on a one-story house. Since the current design guidelines specifically limit the height of additions to be no more than four feet (4') taller than the historic house, staff recommends that the addition be reduced in height by four feet, four inches (4'4") in order to meet the current design guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed rear addition's height is out of scale with this one-story with a raised basement house, and that reducing the addition's height to be no taller than four feet (4') taller than the historic house would make the addition more compatible with the historic house.

The applicant is proposing the addition to be all siding without any masonry. The design guidelines state that "All facades shall be at least 80% brick. A greater percentage of accent materials may be used on facades that are not visible from a public right-of-way." The applicant is proposing an addition that is entirely clad in siding, making the left/north façade fifty-two percent (52%) brick and the right/south façade forty-seven percent (47%) brick. The rear façade is almost entirely siding, with only the two feet (2') of brick walls at the back of the historic house being brick.

Staff finds that in this case, having an addition that contains no brick is appropriate because historically, the historic house had substantial amounts of non-brick facades. Both the 1897 and the 1957 Sanborn maps show that the entire back of the house was frame and not brick and that about two thirds of the right/south façade was an enclosed wood porch. Parts of that wood porch section are now brick. Since historically, appendages and additions to this historic house were frame and not brick, staff finds that the proposed lap siding material to be appropriate for the addition.

Staff finds that the percentage of brick on the side and rear façade to be in keeping with the historic character of 1406 5th Avenue North.

Staff recommends approval of the addition with the following conditions:

1. The addition be no taller than four feet (4') taller than the historic house;
2. Staff approve a brick sample and roof shingle sample;
3. Staff approve the location of the HVAC unit and all utilities; and
4. Staff approve all permanent landscape features, included but not limited to fences, pathways, pavers, parking pads, pools, etc.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed demolition and additions meet Sections II, III, V, VII of the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

John Root, architect for the project, explained challenges to the height such as the rise in grade of ten feet (10') and the previous decision from a few years ago. They did not begin with the previous approval because the owner wanted to take time to consider all the work that would need to be done. He argued that the addition is small (three bedrooms total), compared to the house, and far back from the sidewalk. He explained that character is lost by simply changing the roof pitch to bring the height down. They could change the roof pitch from 10/12 to 8/12 and lower the height by twenty inches (20"). The building itself is dwarfed by the houses on either side. They limited the footprint because the further back they go, the taller the addition will be because of the grade and the more greenspace in the back that will be lost.

Sonya Link, representing the neighborhood association, asked that the revised design guidelines be adhered to so that future projects do not grow in size.

John Root said that he did not feel that the guidelines have actually changed in terms of the height of additions. Ms. Baldock explained that the previous guidelines did not address taller additions but the current design guidelines, in italicized text, states that additions should not exceed four feet (4') in height, forty feet (40') back from the front wall.

Commissioner Tibbs said that the house is small, which provides challenges, but it is hard to go against the design guidelines, which were recently adopted unless they can differentiate this request from other projects.

Commissioner Price said that the house is one-story and that they have consistently not allowed two-story additions on a one-story house.

Commissioner Jones agreed that changing the pitch would change the character but she is concerned that two-stories is too much on a one-story house. She feels that the neighborhood came together to create the design guidelines and they should be upheld.

Motion:

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

1. **The addition be no taller than four feet (4') taller than the historic house;**
2. **Staff approve a brick sample and roof shingle sample;**
3. **Staff approve the location of the HVAC unit and all utilities; and**
4. **Staff approve all permanent landscape features, included but not limited to fences, pathways, pavers, parking pads, pools, etc;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed demolition and additions meet Sections II, III, V, VII of the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously,

VII. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

None.

VIII. VIOLATIONS/ COURT ACTIONS/ / ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVALS

m. 1507 SHELBY AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill/Revision to Previous Approval

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: 2018018857

Staff member Melissa Baldock resented the case for a revision to previously approved infill at 1507 Shelby Ave. In April 2018, MHZC staff issued an administrative permit to demolish the existing structure at 1507 Shelby Avenue. That same month, MHZC approved a duplex infill and an outbuilding for the lot. The application before you today is a request to use white brick on infill construction already approved by the Metro Historic Zoning Commission. The Commission's motion to approve the infill at 1507 Shelby Avenue included a condition that MHZC staff approve a brick sample before the material is purchased and installed.

The proposed brick is General Shale Woodhaven Tudor. Although MHZC does not review the painting of brick in Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlays like Lockeland Springs-East End, MHZC does review new materials for new construction. The Commission's policy has always been to ensure that new masonry is a historic brick color in case paint is ever removed.

Historically, in the major period of development of the Lockeland Springs neighborhood, brick was un-painted. Brick houses of the Victorian, four square, Craftsman bungalow, and Tudor Revival styles were typically unpainted when they were built.

Their bricks were typically earth tones like reds, reddish-browns, dark oranges, tan, etc. Here are some images of typical historic brick. If painted currently, it is likely that these historic houses were painted decades after they were constructed—either to mask brick repairs or deteriorating brick or to follow a trend where painted brick is meant to “freshen up” an older home.

Historic brick and masonry have a protective porous surface that allows moisture to wick out; painting or sealing the brick or masonry can trap the moisture, leading to damage to the material after several freeze-thaw cycles. MHZC therefore strongly discourages the painting of historic brick.

For new construction, staff has encouraged brick to remain unpainted, although MHZC does not review the painting of brick in a conservation overlay. Painted brick is currently a trend in home building and home flipping, but trends like these can come and go. MHZC reviews the underlying brick for new construction to ensure that if an owner wishes to remove the paint in the future to provide for a more historically-compatible material and look, the underlying brick meets MHZC's standards and is similar to historic bricks found in the district.

MHZC staff finds that the proposed painted white brick is not visually compatible with the historic context, as it is not known what the brick underneath the paint looks like. In addition, since the color is applied at the time of manufacturing, it may not be as easily removable as an applied paint. From the sample board and the image online, the brick underneath appears to be rough and tumbled with an uneven surface, which is typically not appropriate for brick in new construction in the historic and conservation overlays. Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed white painted brick, finding that its color and texture do not meet Section II.B.4 of the design guidelines.

The applicant has provided an alternate brick, Acme red brick. If the Commission does not approve the white brick, the applicant has listed this brick as an alternate. Staff finds this brick to meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the white brick, finding that it does not meet Section II.B.4. of the design guidelines.

Teri Preston, 1507 Shelby Avenue, read a prepared statement explaining why they wanted to build what is proposed, her interactions with staff in regards to the number of stories of the building, and the design of the front door. She shared her research regarding the color of buildings in the neighborhood and their design features.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Tibbs said that they have never approved painted brick. Commissioners Mayhall, Price and Jones expressed concern about setting a precedent if approved.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove the white brick, finding that it does not meet Section II.B.4. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

n. 712 BENSON ST

Application: New Construction—Addition/ Revision to Previous Approval
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070251

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for 712 Benson St.

He explained that a rear addition with a ridge raise was approved in September of 2017, and was constructed with the exterior nearly complete with siding, windows, and roofing installed before any inspections were requested. The first contractor was let go and a new one hired. When that contractor requested an inspection, it was discovered that the addition had deviated from the specifications of the permit. The ridge raise was approved to extend the front slope of the roof up and to the rear to a height two feet (2') taller than the original roof ridge, but it was constructed ten inches (10") taller than that.

The siding was approved to be smooth but wood grain siding was installed, and the windows were approved to have single divided lights but grill between glass windows were installed. The applicant has agreed to correct those issues.

They are requesting to retain the ridge raise that was constructed taller than it was approved.

Ridge raises have become a very common type of addition in residential overlays, many approved administratively every year, but none has ever been approved to increase height more than two feet. In fact, the Commission has compelled the builders of ridge raises that exceeded the approved two feet to be corrected numerous times.

Staff recommends that the ridge raise be lowered to be no more than two feet higher than the historic house's ridge.

Matthew and Jennifer Morgan, property owners, explained the project and how the violation happened. The contractor failed to meet the conditions of the contract and they hired a new contractor. In obtaining new permits in the name of the new contractor, the violation was discovered. The additional height is needed for the HVAC lines. They asked to keep the roofline as is because they have spent \$50,000 to correct issues of the former contractor and they would not have funds to complete the project. They do have an alternate design but they cannot wait until December for the Commission to review that alternative.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mayhall asked for an explanation of the difference between this project and the previous project approved. Mr. Alexander explained that the previous project was a taller addition behind the house but this is additional height on top of the existing historic house with a taller ridge raise.

Commissioner Jones and Price acknowledged the difficulties that the applicants have gone through with their previous contractor.

Ms. Jones, legal counsel, cautioned the Commission that their decision has to be tied to the land and the design guidelines.

Commissioner Tibbs asked if Staff has seen the alternative design the applicants mentioned. Ms. Zeigler gave a brief description of the alternative and suggested that the Commission could provide staff with the authority to allow additional height that is pushed back beyond the ridge raise. Mr. Alexander provided a general description of the alternative.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to disapprove the requested change and provided Staff the authority to approve additional height behind the ridge raise and maintain the footprint and ridge raise previously approved. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Jones voting against the motion and Vice-chairman voting in favor of the motion.

IX. MHZC ACTIONS

o. 925 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New construction—Outbuilding/Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070099

The applicant requested deferral after the adoption of the agenda at the beginning of the meeting.

p. 1208 PARIS AV

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018070249

Sean Alexander, staff member, presented the case for 1208 Paris Avenue, an application to construct an addition to an historic house and a DADU. The DADU meets the design guidelines, but none of the materials is labeled so they will all need to be indicated before a permit would be issued.

The addition will enlarge the house on the rear and the right side. It originates near the midpoint of the right side and goes nine feet to the right, extending back and behind the existing building. A rear addition is appropriate, and side additions are appropriate on lots wider than sixty feet (60'), which 1208 Paris is. However, where it is appropriate to have a side addition and a rear addition, the two should be separate and distinct, not one addition that wraps the corner. The reasons for this are not only because it requires more extensive demolition to envelop portions of two facades along with the eaves and roof, but because it also impacts the form of the house and is less reversible.

The addition will be stepped in one foot (1') from the left side of the house. The roof will tie into the rear slope of the roof, extend back, and then step up to be three feet, eleven inches (3'11") taller than the historic house. The guidelines allow additions to be up to four feet (4') taller when necessary, and while the house is only twenty feet (20') tall, staff does not find that the applicant has demonstrated that other options would not work, like a ridge raise or other form on the addition.

This addition is nine feet (9') wider than the house and four feet (4') taller, and would demolish and envelop the rear-right corner of the house's form.

Staff recommends approval of the DADU and addition with the conditions that:

1. The height of the addition shall be reduced to be no more than two feet (2') taller than the historic house;
2. The side and rear additions should not wrap the rear-right corner of the house; and
3. Staff shall approve the roof color and masonry selections, and all DADU materials; and
4. The HVAC units shall be behind the midpoint of the primary building or on the rear.

Duane Cuthbertson, representing the property owner, explained they have worked with the applicant and staff with the intent of gaining practical living area in a modest addition. They feel that the height is consistent with other homes in the area. They want to limit the depth of the rear addition to maximize yard space. The rear corner that is being wrapped is an enclosed porch and so not an original corner to the house.

William Smallman, applicant, said there are three houses on the street that have been approved to wrap corners and had rear porches that were enclosed. He handed out examples of projects with wrapped rear additions. He argued that if there are no walls then there is no corner to preserve. The eave was not preserved on the projects he handed out so all they would be saving is a block of foundation. Keeping the corner makes the addition unworkable. They have submitted a revised version but not in time for the staff report and the height request is the only option.

Commissioner Tibbs asked for clarification of the examples. Ms. Zeigler said that 1211 Paris did not appear to be a wrapped addition and 1504 Paris was approved because of alterations to the historic building. Commissioner Jones agreed having also quickly looked up staff reports and added that the shallowness of the lot at 1504 Paris was another reason for the addition approved there. She explained that not every "want" can be accommodated, in terms of additions, it is about the home. It may be with a small home that an applicant simply cannot get everything they may want. She agrees with Staff.

Commissioner Tibbs said that there have been many requests for additional height but the applicant has provided a reason for not following the design guidelines. Commissioner Price explained that it is difficult when other projects in the neighborhood are given as a reason for a particular action as they may have taken place prior to the overlay or have different reasons the action was allowed but their charge is to uphold the design guidelines. Neighborhood context doesn't always help and there are other options available.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to approve the proposed addition and outbuilding with the following conditions:

1. **The height of the addition shall be reduced to be no more than two feet (2') taller than the historic house;**
2. **The side and rear additions should not wrap the rear-right corner of the house; and**
3. **Staff shall approve the roof color and masonry selections; and**
4. **The HVAC units shall be behind the midpoint of the primary building or on the rear;**

finding that with these conditions, the addition meets Section II.B of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

q. 3925 CAMBRIDGE ST

Application: New Construction—Addition; Setback Determination

Council District: 24

Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018070247

Sean Alexander, staff member, presented the case for an addition at 3925 Cambridge Street. Mr. Alexander noted that two letters of support for the project were forwarded to the Commission via email.

The applicant proposes to construct a side and rear addition that would require a rear setback determination.

As with the previous case, this is another addition wrapping the corner. Here the lot is considerably shallower, and with a considerably wider lot. Staff finds that the unusual lot proportions may justify an addition that envelops the

corner, but special care must be taken to ensure that the scale and setbacks are appropriate and for the addition to be subordinate and minimize damage to the historic form.

The addition will originate on the left side of the house roughly two-thirds of the way back from the front, and extend out to the left, thirty-four feet (34') beyond the existing side porch, forty-two feet (42') out from the primary sidewall of the house. This side addition then comes forward toward the street and the dominant feature of this component will be a garage. The garage's front will be twenty-three feet (23') wide with the front wall just twelve feet (12') back from the front edge of the house, well forward of the historic house's midpoint. The garage component extends back forty-nine feet (49'), which would encroach fifteen feet (15') into the standard twenty foot (20') setback. The commission has the authority to determine when a setback greater or less than the standard setback requirements is more appropriate based on historic context. This side of Cambridge backs up to Aberdeen Road, which has similar lot conditions, and if a five foot (5') rear setback is approved here, it is conceivable that the same setbacks would also be approved for Aberdeen, which could leave only ten feet (10') between houses.

Staff finds that the massing and front setback of the addition, with a garage nearly equaling the width of the house sitting only twelve feet (12') back from the front of the house and dominated by a garage, is not appropriate.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed addition to 3925 Cambridge Avenue, finding that it does not meet sections II.B.1.b (Scale) and II.B.1.c (Setback and Rhythm of Spacing) of the design guidelines of additions in the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Van Pond, architect for the project, explained the pattern of development for this area, which is large outbuildings in close proximity to the main structure. They would like to request a five foot (5') rear setback for a portion of the project and a ten to twenty foot (10' - 20') setback on the rest. They would also like to request the forward facing garage because of the shallow depth of the lot because it is line with the historic porch. The goal was to make the addition look like a second building.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Jones expressed concern with the basic size of the addition to a small home, the width of the addition, the closeness of the addition to the front of the house, and with the five foot (5') rear setback determination. The size of the lot and the previous addition is a good reason to allow for the wrap around addition, in this instance.

Commissioner Tibbs said he was comfortable with the rear setback but not with the garage being so close to the front of the house. The wrap for the addition is appropriate, in this instance, because of the site, the location of the existing home, how the addition relates to the existing house and the porch that provides a break between the historic home and the addition.

Commissioner Price said the addition overwhelms the historic house and expressed concern about the addition wrapping the rear corner.

Motion:

Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove the proposed addition to 3925 Cambridge Avenue, finding that it does not meet sections II.B.1.b (Scale) and II.B.1.c (Setback and Rhythm of Spacing) of the design guidelines of additions in the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 1117 MCKENNIE AV

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding/Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit; Setback Determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman paul.hoffman@nashville.gov

Permit ID#: T2018070470

Deferred at the request of the applicant.

s. 2108 11TH AVE S

Application: New Construction—Addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018069898

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for an addition at 2108 11th Avenue South. 2108 11th Avenue South was constructed circa 1928 and contributes to the historic character of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The porch columns and historic wood siding have been replaced over the years, but the house's form is still clearly that of a late 1920s frame house. The lot slopes significantly from the front to the back, allowing for a basement level that can be occupied. The lot is zoned for two residential units. The house is fairly small, at about nine hundred and forty-four (944) square feet in footprint. By comparison, the lot is over eleven thousand (11,000) square feet.

The applicant is proposing a rear addition to create a second residential unit. The addition meets all base zoning setbacks. It does extend wider than the historic house on the right side, which staff finds could be appropriate since this lot is over sixty-feet (60') wide and the historic house is just thirty-feet (30') wide. However, in general, staff finds that the footprint of the addition is too large for the historic house.

The design guidelines state:

No matter its use, an addition should not be larger than the existing house, not including non-historic additions, in order to achieve compatibility in scale. This will allow for the retention of small and medium size homes in the neighborhood. The diversity of housing type and size is a character defining feature of the historic districts.

MHZC has interpreted this section of the design guidelines to mean that the addition should not more than double the footprint of the house. In other words, the footprint of the addition should not be larger than the footprint of the historic house. In this case, the proposed footprint is more than three times that of the historic house and would quadruple the footprint of the existing house. The historic house has a footprint of nine hundred and forty-four (944) square feet including the front porch. The proposed addition will have a footprint of approximately two-thousand and eight hundred (2,800) square feet, including the rear porch. In total, the addition would increase the size of the house from nine hundred and forty-four (944) square feet to approximately three thousand, seven hundred and forty-four (3,744) square feet.

Staff does appreciate that the applicant has designed the addition so that it is no taller than the historic house. Because of the slope of the lot, the addition gains a basement level that can be used for living space. The left property line borders a side alley, and the applicant proposes a basement level garage, accessed via the alley. As I mentioned earlier, the addition will create a second residential unit. The main door facing 11th Avenue South will remain. The entrance to the second residential unit will be on the side and the rear, and it is designed to look like a secondary entrance, which staff finds to be appropriate.

Even though the height of the addition is appropriate, staff finds that its overall scale is not appropriate. Staff finds that the size of the addition overwhelms the historic house. Staff advised the applicant that because of the small size of the house and the large size of the lot, the Commission might find that slightly more than doubling the existing footprint would be appropriate but advised against quadrupling the footprint. Another option could be an appropriately scaled addition with a detached accessory dwelling unit, although a house behind a house would not be appropriate.

Although gables like the ones proposed are typically appropriate, staff finds that the multiple roof forms tied together to create a long addition are not compatible with the simple side gable of the historic house.

The house next door was constructed recently, but prior to the establishment of the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. There are taller houses nearby, but they are largely new construction built before the

creation of the conservation zoning overlay. For additions, MHZC is tasked with comparing the size of the addition to the historic house, not with comparing the size of the addition to the neighboring context. In this case, the addition's footprint, depth, and scale are just too large when compared to the historic house.

In summary, with historic houses, MHZC is tasked with ensuring that the size and scale of the addition is appropriate to the historic house. The neighborhood context is less important than how the addition relates to the historic house. The design guidelines state that "No matter its use, an addition should not be larger than the existing house." Staff therefore finds that this addition is too large and does not meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the addition, finding that its scale and roof form do not meet Sections III.B. and IV.B. of the design guidelines.

Applicant, Jeff Reed, handed out additional drawings and photographs of the house. He stated that it is the smallest house on the street and possibly the neighborhood, smaller than a DADU that would be allowed. He argued that if you apply the guidelines to small homes then you have a house that is not marketable. He constructed the house next door with the idea of constructing a similar home on this lot. He claimed that if someone applied for this house today, it would not be approved. The proposal is for two average size homes. The addition does not raise the existing height. Other than size, it meets all the design guidelines. The lot has two alleys.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, said that the house is the smallest one on the block. The addition is an attempt to preserve the historic home but new and improved. The site slopes towards the back. The additional square footage is what makes it possible to rehab the existing house. He pointed out that thirty-two (32) of the forty (40) houses on the street are new. The owner purchased the lot expecting to have two separate homes on the lot but the overlay will not allow it.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Jones commended the architect for the design but stated that the proposal was far too large for the historic home. Commissioner Tibbs agreed with both points.

The applicant requested a deferral.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to accept the applicants request for deferral. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

t. 1511 ASHWOOD AVENUE

Application: New Construction—Addition; Partial Demolition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018069996

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for an addition at 1511 Ashwood Avenue.

The house at 1511 Ashwood Ave is a brick bungalow that contributes to the character of the Belmont-Hillsboro overlay. The application is to construct a ridge raise and rear addition to the historic house at 1511 Ashwood Ave. The plan also includes changes to the window and door openings on the front façade, which have been significantly altered over time.

The applicant proposes to construct the windows similar to those seen in the Property Assessor's 1967 photo. The front door will be relocated to the center and include a single side light to the left of the door and a transom above. The 1967 photo shows an off-center door with no sidelights and a single window to the left of the door. Staff finds that it is likely that the front façade had already been altered by 1967 since such a configuration is not typically seen historically. Panels below windows (seen on the left window) and window boxes (seen on the right) are more

typical of a later minimal traditional style. These elements were likely added to change doors to windows. For this reason, staff finds that a front door with sidelights and a transom could be appropriate. While an asymmetrical design may be appropriate for new construction, staff would recommend that the front entrance design be symmetrical, in terms of the sidelights, as was seen historically. The applicant has already submitted a revised plan meeting this recommendation.

The applicant also proposes to remove an existing exterior stair on the left side façade and replace the door on the second story to a window. Staff finds that this is appropriate as Sanborn maps indicate that the house was not a duplex historically.

The new construction includes a ridge raise that will increase the height of the roof by two feet (2') and meets the design guidelines. The proposed rear addition does not more than double the footprint or depth of the house and is inset two feet (2') from both rear corners before going back four feet (4') and coming back out to match the width of the house.

Both side façades include two story pieces on the addition where both the first and second stories match the width of the house. While it may be appropriate for a one story addition, if separated by an alcove, to match the width of an historic house, staff finds that the scale of the proposed addition is not appropriate because the roof and eave height are taller, making the form of the addition appear larger and to have a greater number of stories than the historic house. To help illustrate, the arrows that you see here show the half story of the existing house and the two-story portion of the addition. As proposed the width of these portions line up.

The Commission has required a two-foot (2') inset for two-story additions for many years for three reasons: to distinguish between the new and old, to make the addition easily removable if the original configurations are desired to be reconstructed at some point in the future, and to help hide additions behind historic homes. The Commission has also routinely allowed for additions to step back out, after a two-foot (2') inset, to meet the original walls of the house; however, when that addition is two-stories and it is allowed to step back out behind a one-story or a one and one-half story home, the reason for the two foot (2') inset is no longer met.

While the ridge raise and first story insets of the addition are appropriate, Staff finds the scale of the upperstory is not subordinate to the original house. Staff recommends that either the full width of the addition maintain a two-foot (2') inset or at least the upperstory is reduced in order to sit two feet (2') inside the silhouette of the historic house to meet sections II.B.1.a and II.B.1.b of the design guidelines.

Subsequent revised plans indicate that the materials are parged concrete foundation, lap siding and wood shingle siding, shingle roofing to match the existing house, and a brick chimney on the rear façade – these are common and appropriate for additions. Staff would ask to approve the window and door selections prior to installation as well as a brick sample.

While the ridge raise and first story insets of the addition are appropriate, Staff finds the scale of the upper story is not subordinate to the original house.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition with the following conditions:

1. The width of at least the upperstory, if not the entire addition, shall be reduced to sit two feet (2') inside the silhouette of the historic house;
2. Staff shall review and approve the materials of the windows, doors, and masonry prior to purchase and installation; and
3. If relocated, the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the addition meets Section II.B of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Alex Sherling, 1511 Ashwood, handed out photographs. He said that they worked from recent precedent and there is no design guideline that prevents the type of addition proposed. The house is only thirty feet (30') wide so reducing the upstairs by four feet (4') is a large reduction that would require a larger footprint or a complete redesign. The addition will not be visible for most of the year, because of landscaping.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Jones commended the applicant and architect for an appropriately sized addition that is subordinate to the house. Commissioner Price agreed but said that they have held others to the two foot (2') inset for additions and he does not see how this project is different. Commissioner Tibbs said it was one of the better additions they have seen, in terms of being complimentary with the historic home, but that he agreed with staff recommendation which supports the tools and methods they have set up for additions. There was discussion about the fact that there are different solutions to accomplish the proposal and meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve the proposed addition with the following conditions:

1. **The width of at least the upperstory, if not the entire addition, shall be reduced to sit two feet (2') inside the silhouette of the historic house;**
2. **Staff shall review and approve the materials of the windows, doors, and masonry prior to purchase and installation; and**
3. **If relocated, the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**

finding, with these conditions, the addition meets Section II.B of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

u. 3807 RICHLAND AVENUE

Application: New Construction—Addition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Paul Hoffman paul.hoffman@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2018070820

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, presented the case for an addition to 3807 Richland Ave, an application for a rear addition to the home in the Richland-West End overlay. The new construction will add six hundred and twenty-seven (627) square feet to the existing one-thousand, nine hundred and forty-four (1,944) square feet of the house. The addition will not more than double the footprint of the existing structure and is not wider or taller than the house itself. It sets in two feet (2') at the corners.

The addition's ridge will be two feet (2') below the ridge of the house. On the right side, it will meet the existing eave height of twenty feet (20'). It meets the design guidelines for location, removability, design, setbacks, roof form, fenestration and materials.

On the left side, the eave height of the house is shorter at eleven feet (11'). Where the addition widens after its inset, the eave height jumps up to nine feet (9') taller than the eave of the house. The design guidelines state that the height of an addition's eaves should be subordinate to the eave height of the house. While it may be appropriate for a one story addition, when it is inset, to match the width of an historic house or to even be wider in limited situations, staff finds that the scale of the proposed addition is not appropriate because the eave height is taller, making the form of the addition appear larger, and to have a greater number of stories than the historic house.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition with the following conditions:

1. Where the addition is two-stories, it should sit in from the existing side walls by at least two feet, or at least the taller portion should sit in;
2. Staff approve windows, doors, and roofing color; and,

3. If relocated, the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, explained that they work hard with staff to make sure that their projects meet all the requirements. He said that they are in a regressive design phase now and he emphasized that this decision will be precedent setting. He handed out drawings for other projects. He said that this project is not the same as the Dallas recommendation previously approved by the Commission. He explained how the two foot (2') inset will not work and create "Frankenstein" rooflines. Several years ago they submitted a project for 1711 Linden, where the addition steps back out to be a one foot (1') inset, instead of two feet (2').

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Ms. Zeigler explained that the staff recommendation comes from an attempt to ensure that additions are appropriately scaled for historic buildings and is part of an evolution of parameters recommended to applications.

Commissioner Jones said the addition needs to be subordinate. The two foot (2') inset on every case could be considered arbitrary; however, there needs to be something of a rule so staff knows how to guide applicants. The fact that the house is small is not a hardship. She is wavering on the side of keeping additions subordinate and smaller.

Commissioner Tibbs invited Mr. Ward back to explain the request. Mr. Ward argued that the house is not small and that the renovation costs are so high that additional square footage is necessary to make the rehab cost make financial sense. He said he does not really understand staff's recommendation or how that recommendation meets the design guidelines. He explained that on one side, the house has a high rear eave, which makes the proposed addition meet the design guidelines.

Vice-chairman Stewart said that the setback precedent is clear. Vice chairman Stewart and Commissioner Tibbs discussed with Staff the design guidelines, past decisions, and the purpose of the guidance given.

Commissioner Tibbs believes that the addition is in proportion with the historic home and meets the inset requirement. It also helps that the portion that steps back out is not very deep. The previous project that was way too large for the house it was attached to and therefore different from this proposal.

Commissioner Price said that to be consistent with other decisions, even ones at this meeting, he agrees with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Jones suggested that the issue could be dealt with on a case-by-case basis but acknowledged that that creates difficulties for staff in providing guidance to applicants. This is a two-story addition on a one and one-half-story house but she agrees it is a modest addition.

Staff member, Mr. Alexander, noted that there have been previous discussions about two-story additions that do not inset and that discussions have been ongoing for about five years. He provided a specific example from five years ago.

Commissioner Mayhall said the case before just obviously looked wrong and this one does not jump out at her.

Commissioner Tibbs stated that the project meets the design guidelines because of the height, scale setback and rhythm. He moved to approve the proposed addition with the following conditions:

1. Staff approve windows, doors, and roofing color; and,
2. If relocated, the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;

finding that with these conditions, the addition meets Section II.B of the design guidelines for the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Mayhall seconded. Commissioners Jones and Price voted in opposition and the motion failed without four concurring votes.

Vice-chairman Stewart reopened the public hearing and Mr. Ward was invited back to reiterate his request for approval. He pointed out the differences between this project and the Dallas project such as setback issues, square

footage and the use of a ridge raise. He argued that additions are not getting larger but the houses they are working on are smaller as everyone is now working with houses that have been ignored for years but it is the small houses that are left. However, this one is not a small house; it is primarily a two-story house. This house is massed differently than the previous request on Ashwood. He is concerned about the setting of precedent that will affect all future projects.

Commissioner Tibbs said the recommendation comes from additions getting larger; however, this addition is appropriately scaled to the historic building. If this addition was four to eight feet (4' to 8') deeper, he might feel differently about the proportion. Commissioner Jones stated the issue would have to be taken on a case-by-case basis and she agreed that if the proposal was a longer addition it might not be appropriate. Commissioner Jones and Stewart stated this one is also different from other proposals because there is an existing two-story form on one side of the house and the proposal does not also include a great depth or a ridge raise. The intent of the guidelines is for the addition to not overwhelm the house and since the proposal does not include all those other issues it doesn't overwhelm the house. Commissioner Price agreed that it is truly a two-story house and is swayed by the fact that it is truly a two-story house.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve the proposed addition with the following conditions:

- 1. Staff approve windows, doors, and roofing color; and,**
- 2. If relocated, the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**

finding that with these conditions, the addition meets Section II.B of the design guidelines for the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a break at 5:11 p.m., returning at 5:16 p.m.

v. 521 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New Construction—Infill; Setback determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018069887

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 521 Fatherland Street, currently a vacant lot. The lot is located at the northwest corner of Fatherland and South 6th Streets. The application is to construct duplex infill.

The outbuilding shown on the plan is not part of the application. The front edge of the infill will be twenty-seven feet (27') from the front of the property line. The site plan did not include the front setback of the historic house next door at 519 Fatherland. Staff recommends that the applicant submit a site plan showing the front setback of 519 Fatherland and that staff approved the staking of the front setback prior to construction in order to confirm its compatibility.

The proposed building will be located five feet, four inches (5'4") from the left side of the property, meeting the base-zoning setback. The applicant is proposing to situate the infill eight feet (8') from the right/South 6th Street property line. Base zoning requires a ten-foot (10') side setback from the side street on corner lots. The structure therefore needs a setback determination. Staff finds the proposed eight-foot (8') setback to be appropriate because the location and scale of the building will be compatible with the historic context and the setback is similar to what is found in the district. MHZC approved a similar side setback of eight feet (8') at 601 Fatherland, catty corner from this house.

The new infill will be two-stories in height. It will have a maximum ridge height of thirty-one feet (31') from grade at the front. Staff finds that this height and scale meets the historic context, where historic houses are one and two stories in height, ranging from twenty-four feet (24') tall to thirty-one feet (31') tall. The building will be thirty-seven feet (37') wide. In the surrounding area, there are several historic houses on fifty foot (50') wide lots that are

the same width or wider, including two-story houses at 606 and 610 Fatherland Street. Overall, staff finds that the height and scale are appropriate to the historic context.

In historic preservation zoning overlays like Edgefield, MHZC must review and approve all permanent landscape features like retaining walls. In this case, the retaining wall will create a raised yard space and will not have a slab or pavers. The retaining wall will connect to the infill at the front and side facades. The point of the raised yard is to provide access to the side entry on the left façade. There will be steps leading to the raised yard on the front facade. Staff finds that where retaining walls are found, they are typically away from the house. When they are in the front yard, they are typically away from the house, near the front and side property lines, creating an even yard height. The proposed raised yard instead creates a small raised yard - like a small terrace. As this is not a feature typically found in the historic Edgefield Neighborhood, staff recommends that the raised yard area be removed from the project and the side entry be accessed via stairs.

The infill will be oriented towards Fatherland Street, which is appropriate. The front door to the right residential unit will be on the front façade, behind a partial width front porch that is six feet, eight inches (6'8") deep. French doors will also be behind the front porch.

The entry to the left residential unit will also be accessed via the front porch, but this door will be on the side of the gabled-ell.

Staff finds that this door, which does not face Fatherland Street, is appropriate because secondary and additional doors were commonly found on the side like this.

The left unit also has a secondary entrance on the left façade, just behind the front left corner of the house. This entry will have a bracketed stoop cover over the door. It will read as a secondary entrance.

The house will have a depth of eighty-two feet, eight inches (82'8"). While deep, staff finds that the side facades of the infill, particularly the façade that faces South 6th Street – see on the top here, are varied in order to break up the wall space. In addition, the last ten feet (10') of the house is a one story unenclosed porch.

Staff recommends that instead of the raised bed and retaining wall, there be simple stairs on the side façade leading to this entrance.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The applicant submit a site plan showing the front setback of 519 Fatherland Street, and the infill's front setback match the front setback of 519 Fatherland, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. Staff approve the roof color and texture, a brick sample, the materials of the front porch floor and steps, all windows and doors, and the walkway material prior to purchase and installation;
4. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;
5. The applicant remove the raised yard area on the front façade and instead provide stair access to the left façade side entry; and,
6. Staff approve all permanent landscape features, including but not limited to, fencing, pathways, pavers, pools, and decks.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed infill, outbuilding, and setback determination meet Sections III.B.2. and IV. of the design guidelines.

Chris Wright, representing the applicant, requested approval.

Ms. Baldock noted that public comment was sent to them via email.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

1. **The applicant submit a site plan showing the front setback of 519 Fatherland Street, and the infill's front setback match the front setback of 519 Fatherland, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
2. **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
3. **Staff approve the roof color and texture, a brick sample, the materials of the front porch floor and steps, all windows and doors, and the walkway material prior to purchase and installation;**
4. **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
5. **The applicant remove the raised yard area on the front façade and instead provide stair access to the left façade side entry; and,**
6. **Staff approve all permanent landscape features, including but not limited to, fencing, pathways, pavers, pools, and decks;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed infill, outbuilding, and setback determination meet Sections III.B.2. and IV. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

w. 1817 SWEETBRIAR AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018069909

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for infill at 1817 Sweetbriar Avenue. The existing house at 1817 Sweetbriar Avenue was constructed circa 1952, outside the period of significance for development of this part of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. In August 2018, MHZC staff issued an administrative permit for the demolition of the structure. The lot is one hundred feet (100') wide and one hundred and seventy-five feet (175') deep, or seventeen thousand, five hundred (17,500) square feet.

The application is to construct a detached duplex infill – or two houses on one lot. The Historic Zoning Commission typically requires that new duplex infill development be fully attached, as typically two detached houses do not meet the rhythm of spacing of houses along the street. However, in this case of 1817 Sweetbriar, staff finds that two separate detached houses, which are modestly scaled, meet the rhythm of spacing of houses along this block of Sweetbriar. With the lot being one hundred feet (100') wide, the two detached houses will each visually appear to be on fifty-foot (50') wide lots.

In the immediate vicinity, the lot sizes vary greatly. There are some wide lots that are eighty-five to one hundred and twenty-five feet wide (85'-125'), while others are more average, in the range of sixty to seventy feet wide (60'-70'). Fifty foot (50') wide lots can be found at 1905 Sweetbriar, four houses to the left, and also on the 1700 block of Sweetbriar, one block to the east. Given that there are several sixty-foot to seventy-foot (60'-70') wide lots in the immediate vicinity, staff found that two modestly-scaled detached houses would meet the historic context.

Moreover, staff found that two modestly-scaled detached houses would be more in keeping with the historic context than a larger, wider attached duplex infill. Approval is not likely to set a negative precedent for the immediate area. Staff recommends that two, detached, side-by-side, homes would only be appropriate on a lot with a width of one-hundred feet (100') or more so that the resulting perception is of two fifty foot (50') wide lots that meet the greater context of the neighborhood.

On Sweetbriar, there are just two additional lots that meet this condition: 1821 Sweetbriar (one hundred and twenty-five foot (125') wide lot, constructed circa 1940) and 1907 Sweetbriar (one hundred foot (100') wide lot, constructed circa 1940). Both buildings are contributing and so would not be candidates for demolition and neither building appears to be far enough to one side of the lot to accommodate a second house next to it, in a manner that meets the rhythm of the street.

The Planning Department has found that the lot does not meet subdivision regulations, as Planning's strict calculations would require frontages of fifty-five feet (55') for each house for the lot to be legally subdivided. Staff finds that although the property does not meet the specific calculations of the subdivision regulations, the possibility of what appears as two different lots does meet the historic context. Again, staff found that two, modestly-scaled houses would be more appropriate than one, wider and larger duplex structure.

The two houses will be spaced a minimum of sixteen feet (16') apart, although the bulk of the houses will be about twenty feet (20') apart. The houses will meet all base zoning setbacks. They will be a minimum of five feet (5') from the side property lines, and over fifty feet (50') from the rear property line. The front setbacks will approximate the front setbacks of the houses at 1815 and 1821 Sweetbriar.

The site does not have alley access. Vehicular access to the site will be via a shared driveway between the two houses, which is appropriate. The applicant will return to MHZC in the future for approval of detached garages; they are not part of this application.

The two houses will both be one-and-a-half stories in height with ridge heights of about twenty-seven feet, six inches (27'6") from grade. The immediate context is a mix of one and one-and-a-half story historic houses with heights ranging from eighteen to twenty-eight feet (18'-28'). The taller houses on the block, those that are between twenty-seven and twenty-eight feet (27'-28') tall, are generally infill houses approved by MHZC between 2013 and 2018. In this slide, the middle and bottom photo are infill houses approved at twenty-seven to twenty-eight feet tall (27'-28').

Given that the lots in the immediate vicinity are generally wider than the fifty-foot (50') wide areas for these two infill houses, staff finds that the new infill houses should have heights closer to the mid and lower-range of heights in the immediate vicinity. Although the applicant is proposing heights of about twenty-seven feet, six inches (27'6"), staff recommends that their heights be reduced so that they are no taller than twenty-six feet (26') tall from grade at the front. This will match the height of the historic house at 1821 Sweetbriar, next door to 1817 Sweetbriar

The two houses will both have primary widths of thirty-five feet (35'), although one-story bay bump outs bring the total widths to thirty-seven feet (37'). By comparison, the historic houses in the immediate vicinity have widths ranging from thirty-three feet to fifty-one feet (33' - 51'), with the average width being approximately forty feet (40'). Given that the infill houses will appear to be on fifty-foot (50') wide lots and the surrounding lots are largely sixty-foot (60') wide or wider, staff finds that the proposed widths are appropriate. The proposed widths allow for appropriate setbacks and spacing between the two new houses.

On "House A," the applicant is proposing a brick foundation at the front, with a brick porch floor and possibly brick steps. Historically, there was a change in material from the foundation to the wall above; MHZC has typically required a stone, stucco, or split-faced concrete block foundation with a brick wall. Also, a brick porch floor is not typical for historic houses, as porch floors were typically concrete or wood. Staff recommends that there be a change in material at the foundation level, and that the front porch be wood or concrete. For "House B," the drawings note the foundation material as "block," and staff recommends that the block be split faced.

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. MHZC staff confirm the front setback's compatibility with the historic context during construction;
3. The infills' heights be no taller than twenty-six feet (26') tall from grade at the front;
4. "House A" have a change in material from the foundation to the wall above;
5. The porch floor and steps for "House A" be wood or concrete;
6. The concrete block for "House B" be split faced;
7. Staff approve a brick sample, all windows and doors, and all roof materials prior to purchase and installation; and
8. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines.

Kaitlyn Smous, architect for the project, described the project and the context of the small post-war homes. They agreed with all conditions with the exception of #3, regarding height. She claimed that the precedent is for twenty-seven feet (27') for infill in the area and she read several staff recommendations to prove the point.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Jones commended the architect for creating appropriately scaled homes for the area. She agrees that two is better than one large building. Looking at other infills there are varying sizes and heights in the area so the height is appropriate. Commissioner Tibbs agreed the proposal fits into the context and that the two homes fits the rhythm of the street. Commissioner Price agreed with all.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones 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. MHZC staff confirm the front setback's compatibility with the historic context during construction;**
 - 3. "House A" have a change in material from the foundation to the wall above;**
 - 4. The porch floor and steps for "House A" be wood or concrete;**
 - 5. The concrete block for "House B" be split faced;**
 - 6. Staff approve a brick sample, all windows and doors, and all roof materials prior to purchase and installation; and**
 - 7. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
- finding that with these conditions, the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the design guidelines.**

Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

x. 602 TAYLOR STREET (1401 5th Avenue North)

Application: New Construction – Infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018070424

Jenny Warren, staff member, presented the case for infill construction at 602 Taylor Street. This application is part of a larger site development project at the Werthan complex in Germantown. The part of the project under review today is the new construction of a commercial infill building.

The proposed building will sit on Taylor Street, just west of where 6th Street terminates at Taylor. The site is currently vacant, covered in grass and pavement. The new building will be sited in front of a portion of the existing Werthan warehouse building, which is being rehabilitated as part of the larger site project.

At its highest point, the building is just under twenty-eight feet (28'), which meets the guidelines. The length is considerable at approximately one hundred and sixty-five feet (165'), but that is appropriate in an industrial setting such as this. Staff finds the height and scale to be appropriate.

On these two elevations, you can see how significantly the site slopes, falling away from the Taylor Street frontage and sloping down to the west as well. The front of the building will be about one or one-and-a-half stories, while the rear is a full two stories, due to this slope. In terms of design, Staff finds the proposal to be appropriate. The building is well articulated, with regular openings breaking up the massing. The one exception is the piece of blank raised foundation wall along Taylor Street. Staff recommends that this piece of wall be articulated in some way.

The materials primarily include brick, metal and glass. Staff finds these materials to meet the guidelines as appropriate for infill at the Werthan site. Additional immediate site work includes stairs and pavers.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The exposed concrete foundation wall along the western end of the Taylor Street elevation shall be articulated; and
2. MHZC staff approve following materials prior to purchase and installation: a brick sample, the color of the corrugated metal, the exterior stair and railing material, the plaza pavers and all windows and doors; and
3. The sidewalk along Taylor Street shall be brick

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

Jesse Wilmoth and Dallas Caudle, applicants said they agreed with the conditions.

Sonya Link, representing the neighborhood association, stated that the group supported the project.

Motion:

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

1. **The exposed concrete foundation wall along the western end of the Taylor Street elevation shall be articulated; and**
2. **MHZC staff approve following materials prior to purchase and installation: a brick sample, the color of the corrugated metal, the exterior stair and railing material, the plaza pavers and all windows and doors; and**
3. **The sidewalk along Taylor Street shall be brick;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed project meets Sections III of the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Mayhall seconded. Commissioner Jones abstained and Vice-chairman Stewart voted in favor. The motion passed with four concurring votes.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

I. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES

m. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 pm