

DAVID BRILEY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES

June 20, 2018

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

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

Applicants: Rachel McCann and Scott Morton, William Smallman, Adam LeFever, Brad Van Rassel, Lesley Beeman, Jr., Louis Roberts, Brooke Gilliam Shawn Henry, Kaitlyn Smous,

Councilmembers: Brett Withers, Freddie O'Connell

Public: Matthew Bond, Sheryl Bretts, Walter Campbell, Sonya Link, Colin Sutker, Marcia Silsbee, Brian Williams, Jill Bader, Mike Slarve, Charles Howe, Trey Fanjoy, Isaiah Kearney, Bill Harbison, Lucas Chestnut, Doug Colton, Paul Martin, Carolyn Rainbo, Andreas Albert, Teena Camp, Jan White, Robert Murray, Amy Colton, Darrell Harvey, Batia Karable, Daniel Green, Edward Press, Allison Schachter, Ashley Shoemaker, Rob Benschhof, Thomas Palmeri, Joel Dark, Ronnie Miller, Theo Antoniadis, Joyce Harris, Terri Chapman, Janet Shands, Rodney King, Karin Kalodimos, Rachel Zijlstra

Vice-chairman Bell called the meeting to order at 2:09 p.m.

Vice-chairman Bell welcomed new commissioner David Price, who provided information about his background.

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Zeigler asked that the designation of the expansion of Eastwood and the new NCZO for Edgehill be moved to the end of the agenda, explaining that the mailed notice provided the Parks Board room as the meeting location. At the time of notice, it was believed that the Sonny West Conference room would be unavailable. Signs have been posted at the other location so moving the items to the end will ensure that everyone who may have gone to the incorrect location will have plenty of time to make it to this location prior to the issue being heard. She also noted that the applicant requested 1238 6th Ave N from the consent agenda, placing it at the end of the agenda. 922 Lawrence is off the agenda and 2801 27th is deferred at the request of the applicant.

Motion:

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

II. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

No Council members were present at this portion of the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. May 16, 2018

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the agenda as presented. Vice-chair Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Vice-chairman Bell 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

b. 1506 SHELBY AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren jenny.warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032584

c. 3629 RICHLAND AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren jenny.warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032572 & T2018032581

d. 1232 HOWARD AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 07
Overlay: Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid Melissa.Sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032503

e. 1813 HOLLY ST

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Jenny Warren jenny.warren@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018033372 & T2018033378

f. 1239 6TH AVE N

Application: Demolition-partial; New construction-addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032351
This item was removed from the consent agenda and heard at the end of the meeting.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve all items on the consent agenda with their applicable conditions and with the exception of 1239 6th Avenue North. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

g. 1431 SHELTON AVE

Application: Historic Landmark

Council District: 07

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

The Dr. Cleo Miller House, also known as Ivy Hall, located at 1431 Shelton Avenue, Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee, is listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C for its association with Nashville architect Edwin Keeble and as an excellent example of the Tudor Revival style in Nashville. More history of the building is in your report and in the National Register nomination.

There was a typo in the report so just to be clear the project meets A.5 of section 17.36.120 based on the fact that it is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Staff suggests that the MHZC recommend to Council approval of a Historic Landmark overlay for 1431 Shelton Avenue finding that it meets section 17.36.120.A.5 and to use the Landmark design guidelines as well as the Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation design guidelines to guide future alterations, finding the design guidelines meet the secretary of interior standards.

Rachel McCann, owner of the property, said she was available for questions.

Scott Morton, representative of the applicant, explained the reason for the request, which is paired with a request for a Neighborhood Landmark. He said that they have attended multiple neighborhood meetings, presented at a community meeting, and deferred the project last month.

Matthew Bond, 3519 Golf Street, said there have been no community meetings but rather a “pep rally” hosted by the property owner.

Sheryl Bretts, previous owner, said she worked with Dr. West to have the building listed in the National Register and supports the proposal.

Ms. McCann stated that the neighborhood meeting was held and Mr. Bond knew about the meeting. They sent fliers to 50 adjacent homes, per the Councilmember’s request. Mr. Morton reiterated that they provided notice of the community meeting as advised by the Councilmember. They are open to an additional meeting. The application today is a voluntary request for additional restrictions.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to recommend the overlay to Metro Council finding that it meets part A.5 of section 17.36.120 of the ordinance and to adopt the Historic Landmark design guidelines to guide future alterations, finding the design guidelines meet the secretary of interior standards. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

h. EDGEHILL NCZO

Application: Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Council District: 17 and 19

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

This item was moved to the end of the agenda.

i. EASTWOOD EXPANSION

Application: Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Council District: 06

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

This item was moved to the end of the agenda.

VI. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

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

j. 2018 10TH AVE S

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 17

Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018032477

Staff member Melissa Sajid presented the case for new construction at 2018 10th Ave South.

This is a request to construct a new single-family residence at 2018 10th Ave S. This case was deferred from the May meeting at the request of the applicant. Since then, the applicant has worked with staff to address staff's concerns about the scale of the proposed infill. The plan before you meets the design guidelines for height, scale, setbacks and rhythm of spacing, materials, roof shape, and orientation. As proposed, the infill is oriented to 10th Ave S. Staff recommends that vehicular access be limited to the alley and that a walkway leading from the front porch to the public sidewalk be shown on the site plan. The site plan shows a footprint for an outbuilding, but it is not included with this application.

The proposed house is one-and-a-half stories but will read as a single-story house at the front. The form and height of the infill is compatible with the surrounding historic houses. The left side façade will face Benton Avenue. The house will be approximately eighty-seven feet (87') deep. Staff finds that while the house is somewhat deeper than typical for historic houses with additions in the immediate area, it could be appropriate given the narrowness of the lot and the predominantly single-story form of the infill.

The following photos show the historic context in the vicinity. The photo on the left is the house located to the right of the subject property and the photo on the right is located three doors down. Both of these houses are contributing and are located to the right of the proposed infill, mid-block.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor height of the adjacent historic house, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The front setback shall be consistent with the buildings to either side, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. The site plan shall incorporate a walkway leading from the front porch to the public sidewalk;
4. Vehicular access shall be from the alley;
5. Staff shall review and approve all materials prior to purchase and installation; and
6. The HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets the Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

William Smallman, applicant for the project, stated that he followed staff's direction.

Commissioner Mosley said that the house next door was not in line with other houses on the block and asked if there was consideration of looking at the other setbacks. Ms. Sajid explained that typically the house immediately adjacent is the one used to determine an appropriate setback.

Motion:

Commission Stewart moved to approve the infill with the following conditions:

- 1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor height of the adjacent historic house, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. The front setback shall be consistent with the buildings to either side, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**

- 3. The site plan shall incorporate a walkway leading from the front porch to the public sidewalk;**
 - 4. Vehicular access shall be from the alley;**
 - 5. Staff shall review and approve all materials prior to purchase and installation; and**
 - 6. 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 Waverly Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

k. 2224 BLAIR BLVD

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018018809

Staff member, Jenny Warren, presented the case for an addition at 2224 Blair Boulevard. The house at 2224 Blair Blvd is a circa 1930 bungalow that contributes to the Hillsboro West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. This application is for the construction of an addition, inclusive of an attached garage. As your report indicates, partial demolition will occur on the rear and side elevations of the house. The existing garage will be demolished as well. Staff finds this work to be appropriate.

Staff has worked with this property owner for several months as they have worked to design an appropriate addition. We feel that the plan before you today, while large, is nearly appropriate. It reflects the requested insets and keeps the addition narrower and shorter than the existing house. Further, the addition does not more than double the existing foot print.

In our discussions with the applicant, we agreed that given the relatively shallow lot, an attached garage may be appropriate in this instance, if it was kept to one-story and was subordinate to the house. Staff finds that the proposed two-story garage, with its wide wall dormers and increased ridge height creates too much additional massing and overwhelms the historic house. On the east elevation, note that the garage eaves are significantly higher than on the main house, further increasing the perception of height. Staff recommends that the second floor above the garage be removed. In plan, removing this square footage would essentially eliminate the Bonus Room. Staff finds that with the removal of this square footage – which would include the elimination of the wide wall dormers – the overall massing would meet the design guidelines.

Aside from the issues of the wall dormers and garage height, Staff finds the proposal to be largely appropriate. It meets the guidelines in terms of location, removability, basic roof form, proportion and rhythm of openings and setbacks. The materials have not been indicated, but can be approved administratively.

In conclusion, Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition and partial demolition at 2224 Blair Blvd, with the following conditions:

1. The second level of the attached garage shall be removed to create a more appropriately massed addition for the historic home;
2. Staff shall approve the following materials prior to purchase and installation: brick, cladding, roofing material, trim, terrace material, garage door, pedestrian door and windows and
3. The HVAC shall be located on the rear elevation, or on a side elevation, beyond the midpoint of the house.

As a final note: I met with the property owners yesterday and saw a revision of this design in which the massing over the garage was moved over the family room. Staff's intent with the first condition was for the massing of the addition to be reduced, rather than re-distributed. If the Commission approves this application, Staff requests that you provide some clear direction as to whether this massing can be relocated on the addition - and whether stepping out wider than the historic house is appropriate. The applicant is here today and wishes to present their case.

Adam Lefever, applicant representative, stated that there are no design guidelines specific to massing but the policy states that the addition should not more than double the historic home, which this proposal does not do. He said that

his client has been nominated for seven historic awards and has won three. His client met with historic staff prior to purchasing the property. He has presented three different proposals to staff. He requested the proposal be approved.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart said the addition respects the original house and there is an argument for an attached garage because of the short depth of the lot but he found that the space above the garage increases the massing in a manner that is not appropriate for the historic home. Commissioner Jones agreed as it reads to be a very large back of the house. Commissioner Mosley said that an attached garage makes sense but that the space above was too much for the historic home.

Commissioner Jones, in an effort to give direction to the applicant, said that if the massing removed from above the garage was moved to another location that made the addition wider, that that would also be inappropriate for the historic home. Commissioner Mosley agreed as it is a lot on the lot.

The Commission noted that the applicant could return with new designs in the future if the conditions of approval did not meet their needs.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed addition and partial demolition at 2224 Blair Boulevard, with the following conditions:

- 1. The second level of the attached garage shall be removed to create a more appropriately massed addition for the historic home;**
- 2. Staff shall approve the following materials, prior to purchase and installation: brick, cladding, roofing material, trim, terrace material, garage door, pedestrian door and windows; and,**
- 3. The HVAC shall be located on the rear elevation, or on a side elevation, beyond the midpoint of the house;**

Finding that the proposed addition meets the design guidelines for the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

I. 2517 BLAIR BLVD

Application: New construction-outbuilding; Setback determination

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018032540

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for a new outbuilding at 2517 Blair Blvd. 2517 Blair Boulevard is a one-and-half story, c. 1932, brick bungalow. The application is to increase the height of the existing garage and add a half-story to the garage. In April 2018, MHZC disapproved a proposal to construct a full second story on top of the existing garage.

Staff is recommending disapproval of this proposal as well, for two reasons. First, the existing outbuilding does not meet the base zoning setbacks on the left side, and increasing the height and scale of the outbuilding increases the non-conformity of the setbacks. Second, staff has concerns about the roof forms on the side facades.

The date of construction of the existing outbuilding is not known, but it could be the same structure that appears in the c. 1932 Sanborn Map. As mentioned earlier, the existing garage does not meet the base zoning setbacks on its left side. For outbuildings of this size, base zoning requires a five foot (5'0" side setback. The existing outbuilding is between two feet eight inches (2'8") and one foot (1') from the side property line. Base zoning requires a five foot (5') side setback, and this structure is as little as 1' from the side property line. The outbuilding does meet the rear setback of three feet (3').

The addition to the outbuilding will increase the scale of the outbuilding from one story to one-and-a-half stories and will increase the height of the structure from approximately sixteen feet (16') to twenty-two feet (22'). Staff finds

that increasing the height of the outbuilding from one-story to one-and-a-half-stories and from approximately sixteen feet (16') tall to twenty-two feet (22') tall increases the non-conformity of the setbacks and is not appropriate.

The dormers do meet the design guidelines, however, staff has concerns about the double gable roof forms on the right and left elevation. The connector between the two gables gives the appearance of a two-story form. Given that the structure sits as close as one foot from the side property line, staff finds that the roof form and scale do not meet the design guidelines.

Before I conclude, I want to show the 1957 Sanborn map for this block. You can see that there were many outbuildings that sat near or even on to their rear and side property lines. But all of these structures are just one story in height. They did not have an occupied upper level and were true one-story garages like what is existing.

Staff is recommending disapproval for two reasons - First, the existing outbuilding does not meet the base zoning setbacks on the left side, and increasing the height and scale of the outbuilding increases the non-conformity of the setbacks. Second, staff has concerns about the roof form on the side elevations.

Staff recommends disapproval of the addition to the outbuilding, finding that its roof form, and setbacks do not meet Section II.B.h. of the Hillsboro – West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Brad Van Rassel, architect for the project, provided an electronic presentation that included a perspective. He stated that the location is appropriate based on historic conditions and the design is appropriate for the neighborhood. He provided a description of the design. He made the argument that the side facades will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley said that it is punitive to work with an existing condition, which might be more appropriate than having a larger building; however, he did not find the two-story form to be appropriate and the roof form does not relate to the home's historic roof form. He asked Staff if a side addition might be more appropriate. Ms. Baldock stated that the existing footprint is almost at the maximum allowed already.

Commissioner Jones agreed the setback is what it is; however, the historic buildings that were constructed close to property lines were typically small buildings and this request is for a much larger structure. The massing combined with the setback issue results in a proposal that does not meet the design guidelines.

Commissioner Stewart agreed that the current property line and footprint might be appropriate but not with the roof form that contrasts with the historic building and the neighborhood.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to disapprove the addition to the outbuilding, finding that its roof form, and setbacks do not meet Section II.B.h. of the Hillsboro – West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

None.

VIII. VIOLATIONS

m. 4122 ABERDEEN RD

Application: New construction-outbuilding

Council District: 24

Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032355

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for 4122 Aberdeen Road, noting that Councilmember Murphy sent an email in support of the request. 4122 Aberdeen Road is a c. 1940 brick Tudor Revival style home that contributes to the historic character of the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay (Figure 1). In March 2016, MHZC staff issued an administrative preservation permit for the construction of a twenty foot by twenty-two foot (20' X 22') one-story outbuilding that would not be used as a DADU. The outbuilding was approved at sixteen feet (16') tall.

In May 2018, MHZC staff became aware that the applicant constructed a dormer on the right side of the outbuilding in violation of the preservation permit. The dormer does not meet the design guidelines in size and scale. These photos of the outbuilding were taken from the street. As the photos show, the dormer is not inset two feet (2') from the exterior wall as the design guidelines require. In addition the dormer's width is more than 50% of the width of the roof – in fact it is about 88% of the roof's width.

Staff finds that the dormer's lack of two foot (2') inset and its width do not meet the design guidelines. Staff therefore recommends that the dormer be altered so that it is inset two feet (2') from the wall below and is no wider than twelve feet (12'), which is one-half the width of the roof. With these conditions, staff finds that the revised dormer meets Section II.B.1.h. of the design guidelines.

Staff recommends that the dormer be reduced in size so that it is inset two feet (2') from the wall below and has a maximum width of twelve feet (12'). The dormer's size and scale should be reduced so that it meets Section II.B.1.h. of the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines.

Louis Roberts, contractor for the project, stated that he has experience with historical products. He admitted that he made a mistake, which was suggesting to the owners that they take advantage of upper-level space by adding a stair that would require the dormer. He based the design of the dormer on another dormer existing nearby. He asked the Commission to make an exception in this case as the dormer is subordinate to the structure and would be appropriate for a larger outbuilding, if that had been approved.

Brooke Gilliam stated that she felt like they had followed the appropriate steps for the change in the permit. The dormer is what allows the upper level space to be used. It did not occur to them to revise the permit. She provided a handout that included letters from the neighborhood.

Shawn Henry, legal representative of the owner, pointed out that the building is smaller than what it could be at 460 square feet rather than the 750 square feet that is the maximum allowed. He noted that the principal building is not historic, there is no negative impact on the surrounding properties, and they have support from the councilmember. It was tastefully done and aesthetic compliment to everything they have done.

Walter Campbell, 4119 Aberdeen Road, said he lives across the street, finds the building to be beautiful and he would like to have one just like it.

Vice-chairman Bell stated that their purview is based on the design guidelines, which were partially created by the neighborhoods. Exceptions to the guidelines are rare and the guidelines are their directive. She thanked the applicant for their honesty.

Commissioner Jones said that the building is modest in scale; however, she has concern that it will be brought up in every future meeting by someone else who wants to do the same. Commissioner Mayhall agreed, noting that there is already another property owner who wants to build one just like it. There was no motivation not to follow the design guidelines, which makes it tougher. Commissioner Price agreed and asked about other similar situations. Commissioner Jones said that every decision can have the potential to set precedent but that they also have to take each case on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Mosley noted that there were no easy fixes. If they were reviewing as a new application, they would need to find a way to explain how it met the design guidelines, how this situation was different than others.

Vice-chairman Bell invited Mr. Henry back to speak to the board who explained to the commission that their decision needed to be based on whether or not the building is compatible with the neighborhood, which they have proven that it is.

Commissioner Stewart noted that there have been many difficult discussions regarding outbuildings. He said he has driven past the property and he found that the design is not compatible with the neighborhood. There are shed dormers historically in the neighborhood; therefore, he would be willing to consider alterations that might not be as stringent as what they have requested in the past. He recommended that the left side of the dormer be pushed back by two-feet.

Commissioner Jones said that the current condition clearly does not meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to disapprove the current condition and approve a revision to the dormer that is reduced in size so that it is inset two feet (2') from the wall below and has a maximum width of twelve feet (12'); finding that with these conditions the project meets Section II.B.1.h. of the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed with Commissioner Stewart in opposition.

n. 1205 4TH AVE N

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018032527

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case for signage installed without a permit at 1205 4th Ave North.

This is a request for signage that was installed without a preservation permit. The building is located at 1205 4th Ave N is a 1930s brick bungalow that contributes to the character of Germantown. The historic house includes a non-contributing rear addition that addresses Madison Street. Signage on the addition was permitted prior to the 2017 amendments to the Germantown design guidelines.

The maximum allotment for signage is based on building type. The building type for this site is a “house building type,” given its residential form. The building is a bungalow, which is a common residential form. In addition, the building height, roof form, and front setback are all common for a “house building type.” It is not uncommon for “house building types” to be used for non-residential purposes. So, the maximum allotment for a “house building type” is six square feet. Since this building appears to be two separate buildings with two different forms and different businesses, staff recommends that the building be considered two separate buildings for signage purposes.

Four signs were installed without a permit. These include a monument sign that is twenty-four (24) square feet a shingle sign that is four (4) square feet, a wall sign that is one and a half (1.5) square feet, and a pole sign that is two (2) square feet. Staff recommends that the pole sign which is a parking sign not be included in the allotment as it is a small directional sign that has minimal impact. Not including the parking sign, the total signage is twenty-nine and a half (29.5) square feet, which exceeds the maximum of six (6) square feet by over twenty-three (23) square feet.

Since the signs are existing, staff recommends keeping the shingle and wall signs and removing the monument sign, which would bring the total signage to five and a half (5.5) square feet, which would not exceed the maximum allotment. The materials for both the shingle and wall signs meet the design guidelines, and neither signs are illuminated.

Not only would removing the monument sign reduce the overall signage to be within the allotment, but at this point it is unknown whether or not the monument sign meets the design guidelines for location. A scaled site plan showing the location of the monument sign in relation to the property line and building was not submitted by the applicant. Monument signs are permitted only when a building is at least fifteen feet (15') from the right-of-way. If a monument sign can be permitted, it must also be set back at least five feet (5') from the front property line. Furthermore, the monument sign incorporates manual changeable copy, which the Commission has only approved for civic building forms in the past. In addition, design guidelines VI.6.A specifically lists "marquee type signs for announcements of activities taking place at the location" as unpermitted signage.

The location of the wall sign is appropriate. However, staff recommends relocating the shingle sign from the porch post to one of the side porch racks where it could hang without obscuring the porch post of other architectural details.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the conditions that the monument sign is removed and that the shingle sign is moved to hang from the porch rack. With these conditions, staff finds that the project could meet Section VI.A and B. of the *Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*.

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

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the condition that the monument sign is removed and that the shingle sign is moved to hang from the porch rack; finding that with this condition, the project meets Section VI. A and B. of the *Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning District: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. MHZC ACTIONS

o. 1709 4TH AVE N

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018033071

Staff member Sean Alexander, presented the case for infill at 1709 4th Avenue North, a proposal to construct a new two-story building. A non-contributing building on the lot has been approved for demolition – in fact the building has been demolished.

The historic context nearby consists of one story houses, many with a Folk Victorian gable-L form. The design guidelines allow two stories for new construction in Salemtown.

The new building will match the front setbacks of the context, and the building width will be thirty-one and one half feet, which gives the building side setbacks of three feet (3'). This does not meet the standard five foot (5') side setback requirement. The Commission does have the authority to approve construction that doesn't meet the setback requirements if doing so will be more compatible with the historic context.

There are historic houses nearby that are similar width, but the width is typically on just a small portion of the building whereas this is the entire structure. Also, the new buildings will be two story and the historic houses are all one story. The depth of the new building, front to back, will also be about twenty feet (20') more than the historic houses. Although a two story house meets the guidelines, Staff finds that the massing of the new building is too great.

The building is shown thirty one feet, six inches (31'6") tall, with one foot of foundation. Staff recommends that the foundation/floor height match the adjacent historic house, approximately two feet, nine inches (2'-9"). This

would make the proposed building thirty-three feet, three inches (33'3") tall. This would still meet the design guidelines for infill in the Salemtown overlay which allows infill to be two stories up to thirty-five feet (35') tall.

Materials are split-faced block foundation, cement fiber siding, asphalt shingle roof, which are appropriate, but staff would recommend administrative approval for the front porch columns, stairs, walkway paving materials, as well as the window and door selections and roof colors which have not been indicated.

The side elevations show consistent and compatible window pattern, as does the rear elevation.

There will be a two-story outbuilding. The location, form, materials are appropriate. The drawings show the building to be twenty five feet (25') tall from floor to peak, but the measurement isn't from the actual floor. Staff recommends that the building not exceed twenty five feet (25').

Staff recommends approval of the proposed two story infill at 1709 4th Avenue North with conditions that:

1. The floor height of the principal building, relative to natural grade, is consistent with surrounding historic houses;
2. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. The front setback shall be consistent with setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
4. The width of the principal building is reduced to twenty-seven feet, six inches (27'-6");
5. The height of the outbuilding shall be reduced to twenty-five feet (25') and the area shall be reduced to seven hundred, fifty square feet (750 sq. ft.);
6. The window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff;
7. The roof color shall be approved by MHZC Staff;
8. Front walkway and driveway material shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and
9. The utility connections and HVAC units shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street facing façade.

With those conditions met, Staff finds that the project will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

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

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed two story infill at 1709 4th Avenue North with conditions that:

- 1. The floor height of the principal building, relative to natural grade, is consistent with surrounding historic houses;**
- 2. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. The front setback shall be consistent with setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 4. The width of the principal building is reduced to twenty-seven feet, six inches (27'-6");**
- 5. The height of the outbuilding shall be reduced to twenty-five feet (25') and the area shall be reduced to seven hundred, fifty square feet (750 sq. ft.);**
- 6. The window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff;**
- 7. The roof color shall be approved by MHZC Staff;**
- 8. Front walkway and driveway material shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and**
- 9. The utility connections and HVAC units shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street facing façade;**

finding, that with these conditions the project will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

p. 1000 GILMORE AVE

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018033058

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for an addition at 1000 Gilmore Avenue, an application to construct a rear addition. The owner is currently rehabbing and reconstructing the front porch.

The proposal involves removal of a portion of the existing building at the rear – it may be an early addition or an original porch that’s been altered, but it is fairly minimal and stepped in from the side of the house and sits below the main roof and eave, so it’s not considered to be a significant contributing part of the building.

The new rear addition will tie into the rear of the primary mass of the building and will be stepped in a foot from each side, narrows as it goes back and then expands to thirty-seven feet (37’) wide at the rear. The right façade is articulated, stepping out wider than the primary wall of the house, then back inside the primary wall, then back out to the right again. The site plan shows an uncovered patio, but it’s elevated so it’s really more of a porch, and it encroaches into the street-side setback by six feet (6’). Staff recommends that the addition should not be wider than the houses’ primary wall, and recommends against a reduced side setback.

Front and rear elevations were shown, as well as the side elevations. In the left elevation the center section shows the perimeter of the courtyard. The right elevation shows the elevation that faces 10th Avenue South.

The character of the addition – the roof forms, materials, window pattern – is compatible with the historic house.

However, Staff finds that the massing of the addition is not appropriate, because the depth relative to the depth of the house is too great, especially considering that this long elevation faces the side street.

Regarding depth, the Commission has delegated to staff the authority to administratively approve additions which are no deeper than half the depth of the existing house (if all other guidelines about height, materials, etc. are met). That scale is considered routine and minimal, but the guidelines don’t clearly say what would be the maximum depth that is appropriate for additions beyond that construction (new and additions) should be compatible with historic buildings. There are over 10,000 properties in overlays, each unique, so it’s necessary to employ some judgement to determine what’s appropriate in a given situation.

On this proposal there’s the primary mass of the historic house (52’ from the front edge of the porch to the rear), the non-contributing component at the rear that is to be demolished (which is 7’ of additional depth), and the addition which ties in to the rear of the primary mass at the first story (about 62’ of depth at the first level).

Altogether the total depth of the building with the addition would be one hundred and fourteen feet (114’), which far exceeds any historic structure in the area. Staff finds that the scale as it would be perceived on the highly visible right façade that faces 10th Avenue South is not compatible with the historic building or the historic context.

The addition’s width and depth are not appropriate, and not necessary because it fails to utilize space behind the building where an addition would have smaller scale and less impact.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition to the historic house at 1000 Gilmore Avenue with the following conditions:

1. The depth of the addition shall be reduced to be subordinate to that of the historic house;
2. The walls of the addition shall not be wider than the primary massing of the historic house;
3. The addition shall not encroach into the side setback buffer; and
4. The material of side and rear porch floors and walkway paving materials are approved administratively, as well as the window and door selections;
5. Four inch (4’) mullion between paired windows; and,
6. The HVAC and other utilities shall be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the building.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposed addition would be compatible with the historic house and would meet the design guidelines for additions in the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Kaitlyn Smous, architect for the project, stated that they have removed the side porch and she handed out a packet of materials. She read a letter from the owner explaining that her son will renovate the home, which is in a derelict state. He will live in the rear addition and sell the historic portion of the house. They feel they have achieved an addition that is subordinate to the historic home and meets all the requirements. The “u” shape of the addition is based on retaining the only two trees on the site and to provide a private courtyard that is buffered from the side-street. Ms. Smous explained the feedback she received from staff and explained why they disagreed with each component of the staff recommendation.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioners asked for clarifications of the context, zoning, measurements, drawings and size of the lot. Mr. Alexander provided answers.

Commissioner Mosley stated that to create an umbilical cord duplex is inappropriate for the neighborhood and that it might be more appropriate to have the second unit be a separate building. Cutting the middle out is the only solution.

Commissioner Stewart said that the unit in the rear is subordinate to the historic home but with an umbilical connector of twenty-four feet (24') of laundry room and he doesn't think that shortening the connection will solve the issue. They have done a good job with getting the project to be compatible and he is glad to see that the side porch has been removed. Commissioner Jones stated that the roof form and depth is appropriate but that the setbacks are inappropriate.

Commissioner Price suggested that decreasing the size of the connector or eliminating it will solve the issue of the large massing and scale of the addition. The courtyard could still be usable if it is smaller. The elevations are good but it reads really long.

Commissioner Mosley stated that he is opposed to an umbilical cord connection as it doesn't meet the historic development. He reiterated that a detached structure would be more appropriate. Ms. Zeigler explained that having a detached structure would mean that the unit could not be sold separately and the owner would have to live in one of the two units, which does not meet the goals of the owner.

Commissioner Jones stated the side wall should line-up with the side wall of the historic house as the current proposal makes it further imposing on the street.

Commissioner Stewart noted that the width of the addition is less than the house but it is shifted out to one side and requires a setback determination from the Commission.

Motion:

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the addition to the historic house at 1000 Gilmore Avenue with the following conditions:

- 1. The depth of the addition shall be reduced to be subordinate to that of the historic house;**
- 2. The walls of the addition shall not be wider than the primary massing of the historic house;**
- 3. The addition shall not encroach into the side setback buffer;**
- 4. The material of side and rear porch floors and walkway paving materials are approved administratively, as well as the window and door selections;**
- 5. Four inch (4') mullion between paired windows; and,**
- 6. The HVAC and other utilities shall be located on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the building;**

finding that with these condition the proposed addition would be compatible with the historic house and would meet the design guidelines for additions in the Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a break at 4:30pm and returned at 4:38pm.

q. 922 LAWRENCE AVE

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding/ detached accessory dwelling unit
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#:

Item removed from agenda as changes were made to the plans allowing for an administrative permit.

r. 2801 27TH AVE S

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 18
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock Melissa.Baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032356

The case was deferred at the request of the applicant.

s. 124 S 12TH ST

Application: New construction-infill
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018032354

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for infill at 124 S 12th Street, a proposal to construct a new house on a vacant lot.

At forty-eight feet (48') tall and fifty-two feet (52') wide, it's likely one of the larger infill projects to have come before the Commission, however, it's in a block of the East End neighborhood with large historic houses.

The proportions of the new building will be compatible with those of the adjacent building to the right at 120 S 12th, and 116 S 12th to the right of it.

It will be brick with a stone foundation and asphalt shingle roof. Staff would request that the applicant seek administrative approval of brick and stone samples, roof color, window and door selections.

There is an attached garage on the left side. Staff finds this to be appropriate because the lot does not have an alley at the rear, and because the garage is set in from the primary wall and behind a side porch to help minimize the visibility.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed two story infill at 124 South 12th Street with conditions that:

1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field
2. The front setback shall be consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. The brick and stone colors and textures shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and
4. The window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and
5. The roof color shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and
6. Front walkway and driveway material shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and

7. The utility connections and HVAC units shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street facing façade.

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

The applicant was present and declined to speak. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Councilmember Withers explained that the context is different than the rest of the neighborhood; therefore, he supports the proposal as being appropriate for this specific context. He provided some historical information for the immediate area and praised the owner and architect.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the proposed two story infill at 124 South 12th Street with conditions that:

- 1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 2. The front setback shall be consistent with the setbacks of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
- 3. The brick and stone colors and textures shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and**
- 4. The window and door selections shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and**
- 5. The roof color shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and**
- 6. Front walkway and driveway material shall be approved by MHZC Staff; and**
- 7. The utility connections and HVAC units shall be located behind the midpoint of the building on a non-street facing façade;**

finding that with these condition the project will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Lockeland Springs East-End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

f. 1239 6TH AVE N

Application: Demolition-partial; New construction-addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

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

PermitID#: T2018032351

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the care for an addition at 1239 6th Ave N. 1239 6th Avenue North is a c. 1890s brick commercial structure that contributes to the historic character of the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. It is located at the corner of 6th Avenue North and Monroe Street, and most people know it as the former home of the Mad Platter restaurant. In May 2017, MHZC approved the demolition of the existing rear addition and the construction of a new rear addition. Since that time, the Commission has adopted revised design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. This application is a new design from a different applicant. The applicant is not proposing any major changes to the historic house and will be repairing and repainting the existing materials as needed.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing rear extension. The date of construction of the rear addition is not known, but the 1914 and 1957 Sanborn maps show that there were rear extensions to the structure historically, but their size and depth are different now than they were then. Staff finds that the rear extension's materials, form, roof slope, fenestration pattern, and date of construction do not contribute to the historic character of the historic commercial structure. Staff therefore finds that its removal meets Section VII.B.2. of the design guidelines. Staff finds that the location, width and depth of the addition meet the design guidelines.

The guidelines state that "all facades shall be at least 80% brick." Fiber cement panels are approvable as an accent material. The guidelines further state that "A greater percentage of accent materials may be used on facades that are not visible from a public right-of-way." The design guidelines state here that public facades do include alleys, as well as those seen from the public right-of-way.

Staff finds the addition's height, which is lower than that of the historic building, is appropriate. This façade is 80% brick (including the historic structure and the addition) and therefore does meet the design guidelines for materials. The ground floor of the proposed addition does not have any true glazed window openings. Rather, it has three rectangular areas, with soldier course bricks recessed one-half inch (1/2") and wood frames. In the place where the glazing would typically be, the applicant is proposing to install fiber cement panels. Staff finds that this faux window opening treatment does not meet the design guidelines, which states "On corner commercial buildings, glazing shall address both streets." These openings are not glazed, creating a long wall without any glazing. Staff recommends windows that are frosted or painted black on the interior which will allow the applicant to wall over the windows on the interior. This is necessary because the area will be a commercial kitchen but will still appear as actual windows from the exterior.

This façade is only 46% brick and will be visible from Monroe Street. The rear façade is approximately 46% brick. This façade will be visible from Monroe Street since this is a corner lot. Even though it is less than 80% brick, staff finds that the amount of brick on the rear façade to be appropriate as a part of the façade is neither brick nor fiber cement board panels, but is glazing. On this façade, the panels are used as an accent for the stair tower, which staff finds to be appropriate.

In addition, historically, rear facades of commercial buildings like this one were more utilitarian in nature, even when on a corner lot. The original rear addition to this building was not brick but was wood, according to a 1908 map. On the map, pink is a brick material and yellow is wood. Staff finds that the rear percentage of brick for this façade to be in keeping with the structure's history of additions and extensions.

The left façade is 64% brick, which staff finds to be appropriate since the façade is not highly visible from a public right-of-way. While this façade may be seen from the alley, it will not be highly visible from either 6th Avenue North or Monroe Street, and the design guidelines state that "A greater percentage of accent materials may be used on facades that are not visible from a public right-of-way." Staff therefore finds that the materials on this façade are appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The window openings on the Monroe Street elevation have glazing in them, even if they are painted black or obscured on the interior;
2. Staff approve a brick sample;
3. Staff approve all window and door selections;
4. Staff approve the color and texture of the membrane roof;
5. Staff approve the canopy material; and
6. Staff approve the location of the HVAC units and all other utilities.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed demolition and addition meets Sections III.E., V., and VII. of the design guidelines.

Lesley Beeman, Jr., architect for the project, explained the purpose of the addition which is a kitchen and small second floor dining room. He expressed concern about solar issues with the faux windows suggested by staff.

Sonya Link, neighborhood representative, expressed concern with the materials. She explained that the 80% brick requirement in the design guidelines was based on the desire to reduce the use of fiber-cement panels which have been used on new construction in the area, but that the neighborhood does not find to be appropriate. The rear is highly visible because it is a corner lot and there is a vacant lot behind the building which increases its visibility. The left side of the building will be visible from the alley. They request that the 80% brick requirement be met so that a precedent is not set for additional fiber-cement panels on future projects.

The applicant chose not to rebut and stated that he was happy with the staff's recommendation. He explained that the lot behind the building will be a garden for the restaurant's use.

Commissioner Stewart said that the design guidelines have been met in terms of the percentage of brick because the guidelines allow for a higher percentage of non-brick materials on facades that are not readily visible. Commissioner Jones agreed, stating that the interior side and the rear will not be highly visible. Vice-chairman Bell, who lives in the neighborhood, said that she did not believe the interior side and rear will be highly visible.

Commissioner Stewart said that it is a standard practice to use a spandrel material for glazing that is manufactured to be a structural material and so he agreed with the Staff's recommendation. Commissioner Mosley stated that spandrel glazing is not typical for historic buildings and questioned its appropriateness for this particular project.

Commissioner Mosley expressed concern that the design guidelines state that all facades state that there should be 80% brick and there needs to be some interpretation of how the 80% is calculated.

Commissioner Price asked how the staff will review the new brick color as that might result in three colors of brick. Ms. Baldock said that there is actually only one brick color existing currently on the historic building, although the masonry pointing makes it look like two different colors and she recommended that masonry review by staff be a condition of approval.

Motion:

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

- 1. The window openings on the Monroe Street elevation have glazing in them, even if they are painted black or obscured on the interior;**
- 2. Staff approve a brick sample;**
- 3. Staff approve all window and door selections;**
- 4. Staff approve the color and texture of the membrane roof;**
- 5. Staff approve the canopy material; and**
- 6. Staff approve the location of the HVAC units and all other utilities;**

finding that with these conditions, the proposed demolition and addition meets Sections III.E., V., and VII. of the design guidelines. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

i. EASTWOOD EXPANSION

Application: Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Council District: 06

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

This is a request to expand the Eastwood NCZO with a section of the neighborhood that is similar in architectural styles and forms as the existing overlay. Melissa Baldock put together a good history of the area which is in your report. This will be the third expansion for this overlay.

The expansion area meets criteria 2 and 3 of section 17.36.120 of the ordinance for its association with important figures in Nashville's history and its 1900 to 1965 architecture showing the evolution of architectural design from classical styles, to bungalows, to post-war minimal traditional forms.

Staff suggests that the Commission recommend approval of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay expansion, finding the area to meet criteria 2 and 3 of section 17.36.120.

Staff recommends that adoption of the existing design guidelines for the Eastwood NCZO to guide future changes in this expanded area, finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Councilman Withers stated his support of the request and explained some history of the previous expansions and the general development of the neighborhood. He explained there is a high level of support from the property owners.

Commissioner Stewart left at 5:15pm, returning at 5:20.

Speaking in favor of the project: Colin Sutker, 1 Waters Ave; Marcia Silsbee, 818 Powers; Brian Williams, 814, 812 McCarn and 822 Waters.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to recommend approval of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay expansion, finding the area to meet criteria 2 and 3 of section 17.36.120. Commissioner Price seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Mosley moved to adopt the existing design guidelines for the Eastwood NCZO to guide future changes in this expanded area, finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Commissioner Mayhall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

h. EDGEHILL NCZO

Application: Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Council District: 17 and 19

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

This request is for a new neighborhood conservation zoning overlay that includes Villa Place and portions of South Street, Grand Ave, Tremont St, and Edgehill Avenue.

The draft design guidelines will have been available on line for approximately two months and the draft you have in your packet has two changes from that previous draft.

On page 25, additional flexibility is possible for outbuildings that back up to commercial areas and we added the period of significance to page 18. 1890-1955.

The architectural resource study was conducted by the Center of Historic Preservation at Middle Tennessee State University, led by Katherine Hatfield during the winter of 2017.

The neighborhood has an interesting history, developing into a middle-class African-American community after the Civil War. A more complete history is in your report.

The neighborhood is also significant for its turn-of-the-century architecture (1890s-1960s).

The neighborhood meets criterion 3 of section 17.36.120 of the ordinance for its turn-of-the-century architecture and criterion 1 for its association with the development of an early Nashville African-American neighborhood after the Civil War.

Staff suggests that the Commission recommend approval of the Edgehill Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay, finding the area to meet criteria 1 and 3 of section 17.36.120.

Staff recommends that adoption of the draft design guidelines proposed for the new district finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Councilman O'Connell spoke in favor of the district. He provided some background as to how the discussion of an overlay began and the goal of the overlay, if adopted.

The Commission took a break at 5:33pm and resumed at 5:35pm.

Public comment in opposition: Jill Bader, 1220 Villa Place; Mike Slarve, 1508 Edgehill; Charles Howe, 1009 15th Ave S; Trey Fanjoy, 1722 15th Ave S; Isaiah Kearney, 1024 15th Ave S; Bill Harbison, (representing Schatten Properties, 1514 South St); Lucas Chestnut, 1409 Tremont St; Doug Colton, 1506 South St; Paul Martin, 1011 15th Ave S; Carolyn Rainbo, representing 1502 South St; Andreas Albert, owns multiple properties on 15th Ave S; Teena Camp, 1607 Villa Place; Jan White, 1004 Villa Place; Robert Murray, 1004 Villa Place; Amy Colton, 1506 South St; Darrell Harvey, 1401 Edgehill; Batia Karable, 1703 15th Ave S; Daniel Green, owns 4 properties in the overlay; Edward Press, 1722 15th Ave S

Public comment in favor: Allison Schachter, 1022 Villa; Ashley Shoemaker, 1500 South St; Rob Benshof, 916 14th Ave S and 1016 15th Ave S [approximately 8 people stood in support of Mr. Benshof's comments]; Thomas Palmeri, 1410 South St; Joel Dark, 1027 15th Ave S; Ronnie Miller, 905 Villa Place; Theo Antoniadis, 1720 15th Ave S; Joyce Harris, 1401 Tremont St; Terri Chapman, 1721 15th Ave S; Janet Shands, 1001 14th Ave S; Rodney King, 907 Villa Pl; Karin Kalodimos, 907 Villa Place; Rachel Zijlstra, 1015 Villa Place

Commissioner Mayhall left the meeting at 6:23pm.

Vice-chairman Bell asked Metro Legal to clarify whether or not they can defer. Ms. Jones said that they could defer and deferral would affect the Council schedule.

Commissioner Stewart asked if the study conducted by MTSU meets the requirements for a study of the area and Ms. Zeigler said it did.

Commissioner Mosley asked for clarification of their charge and Ms. Jones read the Rules of Order and provided information from the ordinance.

Commissioner Stewart noted that the action today is not binding as the final action will be taken at Council. He encouraged opposition and supporters to meet together to continue a discussion and gather information. He said there is no question that the area qualifies. Because there is more time to gather information and the councilmember stated that he felt he had the support, he was ready to move forward. Commissioner Jones agreed.

Commissioner Mosley asked if any buildings were currently listed in the National Register. Ms. Zeigler said there are not but it is staff's belief that the area is eligible. He stated that he believed it qualified under criteria 1, 2 and 3.

Motion:

Commissioner Price moved to recommend approval of the Edgehill Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay, finding the area to meet criteria 1 and 3 of section 17.36.120. Further, he recommended that adoption of the draft design guidelines proposed for the new district finding that they are consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

t. ELECT OFFICERS

Commissioner Jones recommended Commissioner Stewart as Vice Chair and Vice-Chair Bell as Chair.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to appoint Vice-chairman Bell as Chair and Commissioner Stewart as Vice-Chair. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES

u. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

Ms. Zeigler noted that the next meeting will be at the Midtown Precinct on 12th Avenue. Commissioner Mosley stated that a staff member was present at the location originally noticed as the public hearing for the Eastwood NCZO expansion and the Edgehill NCZO, who provided maps regarding the actual location. Ms. Zeigler added that the location was also noticed via FB and emails and that Chairman Tibbs announced it at the most recent Planning Commission.

Meeting adjourned at 6:49pm