

FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

February 12, 2018

Project PL-#6625

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Item: | 9 |
| Address: | 99 E. Main St. (Downtown Franklin Historic District) |
| Applicant: | Will Schaedle |
| Owner: | Preston Ingram |
| Project Staff: | Amanda Rose |
| Application: | Demolition & New Construction |
| Staff Recommendation: | Approval with conditions |

PROJECT INFORMATION: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of a one-story building and the new construction of a two-story mixed-use development with rooftop deck feature at 99 E. Main St.

The applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to discuss the proposal at a special-called February 22, 2018, meeting (rescheduled from regular DRC meeting due to inclement weather).

APPLICABLE DESIGN GUIDELINES:

- Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (p.2-3)
- Demolition (p.102)
- Infill Buildings (p.108)
- Parking (p.115)
- Roofs (p.119)
- Storefronts (p.126)
- Utilities (p.128)
- Windows (p.129)

PROJECT REVIEW:

Demolition—The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the one-story building located at the site, which appears to have been constructed as two buildings and connected over time. The applicant has indicated the lack of historical/architectural integrity of the structure.

- According to Rick Warwick, the Williamson County historian, the building(s) were constructed during the mid-to-late 1970s. The left side of the building consists of two side-gabled forms, vertical siding, and three entry points. The right side consists of a side-gabled form with a central pediment and tower feature, storefront windows, and centered entry. The sections are connected by trash receptacle and storage enclosure.

- The *Guidelines* recommend against the removal of historic buildings or structures and state that demolition may be approved by the Historic Zoning Commission if one or more of the demolition criteria are met (p.102, #1). The applicant has applied for demolition based on the criteria of lack of architectural or historical integrity. The building, constructed in the mid-to-late 1970s, does not qualify as historic in age based on the federal guidelines (50 years or more in age). Further, the building does not add to the architectural integrity for the historic district, and its removal would not adversely impact the district's character.

New Construction—The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a two-story mixed-use development with rooftop deck feature.

- **Height/Scale/Massing/Setbacks**

- The *Historic District Design Guidelines (Guidelines)* recommend that the height of new construction “be compatible with the existing buildings on the same block face” (p.109, #16) and that “make new buildings compatible with adjacent buildings through massing, size, scale, and architectural features” (p.108, #2). The existing building is the only one situated on this block face, as the property is abutted by the Harpeth River and the block face breaks at the bridge. Existing buildings on adjacent block faces range from 1-3 stories in height.
- Due to the proposed placement within the floodplain, the building foundation is required to be elevated 1’ above the base flood elevation, per the *Zoning Ordinance*. According to additional information provided by the applicant’s architectural team, the full perimeter of the proposed building measures approximately 725’ long. The proposed height measures 43’ at its tallest point (a projection that houses the elevator), and this projection is recessed 27’ from the E. Main St. facade. Most of the building is of a two-story scale and ranges between approximately 31’-1” to 40’, depending on various cornice and parapet wall projections.
- The survey information provided by the applicant with the COA application (dated 12/21/17) states that “the property does not lie within the 100-year flood plan,” which is not correct. The floodplain maps adopted by the City in 2016, indicate that the property is located entirely within the 100-year floodplain, and a portion of the property is located within the floodway. Therefore, the building, as presented, may not be designed to meet the floodplain construction requirements specified in Section 5.8.5 of the *Zoning Ordinance*.
- The proposed setback for the new construction meets the zoning requirements of the Central Franklin Character Area 1. With a proposed sidewalk width of 11’, the site accommodates pedestrian travel and plantings.

- **Materials/Architectural Features**

- The full perimeter of the proposed building measures approximately 725’ long. The *Guidelines* recommend that new buildings be “compatible with adjacent buildings through...architectural features” and that “buildings constructed over several lots or are 50 feet or more in width” be constructed “with designs to reinforce the spacing and arrangements of adjacent buildings” (p.108, #2, #11). The building is divided into several vertical divisions with widths varying between one to four upper façade window openings. Subtle variations in height are introduced using cornices and parapets, and the building demonstrates slight and regularly-spaced dimensional variations between façade divisions.

- While the design features corbelling and includes subtle inlaid brick herringbone designs between the lower and upper floors, little architectural variation is provided on the upper facades. For better compliance with the *Guidelines*, it is recommended that one or two of the front elevation vertical divisions be revised to include more decorative and substantial cornice detailing is appropriate to provide more compatibility with storefronts along Main St.
 - The front elevation entrance features a window balcony, which is not recommended by the *Guidelines* (p.109, #14). While a historically typical detail in some locations, the Franklin Historic District features relatively few, if any, historic commercial buildings with window or juliet balconies. The entrance design offers little cornice detailing. For better compliance with the *Guidelines*, it is recommended that the entrance be modified to either 1) remove the balcony, or 2) alter the balcony into a deeper, functional porch. It is also appropriate that the a more decorative and substantial cornice design be included on the front entrance to provide more visual prominence and compatibility with adjacent storefront buildings.
- The applicant is proposing the use of masonry building materials, including brick veneer and cast stone. Other proposed materials include aluminum storefronts and windows.
 - The *Guidelines* recommend that one “use brick or masonry construction” (p.109, #17) and that masonry materials be “compatible in size, profile, and detailing with historic materials” (p.110, #18). The “tumbled” brick sample does not appear to be consistent with the detailing of historic materials.
 - The *Guidelines* document has several recommendations pertaining to windows, specifically their material, alignment, proportions, and shapes. The proposal appears to follow the regular proportions of upper façade windows in the historic district, and it utilizes appropriate window shapes (p.109, #12-13). The *Guidelines* recommend that new windows be “wooden, anodized aluminum with dark or bronze finishes” (p.129, #9). The proposed “glazed-in muntin” design may be appropriate for use as storefront walls, but it is recommended that the applicant provide a sample upper-story window for consideration in light of the applicable *Guidelines*. Upper-story windows are recommended to be true or simulated divided-light and to relate to the architectural style of the structure or those found on neighboring buildings (p.129, #4-5).
- A rooftop patio/terrace is proposed on top of the two-story building form at the intersection of 1st Ave. S. and E. Main St. The *Guidelines* state “if modern roof elements like...decks, balconies...are desired, install them so they are not visible from the street” (p.119, #3). At the recommendation of the DRC, the applicant modified the transparent patio wall to be around 50 percent opaque.

- **Parking/Utilities**

- The *Guidelines* recommend that screening should be provided for parking lots and that landscape elements such as trees, hedges, low shrubs, earth berms, or brick or wood fences be used to retain the general setback pattern (p.115, #3). The applicant is proposing the use of a surface parking lot accessible from 1st Ave. S. The site plan and conceptual renderings do not provide information about parking screening.

- A plan for utilities placement has not been submitted. The *Guidelines* recommend that one “locate mechanical systems behind or on top of buildings” and that one “place roof-mounted systems such that distance or elements like parapets keep them from view” (p.128, #3-4). Further, the *Guidelines* state that “meters, conduits, and other equipment” should be placed on rear elevations and that “satellite dishes may be placed on roofs where they are not readily visible from the street” (p.128, #6-7).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Historic Zoning Commission **approve with conditions** the proposed **demolition and new construction** with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must **photograph the existing building satisfactorily**—both inside and outside—and submit photographs to staff for Commission records prior to issuance of a demolition permit.
2. While the design features corbelling and includes subtle inlaid brick herringbone designs between the lower and upper floors, little architectural variation is provided on the upper facades. The applicant must alter one or two of the **front elevation vertical divisions** to include more decorative and substantial cornice detailing for better consistency with the *Guidelines*. The revision must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. For better consistency with the *Guidelines*, the **entrance** must be modified to either 1) remove the balcony, or 2) alter the balcony into a deeper, functional porch. Additionally, a more decorative and substantial cornice design must be included on the front entrance to provide more visual prominence and compatibility with adjacent storefront buildings. The revision must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. All **brick materials** be “compatible in size, profile, and detailing with historic materials.” The “tumbled” brick sample does not appear to be consistent with the detailing of historic materials. The applicant must provide a more compatible brick for consideration and approval by the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. All **upper-story windows** must have historic profile and dimension per the *Guidelines*. The applicant must submit window specifications to the Preservation Planner for consideration and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
6. The **rooftop deck** should not be visible from the street per the *Guidelines*, which state that “modern roof elements such as...decks” be installed so they are not visible from the street. The parapet wall should be utilized to screen it from view.
7. **Parking screening** should be provided through the use of landscape elements or brick walls (both of which are common to the historic district) so as to retain the general setback pattern.
8. Any **utilities** proposed for placement on the top of the building must be placed such that distance or elements like parapets keep them from view, per the *Guidelines*. Grounded utilities must also be screened from street view, per the *Guidelines*.
9. The application must meet the requirements of the City for **site plan approval** and **building permitting**. Depending on the site grading, the overall height of the tallest portion of the building

(43') may be required to be lowered to meet the maximum height regulations associated with Central Franklin Character Area 1.

10. Any **exterior alterations** to the plan set, including, but not limited to, foundation height, overall building height, materials, architectural features, and building footprint, **must be returned to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration and approval in light of the Guidelines.**
11. If the **Floodway Fringe Overlay** is being revised by a LOMR, then the Board of Zoning Appeals must consider the interpretation of the boundary for approval.
12. All signage, awnings, building-mounted lighting, and individual storefront configurations require additional information and more detailed specifications be submitted to the Preservation Planner for determination of eligibility for COAs. This information must be submitted in the form of COA applications at later dates.

SUGGESTED MOTION: I move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission **approve with conditions** a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #6625 for the **proposed demolition and new construction** with **staff's comments**, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated February 12, 2018.