

DAVID BRILEY  
MAYOR



**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission  
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

**METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC)  
MINUTES  
December 19, 2018**

**Commissioners Present:** Chairman Bell and Vice Chair Stewart, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, David Price, Brian Tibbs

**Zoning Staff:** Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Melissa Sajid, Jenny Warren, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Susan Jones

**Applicants:** Craig Kennedy, Martin Wieck and Jeff Zeitlin, Alex Huffstutter, Mark Lynn and Carly Campbell, Paul Boulifard, Van Pond, Mitch Hodge

**Councilmembers:** None

**Public:** None

Chairman Bell called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Chairman Bell 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 there haven't been any requests to revise the agenda.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**II. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS**

None present.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. November 19, 2018

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to accept the revised minutes. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

### III. CONSENT AGENDA

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

#### a. 1208 PARIS AVE

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

#### b. 1207 DALLAS AVE

Application: Partial Demolition; New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander, sean.alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018070250

#### c. 2811 OAKLAND AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding/Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018075666 and T2018075669

#### d. 2302 BELMONT BLVD

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding/ Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018075677 and T2018075677

#### e. 1514 WOODLAND ST

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018075697

#### f. 1231 6TH AVE N

Application: Alterations; New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 19  
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018075711

#### g. 1200 N 14TH ST

Application: New Construction—Addition and Outbuilding; Setback determination.  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018075733

#### h. 3534 RICHLAND AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill; Setback determination  
Council District: 24  
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018076152

**i. 2512 WOODLAWN DR**

Application: New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018076155

**j. 418 FAIRFAX AVE**

Application: Partial Demolition; New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Sean Alexander, sean.alexander@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018076172

**k. 810 POWERS AVE**

Application: New Construction—Addition  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018076417

**l. 628 SHELBY AVE**

Application: Demolition  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T2018074487

**m. 3930 CAMBRIDGE AVE**

Application: New Construction-Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU)  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov  
PermitID#: T20180076448

Commissioner Jones arrived at 2:09 pm.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Stewart moved to approve all consent items with their applicable conditions. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS**

**n. 115 COTTAGE LN**

Application: Historic Landmark  
Council District: 15  
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov

Ms. Zeigler presented the case for a Historic Landmark for Logue Haven at 115 Cottage Lane. The building is significant for its architecture, as a great example of the American Foursquare and is eligible for listing in the

National Register of Historic Places and so meets criteria 3 and 5 of section 17.36.120. The full history of the site is available in the staff report.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Stewart moved to recommend to City Council that Logue Haven be adopted as a Historic Landmark finding it meets the qualifications for the overlay and that the existing design guidelines for Historic Landmarks be used to guide future changes. Commissioner Price 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.

**o. 925 FATHERLAND STREET**

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding/ Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU)

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018070099

Staff member, Paul Hoffman presented the case for 925 Fatherland St. [Public comment was received via email.] 925 Fatherland Street is an application for a DADU behind the home. The proposed outbuilding meets the design guidelines for location, setbacks and materials, however it is designed with a roof form and eave height that are not compatible. The proposed overall height of twenty feet, eight inches (20'8"), is subordinate to the height of the historic house (twenty-three feet, two inches: 23'2"). However the flat-roofed section is nineteen feet, ten inches (19'10"), which exceeds the eave height of the house by about seven and a half feet (7'6"). The footprint is seven hundred and forty-nine (749) square feet, but the cantilevered portion upstairs adds approximately twenty-five (25) additional square feet. As the Commission has previously determined that an overhanging section counts in overall square footage, Staff finds that it is twenty-four (24) square feet over the allowable footprint.

The proposed roof form is a gabled section crossed with a flat roof. Typically the roof of an outbuilding should have at least a 4/12 pitch. The flat roof is not typical of the roof form of surrounding historic outbuildings. When a flat roof is seen, it has usually been on a smaller, one-story example.

Therefore Staff recommends disapproval of the DADU, finding that it does not meet Section III.B.H.1 of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines, or Section 17.16.030.G.7 and Section 17.16.030.G.8 of the DADU ordinance.

Craig Kennedy, architect, explained the applicant's intent of the design. He argued that the visibility from street is minimal. The main gabled portion is two feet (2') lower than the historic building and the proportion is in line with the historic building. They can reduce the overall square footage by twenty-five (25) square feet to meet the requirements. It will have views facing towards downtown. The ground floor is a studio. The "tube" portion is scaled to the width of an appropriate dormer, although it is not a dormer as it is two-stories in height.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Price said he appreciated the architect's desire to use contemporary designs, which have been approved in the past; however, this version doesn't meet the design guidelines in terms of form. Commissioner Tibbs agreed, stating that the DADU ordinance was specific and he feels uncomfortable deviating from the standards.

Commissioner Mosley said that in trying to get flat roofs within the DADU ordinance, the eave height is different than what the ordinance might intend for flat roofs. It's a bit too tall for contemporary interpretation.

Commissioner Stewart read the design guidelines that states the roofline should be similar in shape and pitch to historic outbuildings so he didn't see any way to approve this one.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove the DADU, finding that it does not meet Section III.B.H.1 of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines for massing or roof form, or Section 17.16.030.G.7 for massing and Section 17.16.030.G.8 for design standards of the DADU Ordinance. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

## VII. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

### p. 945 S DOUGLAS

Application: Preliminary SP

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018076183

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the case for the first phase of an SP at 945 S Douglas.

This is an application for a rezoning to a Specific Plan, or SP. The property is a large, irregularly shaped lot at the corner of South Douglas Avenue and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, within the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood. A demolition permit has been issued for the non-contributing church that sits on the lot. You are reviewing the preliminary SP application today, looking specifically at the proposed site plan and massing. If this Preliminary SP is approved by the Planning Commission, then the applicant will come back to you with final building plans.

The church sits on top of a hill surrounded by driveways and parking lots. A stone retaining wall runs along the street-frontage, next to the sidewalk. Historically, this site was divided into several separate lots, with houses fronting the street, as seen in this 1914 Sanborn map. We will first look at the proposed site plan, and then move on to the massing.

The site plan re-introduces houses along the curved street-frontage and also proposes a cluster of houses on the interior of the site, oriented toward a courtyard. Notice that seven of the nine street-facing houses have a uniform setback of twenty feet (20') from the front property line. The houses labelled as #8 and #9 will step back about thirty-five feet (35') and fifty feet (50') respectively to ease the transition to the existing houses along the south side of S Douglas, which have fairly deep setbacks at approximately sixty feet (60').

Most of the street-facing houses are spaced about twenty-five feet (25') apart at the street, though due to the curve of the site, they come closer toward the back – most will maintain a separation of at least ten feet (10'), which is typical for the district. They are all oriented to the street appropriately and a walkway will be constructed connecting the houses to one another, interior to the stone wall. The interior units are not subject to specific setback and rhythm of spacing requirements. They will be regularly spaced and oriented toward the courtyard. These interior units will be connected to the street by walkways. Vehicular access will be provided via the alley off of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue S. All of the units will have attached garages off of the interior driveway, which staff finds to be appropriate.

Moving on to massing, the proposal is for all nineteen (19) houses to be a maximum of thirty-five feet (35') tall, from grade. The nine (9) street-facing houses are proposed to have a one-and-a-half story form, while the ten (10) interior houses will have a two story form. The historic houses in the immediate vicinity are all one story or one-and-a-half story forms. These are the houses that are typically used to determine historic context, and thus the appropriate massing for new construction. However, there are many examples of tall two-story infill, constructed shortly before the establishment of the overlay. While new construction is not typically used to determine context for infill in conservation overlays, in this case, nearly the entire south side of the 900 block of S Douglas Avenue consists of two-story new construction. Given this, staff finds that some two story forms could be appropriate on this site.

For the interior ten (10) units, the applicant has proposed all two-story houses with thirty-five foot (35') ridge heights and nineteen foot, eight inch (19'8") eave heights. The roofs will be front gabled with a 12/12 pitch and will use shed dormers. The proposed building width is twenty-five feet (25') and small front porches will face the courtyard. These houses will include attached garages and will have an overall footprint of just under a thousand

(1,000) square feet. Staff finds the massing could be appropriate for these units, as the basic proportions are appropriate for historic two-story houses, they are interior to the lot, with minimal visibility from the street and they have relatively small footprints.

For the street-facing houses, staff finds that the proposed widths are appropriate to the historic context and appreciates the variety of widths proposed, ranging from thirty-one to thirty-nine feet (31'-39'). The proposal calls for all one-and-a-half story houses facing the street, but these are very tall, with thirty-five foot (35') ridge heights and fifteen foot, four inch (15'4") eaves – as measured from the foundation. For comparison, the nearby historic houses have ridge heights of approximately eighteen feet to thirty feet (18'-30') and eave heights that measure between eleven and twelve feet (11'-12') from the foundation height. Staff is concerned that the thirty-five foot (35') ridge height, combined with the more than fifteen foot (15') eave height – both taller than the historic context - creates an overall height and massing that is too large.

To illustrate our concern with the eave heights – Here is the historic house at 937 S Douglas, located right next to the development. The purple line illustrates the eave height, from the foundation or finished floor –it measures approximately twelve feet (12') tall. The applicant proposes a similar form, but here the eave height, also measured from the foundation, is over fifteen feet (15') high. Plenty of historic examples of taller eaves can be found if you measure from grade, or ground-level, as shown by the blue line. Staff recognizes that due to grade and foundation heights, the eave height may vary a bit as measured from the ground, but recommends that it not exceed twelve feet (12') from the foundation, as is standard in historic examples.

While staff agrees that given the greater context some street-facing units could be appropriate with a ridge height of up to thirty-five feet (35'), it is not appropriate for all the units to max out this height. As such, staff suggests a mix of building heights and forms. Our recommendation is as follows:

Two of the houses facing the street could be two story in form, with a maximum ridge height of thirty-five feet (35') and a maximum eave height of nineteen feet, eight inches (19'8"). We suggest perhaps Units 1 and 8. The remaining houses should all be one-and-a-half stories. The seven (7) one-and-a-half story houses should all have eaves no taller than twelve feet (12'). Further, staff recommends that four of these have ridge heights no taller than thirty-two feet (32'). Unit 9, next to the historic house at 937 S Douglas, should be one of the shorter houses. Then we suggest units 2, 3 and 7. Staff finds that providing a mix of heights and forms along the street, rather than uniform thirty-five foot (35') heights will help the project fit within the neighborhood context.

Lastly, staff recommends a greater variety of building forms be presented for final approval, rather than just the four models that were presented here for massing purposes.

In conclusion, Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Buildings 1 and 8 (from Figure 7 of your report) be a maximum of two-story forms with a maximum ridge height of thirty-five feet (35') and maximum eave heights of nineteen feet, eight inches (19'8");
2. Buildings 4, 5 and 6 (Figure 7) be a maximum of one-and-a-half stories with a maximum ridge height of thirty-five (35') and a maximum eave height of twelve feet (12');
3. Buildings 2, 3, 7, and 9 (Figure 7) be a maximum of one-and-a-half stories with a maximum ridge height of thirty-two (32') and a maximum eave height of twelve feet (12');
4. The front-units have greater variety of forms; and
5. If the SP is approved by the Planning Commission, the applicant will return to this Commission with a second application, or additional applications, including full plans complete with design details; review of materials; windows and doors; proportion and rhythm of openings; porches and stoops, fences and walls, appurtenances and utility locations; and the overall detailing of the proposal.

With these conditions, Staff finds the site plan and massing of the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Martin Wieck, architect, stated that they have worked with MHZC staff, Planning Staff, the Councilmember and the neighborhood on the current design. He argued the definition of one and one-half story homes and claimed that

historic is limiting development in the county. He asked that the taller one-and-one-half story homes have the taller eave requested.

Commissioners asked clarifying questions of Mr. Wieck.

Jeff Zeitlin, developer for the project, stated that they are at the preliminary stage and so they don't want to be locked into a twelve foot (12') eave height and they would like to continue to work with Staff on greater heights. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Tibbs said there could be value in reviewing each house as they are brought back to the Commission. Commissioner Stewart agreed that could be of benefit for the eave height and that Staff's recommendation is also valid. This will be a dominant and visible project so height will be critical. Commissioner Price agreed.

Commissioner Mosley said that the application is preliminary but there are some specific measurements given. Staff placed dimensions on paper for a specific reason; and to back up from it, could delay the applicant as it may give them an expectation that is not ultimately approved by the Commission. The Commission needs to provide guidance to the applicant.

Commissioner Jones agreed that they will likely be looking for something shorter rather than taller in a mix. Commissioner Stewart noted that there is the possibility of tall foundations because of the grade of the lot that coupled with a tall eave height could result in a very tall building. Commissioner Mayhall agreed, citing the examples the applicant provided, that by not providing direction it could cost them money in the long run.

Ms. Zeigler provided information regarding the SP process and how it came about.

Commissioner Tibbs and Vice-chairman Stewart stated that there may be some leeway on the maximum eaves when the project returns for final review.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chairman Stewart moved to approve with the conditions that:**

- 1. Buildings 1 and 8 (Figure 7) be a maximum of two-story forms with a maximum ridge height of thirty-five feet (35') and maximum eave heights of nineteen feet, eight inches (19'8");**
- 2. Buildings 4, 5 and 6 (Figure 7) be a maximum of one-and-a-half stories with a maximum ridge eight of thirty-five (35') and a maximum eave height of twelve feet (12');**
- 3. Buildings 2, 3, 7, and 9 (Figure 7) be a maximum of one-and-a-half stories with a maximum ridge eight of thirty-two (32') and a maximum eave height of twelve feet (12');**
- 4. The front-units have greater variety of forms; and**
- 5. If the SP is approved by the Planning Commission, the applicant will return to the Commission with a second application, or additional applications, including full plans complete with design details review of materials; windows and doors; proportion and rhythm of openings; porches and stoops, fences and walls, appurtenances and utility locations; and the overall detailing of the proposal; finding the massing of the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**VIII. VIOLATIONS/ ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUS APPROVALS**

**IX. MHZC ACTIONS**

**q. 3707 RICHLAND AVE**

Application: Partial Demolition; New Construction—Addition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018076183

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for an addition at 3707 Richland Ave, a historic one story Craftsman style house with a hipped roof with projecting gables and dormers. It has a stone veneer first story with wood shingle siding in the gable fields. The house was constructed circa 1930 or earlier, and contributes to the historic character of the area.

The applicant is proposing to demolish everything on the house from the eaves up: the main hipped roof, gables, and dormers, and to increase the wall height and build a new taller, steeper roof.

It is not appropriate to demolish a major portion of a building that has architectural or historical significance. The proposal does not meet this design guideline.

The addition would increase the first story wall height, and add a roof with a steeper pitch that gives it taller gables and taller peak. The addition would also expand the house to the rear.

Additions to historic buildings should not disturb the building's primary facades, additions should not destroy historic material, and they should be reversible without impairing the historic form and integrity of the building. The proposal does not meet these design guidelines.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposal to demolish the original roof, dormers, and gable field at 3707 Richland Avenue, along with a proposed increase of the first-story wall height and construction of a new taller upperstory and rear addition, finding the proposal to be inappropriate and to not meet the following sections of the design guidelines for the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay:

- II.B.1.a (Height)
- II.B.1.b (Scale)
- II.B.1.d (Materials)
- II.B.1.e (Roof Shape)
- II.B.1.g (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings)
- II.B.2.a & II.B.2d (Additions)
- III.B.2.a & III.B.2.b (Demolition)

Alex Huffstutter, owner of the property, said that the report is based on the removal of the roof and there isn't a design guideline that says they cannot do that. He does not agree that the roof is integral and that it is against the public interest to remove the roof. The house is not intact as all the rafter tails were cut for gutters. If they are going to replace the rafters anyway, might as well go ahead and change the roof pitch. They are suggesting cedar shake, rather than the asphalt shingle noted in the report and all the windows will be replaced. The façade has to be removed to shore up the foundation so might as well get additional wall height. He maintains that the character of the house will be consistent with what it is now. The house is already the smallest one and won't be as big as new construction down the street. He should be able to get the square footage he needs and wants.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Vice-chairman Stewart said the neighborhood has a long history with the overlay and that the guidelines are based on the Secretary of Interior Standards. Preventing demo of historic buildings is a foundation of the design guidelines. Commissioner Price said that it is a lovely example of a craftsman bungalow and the proposal runs counter to the very heart of the design guidelines with the purpose of preserving historic character.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mayhall moved to disapprove the proposal to demolish the original roof, dormers, and gable field at 3707 Richland Avenue, along with a proposed increase of the first-story wall height and construction of a new taller upperstory and rear addition, finding the proposal to be inappropriate and to not meet the following sections of the design guidelines for the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: II.B.1.a (Height), II.B.1.b (Scale), II.B.1.d (Materials), II.B.1.e (Roof Shape), II.B.1.g (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings), II.B.2.a & II.B.2d (Additions), III.B.2.a & III.B.2.b (Demolition). Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**



**r. 918 A WALDKIRCH AVE**

Application: New Construction—Addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018076146

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for an addition at 918 A Waldkirch.

This is a request to construct a fully enclosed walkway from the house to the outbuilding. The house located at 918 A Waldkirch Avenue was constructed c. 2007 and is an attached duplex that was constructed prior to the Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. It does not contribute to the historic character of Waverly Belmont as it is recent construction.

The property includes an existing detached outbuilding that is connected to the house via an uncovered deck; both the outbuilding and deck were also constructed prior to the overlay. Currently there is approximately twelve feet (12') between the two buildings but there will be no separation if there is an addition between the two. Generally, the Commission requires at least twenty feet (20') between the rear of a primary building and an outbuilding.

The applicant proposes to construct a four feet (4') by seventeen feet (17') enclosed addition that connects the house to the outbuilding. As proposed, the addition is neither taller nor wider than the house, but it will increase the massing of the unit so that the depth extends from the front setback to the rear setback. According to the site plan, this would increase the depth of the house from fifty-six feet (56') to ninety-three feet (93'). Staff finds that the proposed depth created by the addition does not meet the historic context. The Commission has approved several additions to historic homes on Waldkirch Avenue near the subject property since the conservation overlay has been in effect, and the overall depth of those houses including the additions range from approximately fifty-four feet (54') to sixty-six feet (66') deep.

While this house is not a historic house, the proposed construction should meet the design guidelines in order for the site to move closer towards meeting the historic context. Staff finds that the proposed addition does not achieve this. While a fully enclosed connection does not meet the design guidelines, staff finds that a covered breezeway that is not enclosed on the sides could be appropriate in this case. The Commission has approved covered breezeways connecting a house to an outbuilding in previous cases, finding that the open nature of a breezeway to be appropriate.

The purpose of the proposed addition is to create an attached garage. Section III.H.6.c. of the design guidelines states that "generally, attached garages are not appropriate" for new construction. The italicized language further states that attached garages may be appropriate when they are a typical feature of the neighborhood and when the location of the garage is located in the basement level. Staff finds that attached garages are not a typical feature of the Waverly Belmont neighborhood. In addition, while there is some change in grade on the site, the addition would not create a garage that is fully at basement level. Furthermore, staff finds that a covered breezeway as an alternative to the fully enclosed addition could be appropriate on this site.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the condition that the addition not be enclosed on the sides. This would allow for a covered breezeway, which the Commission has approved in similar situations, finding that the open nature of a breezeway to be appropriate as opposed to a fully enclosed addition. With this condition, staff finds that the project meets Section III of the *Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Mark Lynn, designer of the project, and Carly Campbell, property owner, stated that the house is so inset that you cannot see the enclosed breezeway. There is already a wall there to separate the two units so he is just adding another wall. Ms. Campbell is pregnant, the steps ice over, and it's a hazard. He argued that wind and rain will still ice the steps, even with a covering. Ms. Campbell said the main point is that it cannot be seen from the street or the alley; she wasn't even able to get photographs. All the materials will match the house and it will look like it has always been there. The rest of the deck will remain open as they like to grill.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioners Jones and Mayhall were convinced the project is appropriate by the fact that there is an existing wall and because of the low visibility of the proposal. Commissioner Mosley said the proposal is not obtrusive but it may be arbitrary to allow it when it has not been allowed in the past. Commissioner Price also expressed concern about setting a precedent.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Mosley moved to approve with the condition that the addition not be enclosed on the sides. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed with Commissioners Mayhall and Jones voting in opposition.**

**s. 1502 PARIS AVE**

Application: Partial Demolition; New Construction—Addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018076080

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 1502 Paris, an application to construct an addition to a one and one-half story historic house.

The addition will include a ridge-raise, which will be stepped in from the sides of the house. It will have a two-story component, but the two story component will be tucked in two feet from the sides of the one and one-half story primary mass on the house. Staff finds this massing to be appropriate because although the ridge raise makes it taller, stepping in the upperstory makes the massing subordinate.

Other aspects of the proposal, such as roof form and window pattern, also meet the design guidelines. The materials will be appropriate, but staff asks to review the materials, including masonry and window and door selections.

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

1. Staff approve the unknown materials, including masonry, and the window and door selections are approved administratively prior to construction; and,
2. The HVAC units and utilities are behind the midpoint or on the rear of the building.

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

Paul Boulifard, architect for the project, stated that he was available for any questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed addition with the following conditions:**

1. **Staff approve the unknown materials, including masonry, and the window and door selections prior are approved administratively prior to construction; and,**
  2. **The HVAC units and utilities are behind the midpoint or on the rear of the building;**
- finding that 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.**

**t. 3925 CAMBRIDGE AVE**

Application: Partial Demolition; 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

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 3925 Cambridge Ave, an application to construct an addition which will require a rear setback determination.

The addition would attach to the historic house on the rear and the left side, wrapping the corner and extending to the left. We have had a few cases recently where wrapping the corner has been discussed, and the consensus is that it is generally not appropriate in most situations. But here the lot is considerably shallower than most, and it is also considerably wider. Staff finds that the unusual lot proportions could justify an addition that envelops the corner, but in making that exception from the norm, 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 has an attached front-facing garage, as did the previous version. As with the previous submittal, the height of the addition is subordinate.

In the proposal disapproved last month, the front of the garage was set back twelve feet (12') from the front of the house, or roughly a third of the way back. This was not approved, as the Commission found the relationship not subordinate and not compatible. In the current proposal the garage has been pushed back an additional six feet (6') to about the midpoint. Staff finds that this is more appropriate.

The applicant is requesting a five foot (5') rear setback, a seventy-five percent (75%) reduction of the standard 20 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's conceivable that the same setbacks would also be for Aberdeen, which could leave only ten feet (10') between houses. Staff finds that the five foot (5') rear setback would not be appropriate.

The addition is otherwise very similar to the previous proposal as I said in its height, but also the materials and overall character.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition to 3925 Cambridge Avenue with the following conditions:

1. The rear setback shall be a minimum of ten feet (10'); and
2. The window and door selections and paving material are administratively approved.

With those conditions, Staff finds that the proposed addition would meet the design guidelines for additions in the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Van Pond, architect for the project, explained that the design guidelines envision a standard lot. He explained how the lot has some advantages and some disadvantages to what can be accomplished. The portion where they are requesting a reduced setback is just a portion of the addition, not the entire addition.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the rear setback is a condition that is prevalent in more lots and that the applicant presents a good case for the request. Vice-chairman Stewart agreed that the lots are not very deep, there is a utility line between the two properties and that existing garages are as close as three feet (3') to the rear property lines, all conditions that make this proposal appropriate without setting a precedent for future projects.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Price moved to approve the proposed addition to 3925 Cambridge Avenue with the condition that the window and door selections and paving material are administratively approved; finding that with this condition, the proposed addition meets the design guidelines for additions in the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Vice-chairman Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**u. 114 LINDSLEY PARK DR**

Application: New Construction—Infill  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid [Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov](mailto:Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov)  
PermitID#: T2018076151

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for new construction at 114 Lindsley Park Drive.

This is a request to construct a detached duplex on the property with one unit fronting Lindsley Park Drive and the other fronting South 15<sup>th</sup> Street. The property located at 114 Lindsley Park Drive is a vacant lot that has double frontage on Lindsley Park Drive and South 15<sup>th</sup> Street. The lot slopes down approximately twenty-eight feet (28') from Lindsley Park Drive to South 15<sup>th</sup> Street. The Commission approved a single-family infill project for this site in May 2017, but that project was not constructed.

The Commission typically requires new duplex infill development to be fully attached, as two detached houses usually do not meet the rhythm of spacing of houses along the street. However, in this case, the lot has double frontage and the two buildings are proposed to be back-to-back. The Commission has approved similar requests in similar cases of double-frontage lots.

The lot is one hundred and ninety-four feet (194') deep on a double frontage lot, and the lot width at both street frontages is at least fifty feet (50') wide. As a result, the two detached houses will each visually appear to be on separate fifty-foot (50') wide lots. The lot is one of three with double frontage on Lindsley Park Drive and South 15<sup>th</sup> Street, but it is the deepest of the three.

The proposed houses will meet all base zoning setbacks. Both houses will meet the minimum front setback of twenty feet (20'), which is appropriate as the abutting lots provide no historic context for a front setback. Both proposed houses will be one and one-half stories at their respective fronts. Staff finds the proposed massing is compatible with the scale of the historic context, which includes one and one-and-one-half story homes.

The overall height and width of the building facing Lindsley Park Drive is similar to the infill approved by the Commission in May 2017, and staff finds that it is compatible with the historic context. This unit will be one-and-one-half stories at the front and three stories at the rear due to the change in grade. The plan incorporates an attached garage at basement level which meets the design guidelines. The design includes some more modern detailing in the roof form, material locations, and window openings that meet the design guidelines and will help to distinguish the infill from historic homes in the neighborhood.

Here is the context for the Lindsley Park Drive unit. The photo on the left is a view of the site from Lindsley Park Drive while the photo on the right is 105 Lindsley Park Dr, which is a contributing, historic home.

The house on the left is 107 Lindsley Park Dr, which is contributing, and the photo on the right shows 104 Lindsley Park Drive, which is infill that was approved by the Commission in 2009.

The infill facing South 15<sup>th</sup> Street will have an overall height of approximately thirty-seven feet, three inches (37'3") at the front, which includes a foundation height of approximately five feet, six inches (5'6"). Given the change in grade, the house will be approximately twenty-five feet (25') tall at the rear, without an exposed foundation. Staff finds that overall height and one and one-half story form of the house are appropriate as there is no historic context on this block of South 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Like the Lindsley Park Drive unit, this infill includes modern design details that meet the design guidelines and will help to distinguish the infill from historic homes in the neighborhood. The front dormer of the infill also includes a balcony that is located fully under the dormer roof. The Commission has approved similar designs for balconies within dormers on infill.

The only other house on this block is 102 South 15<sup>th</sup> Street (shown on the left here), which was constructed c. 1955 and does not contribute to the character of the neighborhood. The context on the same side of the street as the proposed infill is shown on the right and includes the rear of the non-contributing house at 104 Lindsley Park Drive, which is three stories along South 15<sup>th</sup> Street.

Here are the side elevations. The South 15<sup>th</sup> Street unit incorporates an attached carport that is also accessed from the proposed driveway off South 15<sup>th</sup> Street. While the attached carport is not located at basement level, staff finds that it could be appropriate in this case given the steep topography on the lot.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions: (There is one fewer recommended condition than those in the staff recommendation as there was a duplicate.)

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 details, dimensions and materials of foundation, roof color, trim, windows, doors, garage door, porch steps, porch floor, porch railing, porch posts, walkway, and driveway material prior to purchase and installation;
3. The siding reveal shall not exceed five inches (5");
4. The site plan shall incorporate a walkway for each unit that connects the front porch to the street; and
5. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Staff finds that the project meets the established scale of one to one and a half story historic homes in the immediate area and meets Section II.B of the design guidelines for the Lockland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay for new construction and infill.

Mitch Hodge, architect, explained that the site is unique in terms of boundaries and topography. He stated that he agrees with the conditions. The owner said he was available for questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Vice-Chairman Stewart moved to approve the proposed detached duplex infill 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 details, dimensions and materials of foundation, roof color, trim, windows, doors, garage door, porch steps, porch floor, porch railing, porch posts, walkway, and driveway material prior to purchase and installation;**
3. **The siding reveal shall not exceed five inches (5");**
4. **The site plan shall incorporate a walkway for each unit that connects the front porch to the street; and**
5. **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 project meets II.B of the *Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**X. REQUEST FOR REHEARING**

**v. 1511 ASHWOOD AV**

Application: Request for Rehearing

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

The applicant requests a rehearing for a project that was approved with conditions at 1511 Ashwood Ave. At the November 19, 2018 public hearing Alex Sherling, property owner, spoke against one of the conditions. The Commission voted to approve the project with all conditions recommended by Staff.

The applicant now requests a rehearing. The Commission's Rules of Order allow for a rehearing in a situation when any aggrieved party has new information that was not available at the time of the hearing. In his request, the applicant cites the decision for two other projects as reasons for the rehearing. One is the decision for 1512 A Dallas made on September 19, 2018. Another is the decision for 3807 Richland Avenue made on November 19, 2018, on the same date as the decision for 1511 Ashwood but after the Ashwood hearing.

Staff maintains that there is no new information for 1511 Ashwood as the decision for 1512 A Dallas was available at the time of the November meeting. The decision for the 3807 Richland cases was not available at the time the 1511 Ashwood case was heard; however, Staff finds that the two cases are not related so one doesn't provide "new information" for the other. Commissioners specified that the 3807 Richland Avenue case was different from the 1511 Ashwood case, at the meeting, because the Richland project did not also include a ridge raise as the Ashwood project did and the Richland property had an existing 2-story form on the rear of the house, which the Ashwood property does not. Commissioners stated that projects have to be taken on a case-by-case basis; therefore Staff finds the decision for a different addition on a different house has no bearing on the approved addition for 1511 Ashwood Avenue.

Staff recommends disapproval for the request as the applicant has not provided relevant new information that was not available at the time of the request.

If the Commission agrees to a rehearing, the motion must be made by a commissioner who voted in the affirmative. Since the decision was unanimous, the motion for rehearing could be made by anyone in attendance, which would be Vice-chairman Stewart and Commissioners Jones, Mayhall, Price or Tibbs.

If the rehearing request is granted, the project will be placed on the January 2019 agenda.

Chairman Bell disclosed that she spoke to the applicant about process but not the specifics of the address. Since she was not present at the previous meeting she would turn the case over to Vice-chairman Stewart. Commissioner Jones noted that the cases were different conditions and different proposals so she does not see a reason to rehear. Commissioner Tibbs agreed that the cases were different so he was not comfortable with a rehearing. Commissioner Price agreed.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Tibbs moved to disapprove request. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**w. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES**

**x. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH**

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented an overview of the design guideline consolidation project to begin January.

The meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.