

DAVID BRILEY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

May 16, 2018

Commissioners Present: Chairman Tibbs, Vice-Chair Bell, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Cyril Stewart

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

Applicants: Nick Dryden, Brian Layton, Jim Rowan, Preston Quirk, Will Jenner, Dan and Alex Huffstutter, Michael Ward, Emily Johns, Ed King, Steve Meisner and Bobby Joslin

Councilmembers: None

Public: Carter G. Baker

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Zeigler noted that 2517 Blair, 2020 10th Ave S, and 934 McFerrin are deferred at the request of the applicants and the historic landmark designation at 1431 Shelton Avenue will be deferred until the June 20th, 2018 meeting. The purpose is so that the property owner can host a community meeting regarding the companion piece to this project which is a Neighborhood Landmark. We have also had a request to move 422 Broadway to the end of the agenda.

II. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

No councilmembers present.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 18, 2018

Motion: Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the agenda as presented. Vice-chair Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Tibbs read information about the amount of time people have to speak, the process of the consent agenda and the process for appeals.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

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

b. 106 LINDSLEY PARK DR

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018025014

c. 519 ACKLEN PARK DR

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding (revision to previously approved plan)
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland – West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov

d. 720 MCFERRIN AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Paul Hoffman Paul.Hoffman@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018024814

e. 1013 CLAYTON AVE

Application: New construction--addition; Setback determination
Council District: 17
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018025078

f. 1602 17TH AVE S

Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 17
Overlay: South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018025121

g. 1514 CEDAR LN

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#: T2018025129

h. 146 ENSWORTH AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 24
Overlay: Woodlawn West Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren Jenny.Warren@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2018025164

i. 1105 S DOUGLAS AVE

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018025168

Motion:

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

V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

j. 1431 SHELTON AVE

Application: Historic Landmark

Council District: 07

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

Deferred.

k. 161 ROSA L. PARKS

Application: Historic Landmark

Council District: 19

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

Historic Zoning Administrator Robin Zeigler presented the case. Councilman O'Connell requests the designation of a Historic Landmark for 161 Rosa L. Parks. The Frost Building, constructed in 1913 is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The building figures prominently in the history of the Southern Baptist Convention, the largest Protestant denomination in the United States. Additional history and information is in the staff report and in the National Register nomination. The Frost Building is significant as an excellent example of its style of architecture and retains its historic character and features. The property is listed in the National Register of Historic places and so meets criterion 5 of section 17.36.120 of the ordinance.

Recommendation Summary: Staff suggests the Commission recommend to City Council that the Frost Building be adopted as Historic Landmark and the existing design guidelines for Historic Landmarks be used to guide future changes. You received an email in support of the designation from a neighboring property owner via email yesterday.

There were no requests from the public or applicant to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to recommend to City Council that the Frost Building be adopted as Historic Landmark and the existing design guidelines for Historic Landmarks be used to guide future changes. Commissioner Mayhall 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.

m. 2804 HAWTHORNE PL

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018026132

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the case for 2804 Hawthorne as an application to construct a rear addition to a contributing Minimal Traditional house. The addition is to be wider than the house, which can be appropriate as the lot is sixty-eight feet (68') wide at the front and expands to one hundred and twenty feet (120') wide at the alley.

This is a roof plan and the front and left elevations for an iteration of the project which was reviewed by Staff last month and would have been recommended for disapproval but it was deferred before it was presented to the Commission. In the recommendation we wrote that the height, scale, window pattern, materials, and appurtenances didn't meet the guidelines.

The applicant made revisions, and addressed Staff's concerns about the window pattern, materials, and appurtenances, but Staff felt that the height and scale were inappropriate and the recommendation we made was for disapproval of the design.

We typically cannot accept revisions late because there wouldn't be time to review them, but the applicant reached out last week and we discussed a few additional changes that the applicant has made to the design and revised drawings were submitted. Staff has had time to review them and is comfortable making a new recommendation. The window pattern, materials, and roof forms are similar to the previous version, which Staff described in the recommendation as meeting the design guidelines. The height has been reduced by nine inches and the massing of the addition that extends to the left of the historic building's silhouette is broken up into two sections to reduce the perceived scale. Additionally, the upperstory has been broken into two dormers and stepped in further from the side walls. The dormers will resemble the historic house in having very shallow eaves, which helps to minimize their scale given that they're located so far back into the property. Staff finds that separating the addition from the historic house with an alcove on the left side helps to distinguish the old from the new, but that the alcove should be two feet (2') deep as is typically required for additions to one story houses.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval of the revised application with conditions that:

1. The alcove where the addition connects on the left side of the house should extend two feet (2') before the addition gets wider;

2. Staff shall approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
3. Staff shall approve a brick sample;
4. Staff approve the roof shingle color;
5. The clapboard siding shall be smooth faced;
6. Staff shall approve the driveway, stoop, and walkway materials;
7. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Commissioner Stewart arrived at 2:22 p.m.

Nick Dryden, architect for the project, explained the timeline and process behind the proposal. The design of the addition plays off the historic character of the home and is based on the unique conditions of the lot.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the revised application with conditions that:

- 1. The alcove where the addition connects on the left side of the house should extend two feet (2') before the addition gets wider;**
- 2. Staff shall approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- 3. Staff shall approve a brick sample;**
- 4. Staff approve the roof shingle color;**
- 5. The clapboard siding shall be smooth faced;**
- 6. Staff shall approve the driveway, stoop, and walkway materials;**
- 7. 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 the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

None.

VIII. VIOLATIONS

n. 2406 BARTON AVE

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: 2017044513

Mr. Alexander presented the case for 2406 Barton Avenue. In July of 2017, the Commission approved a rear addition to this historic house, with a ridge that stepped up taller than the historic house. The guidelines allow for additions to be taller than historic houses when it is necessary (like on a very short house or a lot that slopes up), provided that the taller portion be sufficiently set back (typically at forty feet back). This taller section happens at about thirty-seven feet (37') back, but because it only went up one foot, four inches (1'4") it wasn't expected to be very visible.

In March of this year, Staff was notified by the applicant that addition had deviated from the approved plans. As it was first approved, the first floor was to step down from the existing but it was built with a single floor level. This was going to impact the upperstory, but working with the architect Staff approved a revision that increased the height to two feet (2') taller than the historic house and changed a side-gabled roof at the back to shed dormers.

Last month, we were again informed that the addition had deviated from the approved plans. The roof has been framed to be two feet eight inches (2'8") taller than the historic house. The taller roof begins closer to the front, and now the addition is much more visible than it was anticipated to be. We met with the applicant again and tried to find a solution that lessened the visibility that we could all accept, but were not successful. They're asking to have what has been built approved after the fact.

We certainly give credit to the applicant for being proactive and letting us know that the project has deviated from the plans before it's discovered in an inspection, but it doesn't negate the fact that they deviated twice, and have now doubled the amount that the addition is taller, it goes back less than forty feet (40') before it gets taller, and it's now less compatible and more visible. Overall, Staff found it not to be very compatible.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends disapproval after-the-fact of the revision to the addition at 2406 Barton Avenue as it has been built, finding that the height and visibility are not compatible and that it does not meet section II.B.1.a. and II.B.1.b of the design guidelines for additions to historic houses in Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

If the revisions after-the-fact are not approved, the applicant could submit plans for another revision to be reviewed by the MHZC at the next meeting, or they could alter what has been constructed to extend back fifteen feet (15') before going higher at a 5:12 pitch to make a new ridge two feet (2') higher, as the addition was approved.

Commissioners and staff discussed details of the project and asked for clarifications of what happened, at what point.

Brian Layton, Britt Development, shared additional photographs and explained existing conditions which do not allow them to meet the permit. The architect made some assumptions on existing heights of the building that were not accurate.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Vice-chairman Bell noted that to approve as-is would be an exception to what they normally approve. Commissioner Stewart said he appreciated what they have run into but that there were architectural plans and the addition is highly visible. He noted that public comment was received and he was not in favor of approving the as-is conditions.

Commissioner Jones explained that she works with a builder and when changes happen, they have to meet the drawings. She didn't see any reason why the approved plans could not be met. Chairman Tibbs agreed.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the after-the-fact of the revision to the addition at 2406 Barton Avenue as it has been built, finding that the height and visibility are not compatible finding that it does not meet section II.B.1.a.and II.B.1.b of the design guidelines for additions to historic houses in Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Vice-chairman Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. MHZC ACTIONS

o. 305 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018025161

Staff member Jenny Warren presented the case. 305 Broadway is a three story brick commercial structure. Constructed circa 1910, the property contributes to the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. The applicant is proposing a vertically oriented sign along the exposed western façade of the building, where it will be visible to east-bound traffic on Broadway. Signage along secondary elevations has been permitted, the design guidelines for Broadway did not anticipate or provide for vertical wall signage, other than painted signs.

A permit was recently issued for a vertical neon sign at 400 Broadway in error. As this is the second such application to be submitted, and as the design guidelines do not provide specific guidance for this type of signage, Staff is proposing a policy to govern such situations in the future. Here is the policy staff is proposing:

Draft Vertically-Oriented Wall Signage Policy for the Broadway District

- *Appropriate location for wall signs is side elevations that are exposed party walls that historically connected to another building. Vertically oriented signage is not appropriate on front facades, rear or side facades that front an alley or street.*
- *Vertical wall signage should meet requirements for wall signage and not cover historic painted signage.*
- *Vertical wall signage should be considered within the total allotment with maximums of 15' in height and 3' in width, with the bottom of the signage at 12' from grade.*

- *Vertical signage shall not include flashing or chasing lights or moving elements.*
- *Neon signs should utilize raceways, painted the color of the building if not used as a background for the sign, in order to minimize holes in the building.*

If approved by the Commission, it will be added to the guidelines as italicized language.

The proposal meets the guidelines in that it does not extend above the window sills of the top floor, does not extend above the roof line or the parapet wall and does not cover windows or architectural details. The materials are all appropriate and the illumination as proposed is appropriate as well. The sign projects a total of six inches (6") from the wall, which is less than the thirteen inches (13") that are allowed. As proposed, the sign is only ten feet (10') from grade, Staff recommends that the bottom of the sign be moved up two feet (2') so that it is twelve feet (12') from grade. The sign is proposed to be seventeen feet six inches (17'6") tall and five feet six inches (5'6") wide. The vertical signage policy recommends that such signs be no more than fifteen feet (15') tall and three (3') wide. Staff recommends that the sign size be altered to meet these figures.

The raceway, which is the strip that supports the letters, can only be half the height of the letters that it supports. The two raceways on the larger letters meet this requirement, but on the smaller letters, the raceway height is more than half the height of the letters.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval of the proposed vertical signage with the following conditions:

1. The sign be altered in size so that it is a maximum of fifteen feet (15') high and three feet (3') wide
2. The bottom of the sign be twelve feet (12') from grade
3. The raceway height shall not exceed 50% of the height of the letters it supports
4. The sign shall not have any moving parts or lights that blink, flash, chase or that are sequential.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Vice-chairman Bell expressed concern with creating a policy when there is a sign that already exists and doesn't meet the policy. Commissioner Mayhall agreed.

In answer to Commissioner Jones' question, Ms. Warren explained that there are approximately eight (8) properties that the policy would affect.

Commissioner Jones agreed with the policy as there is enough signage already on Broadway.

Commissioner Mosley explained that the intent of the guidelines was to contemplate the signage arms war, which actually diminishes the signage.

Chairman Tibbs suggested that the policy be considered as a stand-alone piece rather than as a part of this particular signage request.

Jim Rowan, with Sign Me Up, explained that he wanted a much larger sign but he designed this one to meet all the design guidelines. He said he was interested in talking to the Commission about changing the design guidelines.

Commissioner Stewart asked the applicant to address each condition and Mr. Rowan responded that none of the conditions are in the code or the design guidelines but he was willing to do whatever the Commission approves. He would be willing to do a mural, if that is all that is allowed, but it isn't what his client wants. He agrees with all the conditions with the exception of the size.

The Commission and staff debated how the design guidelines defined the allotment and how they had been interpreted in the past. Following legal counsel's reading of the design guidelines, Ms. Warren confirmed that the sign meets the allotment.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley explained he believes the sign meets the original intent of the design guidelines and he was involved with writing them.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed vertical signage with the following conditions:

- 1. The sign be altered in size so that it is a maximum of seventeen feet (17') high and five feet (5') wide;**
- 2. The bottom of the sign be twelve feet (12') from grade;**
- 3. The raceway height shall not exceed 50% of the height of the letters it supports; and**
- 4. The sign shall not have any moving parts or lights that blink, flash, chase or that are sequential;**

finding that the project meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

p. 2517 BLAIR BLVD

Application: New construction—addition (outbuilding)

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018025025

Applicant has requested a deferral.

q. 934 MCFERRIN AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 05
Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018025033

Applicant has requested a deferral.

r. 3308 WINDSOR AVE

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 07
Overlay: Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018025053

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for 3308 Windsor. 3308 Windsor Avenue is a vacant lot in the Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The application is to construct a single family house on the vacant lot. The infill will meet all base zoning setbacks. The front setback is proposed to line up with the front setback of the house at 3304 Windsor, which is the only house on this side of the street that faces Windsor Avenue. The applicant is proposing a one-and-a-half story single family infill with a maximum ridge height of twenty-seven feet, five inches (27'5") from grade. This is compatible with the heights of houses in the surrounding area. The infill will be thirty-three feet (33') wide, which staff finds to be appropriate and to meet the historic context.

Staff finds that infill's height and scale, roof form, fenestration pattern, orientation, and known materials meet the design guidelines. In terms of context, 1132 Shelton Avenue is a contributing house to the left of 3308 Windsor. 3304 Windsor, to the right of the site, is non-contributing and not part of the conservation zoning overlay. A three-infill development across the street at Windsor and Shelton was approved by MHZC last year.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the nearby historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. Staff approve the final details, dimensions, and materials of all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
3. Staff approve the roof color and texture;
4. Staff approve a brick sample;
5. Staff approve the materials of the front and rear porch floors, steps, and railings; and
6. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III of the *Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Architect for the project, Preston Quirk, stated he was available for questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the nearby historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. Staff approve the final details, dimensions, and materials of all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- 3. Staff approve the roof color and texture;**
- 4. Staff approve a brick sample;**
- 5. Staff approve the materials of the front and rear porch floors, steps, and railings; and**
- 6. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**

finding that with these conditions, the project meets Section III of the *Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

s. 503 BUCHANAN ST

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018024879

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented the case for 503 Buchanan Street. This is an application for infill with an attached outbuilding at this vacant lot in Salemtown. The new residence will meet base zoning setback requirements of five feet (5') from the sides and twenty feet (20') from the rear. The front setback is seventeen feet and eight inches (17' 8"), which matches the nearest contributing building on this block. As the setback of this nearest contributing building is not indicated on the site plan, Staff recommends confirming the appropriate front setback prior to construction. It is a two-story building with a ridge height of thirty-four feet, nine inches (34' 9") and eave height of twenty-two feet (22'). The width is thirty-four feet (34'). The height and width meet the context of structures nearby. However the proposed side dormers add to the building's massing. The Commission has approved two-story structures, but has not allowed this much room above that. The hipped roof is an appropriate roof form. The Commission has approved infill in Salemtown with a rooftop access at the rear. But the dormers and the cut-off sort of form at the rear as drawn do not meet section III.A.B. or E for height, scale and roof form. Staff recommends removal of the dormers and completing the hipped form to the rear. The proportion and rhythm of openings are compatible, but there is one long stretch without an opening on the building's left side. This expanse of nineteen feet (19') should be broken up with a window or windows. The front porch is only five feet (5') deep; the guidelines state that a

porch should be at least six feet (6') deep, so staff recommends this as a condition of approval as well.

The proposed materials meet the design guidelines, with staff approval of masonry materials, windows and doors, and walkways and driveways. The plans do not indicate the location of HVAC or other utilities; Staff recommends that these be located behind the house or on a side façade past the midpoint. The structure includes an attached garage at the rear. These are not a typical feature, however the garage is located at the rear of the building, with access from the rear alley. The lot is very short, at ninety-nine feet (99'). For these reasons Staff finds the attached garage appropriate in this case.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height is consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The front setback is consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. The side dormers be removed;
4. The massing of the roof form be reduced;
5. The front porch be a minimum of six feet (6') deep;
6. A window or windows be added to the left side;
7. Staff approve a sample of brick and stone;
8. Staff approve the roofing color, windows and doors, and material of driveways and walkways;
9. Driveways and walkways are added to the site plan; and
10. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

Will Jenner, designer of the project, stated that he agreed with all conditions with the exception of the dormer. He explained that the house is too small without the dormer. He provided google street views of the area. In answer to Commissioner Mosely's question, Mr. Jenner said he could add a rack to the rear of the back porch.

Robert Holly, owner of the project, said that there are rooftop patios all around so he asked that the proposal be approved with the current dormer.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart stated that the dormers do not reflect a traditional dormer shape and there are no windows and therefore it does not meet the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones agreed and suggested the applicant continue to work with Staff. Commissioner Mosley noted that many of the examples given are projects constructed prior to the establishment of the overlay.

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor height is consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. The front setback is consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. The side dormers be removed;**
- 4. The massing of the roof form be reduced;**
- 5. The front porch be a minimum of six feet (6') deep;**
- 6. A window or windows be added to the left side;**
- 7. Staff approve a sample of brick and stone;**
- 8. Staff approve the roofing color, windows and doors, and material of driveways and walkways;**
- 9. Driveways and walkways are added to the site plan; and**
- 10. 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 III for New Construction of the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

t. 2020 10th AVE S

Application: New construction-infill; Setback determination

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018025147

Applicant has requested a deferral.

u. 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#: T2018026135

Mr. Alexander presented the case for 3707 Richland Ave. The house is an historic Craftsman style house with a stone veneered first story and a complex roof with hips, gables, and dormers, with shingle siding in the upperstory gable fields. The form of the house is intact and it contributes to the historic character of the neighborhood.

The applicant wants additional upperstory space, so they're requesting to demolish the roof and dormers entirely, then to replace it with a new taller roof. They would also expand the house to the rear with an addition. Unlike a side gabled house where the front slope can be extended up to increase the height, leaving the roof otherwise intact – because this is a hipped roof, this application would involve demolishing a major portion of the original building.

III.B.1 Demolition is Not Appropriate

a. if a building, or major portion of a building, is of such architectural or historical interest and value that its removal would be detrimental to the public interest; or

III.B.2 Demolition is Appropriate

b. if a building, or major portion of a building, does not contribute to the historical and architectural character and significance of the district and its removal will result in a more historically appropriate visual effect on the district

The addition does not have a terribly large footprint, but it is inextricably connected to the inappropriate demolition of the upperstory. The sides of the addition do not step in from the sides of the historic house – the applicant says it’s stepped in from the widest part of the house, but that’s not the standard the guidelines and the Commission have always required. An addition would need to be stepped in from the historic house where it attaches, not just stepped in from a shallow side bay. This retains the original form of the building envelope, in the wall and it also preserves the roof form.

II.B.2. ADDITIONS

a. Generally, an addition should be situated at the rear of a building in such a way that it will not disturb either front or side facades.

c. Contemporary designs for additions to existing properties are not discouraged when such additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material; and when such design is compatible, by not contrasting greatly, with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment.

d. A new addition should be constructed in such a manner that if the addition were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired.

The demolition is not appropriate; the addition does not meet the design guidelines. The proposal is antithetical to the very concept of historic preservation.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends disapproval of the proposal to demolish the original upperstory at 3707 Richland Avenue and construct a new taller upperstory and rear addition, finding the proposal to be an inappropriate addition under section III.B.1.a and to not meet the criteria of an appropriate demolition under sections III.B.2.a or III.B.2.b.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposal to construct a rear addition finding the proposal to not meet the following sections of the design guidelines:

II.B.1.a (Height)

II.B.1.b (Scale)

II.B.1.e (Roof Shape)

II.B.2.a & II.B.2d (Additions)

Dan Huffstutter, legal representative of the applicant, explained that he responded via writing. [Letter was sent to Commission via email.] The owners need more space upstairs and it is in poor shape. They are asking for a two foot (2’) ridge raise that he claims the design guidelines allow for, putting back on all the same features and matching the roof next door.

Alex Huffstutter, owner, said it is a very large addition and they need the additional space upstairs. They will reproduce all the features they are ripping off, just with different dimensions.

Dan Huffstutter explained that all the rafter tails were removed for gutters, prior to his son's purchase. They will not add gutters once the new roof is created.

Carter G. Baker, 3708 Richland, said he lives across the street. He asked that the commission follow the recommendation of the staff. The overlay has been in place for twenty-four (24) years and it has successfully always provided a street-façade protection. The Commission has approved the demolition of three (3) houses in the neighborhood which required that the front of the house be constructed exactly as it was. He is asking for the same consideration, that the street façade be maintained.

Commissioner Stewart said the neighborhood is one of the most valued with a tremendous amount of integrity. He explained that they are required to meet the design guidelines and the Secretary of Standards followed across the country, which do not support re-creating the past. In this case, the proposal does not meet the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones agreed. Vice-chairman Bell found that when the historic architecture is greatly altered then the building is compromised.

Motion:

Vice-chairman Bell moved to disapprove the proposal to demolish the original upperstory at 3707 Richland Avenue and construct a new taller upperstory and rear addition, finding the proposal to be an inappropriate addition under section III.B.1.a and to not meet the criteria of an appropriate demolition under sections III.B.2.a or III.B.2.b. She further moved to disapprove the proposal to construct a rear addition finding the proposal to not meet the following sections of the design guidelines: II.B.1.a (Height), II.B.1.b (Scale), II.B.1.e (Roof Shape), II.B.2.a & II.B.2d (Additions). Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Commission recessed for a 10 minute break.

v. 1515 ASHWOOD 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#: T2018026134

Mr. Alexander presented the case for 1515 Ashwood Avenue, an application to demolish the roof on this historic house in order to construct a new taller roof and to construct a new rear addition.

The roof is unusual in that: 1) side gabled roofs and front gabled dormers are common roof forms, but not so much for a house of this particular age and style and 2) The roof pitch changes mid-slope. Again this isn't unique, but it's not common. At first it was thought that the roof was sagging and needing to be straightened, but in our observation we saw no reason to think it was not built that way – and having more recently visited inside the attic I believe that we confirmed that this form does

appear to be original. It does have framing issues that need to be corrected, but the form (height, shape, pitch) is original. I couldn't see the framing of the dormers and they may not be original, but I can't be sure and we can't make decisions based on conjecture.

The proposal would remove the roof and replace it with a straight slope that has a ridge one foot taller. The three dormers would be replaced with two. It would tie into the rear slope of the roof above the height of the existing peak and would step up two feet (2') – which is actually three feet (3') taller than the existing. The sides do step in appropriately, however. The addition does not have a terribly large footprint, but it is inextricably connected to the inappropriate demolition of the upperstory.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends disapproval of the proposal to demolish the upperstory of the historic house at 1515 Ashwood Avenue finding the proposal to be an inappropriate addition under section III.B.1.a and to not meet the criteria of an appropriate demolition under sections III.B.2.a or III.B.2.b.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposal to construct a rear addition finding the proposal to not meet the following sections of the design guidelines:

II.B.1.a (Height)

II.B.1.b (Scale)

II.B.1.e (Roof Shape)

II.B.1.g (Proportion and Rhythm of Openings)

II.B.2.a & II.B.2e (Additions)

Architect for the project, Michael Ward, handed out photographs of existing conditions. He said that because of the poor condition, the roof has to be re-framed and that they want to do that by “straightening” the current roof form and raising the ridge two feet (2'). He asked that the addition be taller as he could accomplish the same with a ridge raise, which would be less attractive. The dormers do not appear to be original so he would like to go back with just two dormers, rather than the three shown on the plans. It is not fair to the client to have to accept less space when the visual impact is minor. He also requested replacing two (2) rather than three (3) dormers since the dormers did not appear to be original.

Commissioner Mosley surmised that a ridge raise could create an odd look with this particular roof form.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mayhall said the dormers do not look original and his proposal will make the house look better. Commissioner Jones agreed that the dormer proposal is appropriate.

Vice-chairman Bell said this one is different from the other because it is restoring the original form. Chairman Tibbs said that the roof may not have to be taller in order to restore original conditions but Commissioner Mosley thought that might not be the case. Further, he said that unless there is compelling information that the current roof form is not original, then it needs to be reconstructed with that feature. Vice-chairman Bell asked if there was a structural report. Ms. Zeigler explained that Mr. Walker, who is both the director of the MHZC and an architect, visited the site and agreed that it would have to be reframed.

Mr. Ward claimed that the form is not original but rather evidence of a sagging roof. He made the case that ridge raise would be an odd feature on this home if they have to reconstruct the slope of the roof but he would do it, if that is what the Commission wants.

Mr. Alexander offered a reassessment of the issue if during the selected demolition planned, evidence was found that the current roof form was not original. Mr. Ward expressed concern with trying to obtain bids for the project without really knowing what they are doing.

Vice-chairman Bell said that the dormers have gained historic significance in their own right, since they are seen on the earliest photograph available from the early 1970s.

Commissioner Stewart said that the roof form is a contributing factor and it's important to retain the existing form. The bow in the roof is a feature of the neighborhood going back to the 60s. It's clear the roof has to be reconstructed but the ration, shape, and dimensions need to be retained to meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove a new roof form for the upperstory of the historic house at 1515 Ashwood Avenue finding the proposal to be an inappropriate addition under section III.B.1.a and to not meet the criteria of an appropriate demolition under sections III.B.2.a or III.B.2.b. Further, reconstruction of the existing roof form is approved with the option of a ridge raise, as defined by the design guidelines, finding the proposal to not meet the following sections of the design guidelines: II.B.1.a (Height), II.B.1.b (Scale); II.B.1.e (Roof Shape). Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Alexander noted that the addition itself could receive an administrative permit.

w. 1404 LINDEN AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018026130

Mr. Alexander presented the case for infill at 1404 Linden. He stated that the proposed infill largely meets the design guidelines.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval of the proposed infill with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The front setback be consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. A sidewalk be added from the sidewalk to the front porch;

4. The front porch be a minimum of six feet (6') deep;
5. A change in material occur between the foundation and the wall above;
6. The front steps and porch floor be wood or concrete;
7. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
8. Staff approve a brick sample;
9. Staff approve the roof shingle color;
10. The cement fiberboard lap siding be smooth with a five inch (5") reveal; and
11. 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.1. of the Belmont Hillsboro-Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

The applicant, Emily Johns of Aspen Construction stated she agreed to all conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

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

- 1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. The front setback be consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. A sidewalk be added from the sidewalk to the front porch;**
- 4. The front porch be a minimum of six feet (6') deep;**
- 5. A change in material occur between the foundation and the wall above;**
- 6. The front steps and porch floor be wood or concrete;**
- 7. Staff approve the final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
- 8. Staff approve a brick sample;**
- 9. Staff approve the roof shingle color;**
- 10. The cement fiberboard lap siding be smooth with a five inch (5") reveal; and**
- 11. 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.1. of the Belmont Hillsboro-Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Vice-chairman Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

x. 2810 W LINDEN AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018024823

Staff member, Paul Hoffman presented the case for an addition and outbuilding at 2810 West Linden. This is an application for an outbuilding and rear screened porch addition to this contributing home in Hillsboro-West End. The outbuilding is proposed at ten feet (10') from the rear of the house. The Commission has required at least twenty feet (20'), however staff finds the location appropriate in this case for several reasons: The new structure is in the same location as an outbuilding historically; there has been a curb cut in place for this access; and moving the outbuilding farther to the rear of the lot would put it closer to the residence at 2218 19th Avenue South. The lot was subdivided previously, so there is not as much buffer area as is typical. For these reasons staff finds the location appropriate and recommends approval. The outbuilding is one and a half stories with a footprint of eight hundred and eighty-six square feet (886sqft). It meets the remaining guidelines, with staff approval of materials. The addition is a screened porch, it is twenty-two feet (22') deep by fourteen feet (14') wide, adding three hundred and thirty-three square feet (333sqft) to the house. The addition meets the relevant design guidelines, except that the new chimney is drawn with a lap siding material, which has not been approved in the past. Staff recommends that the chimney be masonry or stucco.

Recommendation Summary: Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The chimney is clad in masonry or stucco;
2. Staff approve the masonry prior to purchase and installation;
3. Staff approve the outbuilding's windows, doors and garage doors; and
4. HVAC and other utilities are located to minimize visibility from the street;

The applicant Ed King stated that he agreed with all conditions. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the conditions that:

1. **The chimney is clad in masonry or stucco;**
2. **Staff approve the masonry prior to purchase and installation;**
3. **Staff approve the outbuilding's windows, doors and garage doors; and**
4. **HVAC and other utilities are located to minimize visibility from the street;**

finding, that with these conditions, the application meets Section II of the design guidelines for additions and outbuildings in the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously

I. 422 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

Ms. Zeigler began the staff presentation with some background on how we got to the current request. In 2011, as part of an approval for rooftop and rear additions, the Commission approved moving the existing rooftop sign to the rear wall.

In September of 2013 it was discovered that the project did not meet the permit and since that time, the matter has been in court. On October 20, 2017, the court decided that the applicant should apply to the MHZC to retain the sign. This recommendation is in regard to the sign only.

The applicant's request is to retain the new sign that is similar to the historic sign that was initially approved to be relocated. When the application was reviewed in 2011, the design guidelines for signage dimensions were not applied to the request since it was the understanding of staff and the commission that a historic sign was simply being relocated. There was no indication that the sign would be fully recreated, with an additional element added and with a different design.

Had that been the case, Staff would have encouraged the Commission to apply all of the design guidelines. Here you can see the difference between the two.

Because the signage was installed in 2011, staff used the design guidelines in place at that time to analyze the appropriateness of the request. However, wanting to provide all opportunities that might currently be available, the current design guidelines have also been analyzed.

The project meets some of the design guidelines for signage but not the guidelines for location and signage projection, using both the 2011 design guidelines and the current design guidelines.

Both the 2011 and current design guidelines do not allow for signage to obscure windows and architectural details and the sign is attached to a window. The original application did not show the sign attached to a window.

In addition, the sign projects more than the design guidelines allowed for in 2011. The sign projects more than eight feet (8'); whereas the design guidelines in 2011 allowed for a maximum projection of seven feet (7') and the current design guidelines allow for a maximum of six feet (6').

Staff recommends disapproval finding the request does not meet the design guidelines from 2011 for Signage or the current design guidelines for Signage, specifically design guidelines for projection and location.

Steve Meisner, attorney for Tootsies LLC, provided handouts and explained the background. He stated that staff has issues with the size, location and content. The size of the sign was approved by staff, according to Mr. Meisner, and has been in place since 2013. He claimed Ms. Zeigler approved the size of the sign and that the Judge did not have issue with the size of the sign. He requested that the Commission approve the location. The sign does not violate any ordinances. Initially it was in disrepair and there was no question that the sign would be replaced.

Bobby Joslin, owner of Joslin & Sons Signs, said he has restored quite a few signs and this one looks like it did in the 50s era. The original sign was beyond repair and this one looks like it did in the '50s. They believe the sign was put up in the late 40s or early 50s. They did what was in the best interest of the City, the public, and Tootsies.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Ms. Jones, legal counsel to the Commission, explained the charge before them today, which was to review the sign since it was installed without approval from the Commission. She read the Judge's decision.

Mr. Meisner reiterated what Mr. Joslin said and explained that the new sign was similar to the historic sign. He said that Tootsies was a non-conforming building.

Commissioner Mosley asked which design guidelines should be used and Ms. Jones said that the judgement didn't specify but she thought the 2011 guidelines would be appropriate since those were the guidelines in place at the time.

Commissioner Mayhall asked if the decision was disapproved could the applicant appeal and Ms. Jones said they could.

In answer to Commissioner Mosley's questions, Ms. Jones and Ms. Zeigler explained that it was the understanding, at the time of permitting, that an existing sign would be relocated. The sign would not be changed, just relocated. Ms. Zeigler read the original permit drawings, provided by the applicant, which stated "reusing existing historic sign on new brackets."

Commissioner Mayhall asked where the sign would have been located, if it had been know that it was a new sign. Ms. Zeigler said that the permit drawings show the sign as located on a solid wall but the design of the addition changed, without their knowledge, so that now it is located on a window.

Commissioner Mosley said that if the historic sign was relocated it wouldn't meet the design guidelines. He asked if the issue was that the sign is now a new sign. Ms. Zeigler said that whether or not the sign was actually a historic sign, it was an existing sign so the Commission agreed to let them keep it in the new location since the rooftop would not be an appropriate location. If staff had known what was being requested was a new sign, it would have been reviewed by Staff and the Commission as a new sign.

Commissioner Jones stated that if they are doing as charged the sign does not meet the design guidelines in existence at the time. Commissioner Mosley said that consideration should be given to the fact that the applicant's current testimony states that the sign was in disrepair.

Commissioner Mosley confirmed with staff that it is not their practice to document existing signage or conditions. Ms. Zeigler reiterated that they didn't know that the request was to reconstruct the sign so they did not know that documentation might be necessary.

Commissioner Stewart said that at the time of the original application that the existing sign could be relocated but the applicant changed and altered the sign, in a manner that made it not in accordance to the design guidelines. It doesn't comply with the 2011 design guidelines so he doesn't see that they can approve it. Vice-chairman Bell added that the signage location also does not meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Vice-chairman Bell moved to disapprove, finding the request does not meet the design guidelines from 2011 for Signage or the current design guidelines for Signage, specifically design guidelines for projection and location and based on the fact that the current sign is not the sign in existence at the time of approval for moving the sign. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Zeigler reminded the Commission that they will vote on a new chair and vice-chair next month with those officers beginning their duties in July. She noted that at this time, she does not know where they will be meeting so encouraged everyone to check the next agenda for the location.

She noted that Commissioner Nielson's term will be up after next month's meeting.

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES

y. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH