

The regular meeting of the **Historic District Commission** was held on Thursday February 25, 2016, at 5:00 p.m. in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, 500 Poplar View Parkway.

The following Staff members were present: Town Planner, Mr. Jaime Groce; Assistant Town Planner, Mrs. Nancy Boatwright; Planner, Mr. Scott Henninger; and Administrative Specialist, Mrs. Sandi Robbins.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Cox led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Roll Call:**

Chairman Lee asked Mrs. Robbins to call the roll to see if there was a quorum.

Kelsey – present, Walker – present, Cox – present, Lee – present, Brooks - absent, Todd – absent Rozanski – absent

**Quorum present.**

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Lee asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from January 28, 2016 meeting.

Hearing none, Chairman Lee called for a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Cox, and seconded, to accept the minutes from the January 28, 2016 meeting.

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Walker – yes, Cox – yes, Lee – yes.

**Motion approved.**

**Approval of the Agenda**

Chairman Lee stated they are going to review item HDC 15-34189 S. Main - South Mane prior to HDC 16-01 Natchez Place Subdivision Lot 2.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any other changes to the agenda as amended.

Mr. Jaime Groce stated HDC 16-02 Andrews Minor Subdivision Lot 2 (235 Amelia Cove) have requested to increase the post size from 4” by 6” to 6” by 6”.

Motion by Commissioner Cox, and seconded, to approve the agenda as amended.

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Walker – yes, Cox – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

**Consent Agenda**

**HDC 16-02 Andrews Minor Subdivision Lot 2 (235 Amelia Cove) – Request a Certificate of Appropriateness for Fencing**

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Lee called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Kelsey, and seconded, to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing (Exhibits 2, 3 and 4) at 235 Amelia Cove (Andrews Minor Subdivision, Lot 2) subject to the following conditions.

- | <b>EXHIBITS</b>  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application (received 2/16/16)</li> <li>2. Site plan with fence location (received 2/16/16)</li> <li>3. Photo of proposed ornamental fence style with 6”x 8” posts (2/25/16)</li> <li>4. Staff photo of existing north fence (2/17/16)</li> <li>5. Wide Board Fence Examples in the Historic District</li> </ol> |

1. Any deviations from the approved Certificate of Appropriateness shall require the approval of the HDC and/or staff prior to beginning work.
2. A fence permit, with exhibits consistent with the HDC’s Certificate of Appropriates, must be obtained before construction of the fencing begins.

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Walker – yes, Cox – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

**Formal Agenda:**

**Commissioner Walker Recused himself at this time.**

**HDC15-34 189 S. Main - South Mane– Request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction for a 1,218 square foot, one-story hair salon on 0.208 acres located on the west side of South Main Street.**

Mr. Scott Henninger gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated there is a pending rezoning of this property (along with a few other properties) to Mixed Used. He stated and answered six key questions for this request.

- | <b>EXHIBITS</b>   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Applicant’s cover letter (1/12/16)</li> <li>2. Color Site Plan Rendering (1/12/16)</li> <li>3. Site Layout Plan (1/12/16)</li> <li>4. Elevations (1/12/16)</li> <li>5. Lighting Plan, Light Fixture &amp; Window Cut Sheets</li> <li>6. Sample Board &amp; Color Elevations</li> <li>7. Site Contextual Photos</li> <li>8. Aerial Photograph (1/12/16)</li> <li>9. Landscape Plan (11/30/15)</li> <li>10. Tree Removal Plan (11/30/15)</li> </ol> |

1. Is the proposed use (hair salon) permitted in the current zoning district, GI: General Industrial?  
He stated no, but they are in the process of rezoning the property to allow the MU: Mixed Use. He stated the intent of the MU district is to provide appropriate areas for quality mixed-use developments, to link uses for living, working, shopping, educating and recreating, and to encourage infill development compatible with the existing character of downtown. He stated the MU District has “form based” bulk requirements with setbacks require buildings to be pulled up to the street.
2. What does the 2010 Downtown Collierville Small Area Plan say about this block?  
He stated the block is identified as the “Mixed Use” Activity Center (Special Area 2) which is envisioned to “become the fourth side of the Square” as part of “the Live, Work, Play Initiative.” Via incremental infill or large assemblages or land, redevelopment should occur in these areas and will develop with a gridded and interconnected road network to create smaller and more walkable block sizes. The uses are

often varied within the same building with retail/office space below residential and have shared parking, on-street parking, and supportive surface parking located to the side or rear of buildings which address the street is encouraged. Parking lots and service areas and mechanical equipment should be screened. He stated shared access and service should be provided between adjacent parcels or buildings and to the rear of buildings to the maximum extent feasible.

3. Does the design comply with the Historic District Design Guidelines?

He stated for the most part yes, but there needs to be discussion over the architectural style and details.

He showed examples of the site plan, tree removal plan, and landscaping plan. Then he explained some elevation plans and materials the applicant planned to use.

4. What road improvements are required along the Main Street frontage?

He stated this lot has 65 feet of frontage on Main Street, which is a local street with a rural, unimproved character. The applicant will be dedicating an additional 5 feet of right-of-way and an additional 5 feet will become a pedestrian easement for a new sidewalk to parallel Main Street. In addition to the sidewalk, a concrete apron is proposed for the driveway to allow handicap accessibility as the sidewalk crosses the driveway. He stated a payment in-lieu for road improvements (curb and gutter) would be required per the Subdivision Regulations and this will be part of the Development Agreement.

5. What are the applicant's next steps to redevelop the property?

He stated if the HDC grants this Certificate of Appropriateness then the applicant will need to complete the Mixed Use rezoning. The applicant will need to meet the Conditions of Approval and address any concerns identified by the administrative final site plan. The applicant would need to enter into a Development Agreement and pay fees in-lieu of construction for road improvements, and apply for building permits.

6. Is gravel/stone an appropriate material for a nonresidential lot?

He stated the answer to this is maybe. The HDC Guidelines indicates that new parking should be paved with appropriate materials such as asphalt, brick, stone, or patterned concrete. The Zoning Ordinance generally requires parking lots to be paved. It also states "decorative, dust-free gravel used on conjunction with reinforced matting, grid pavers, or pervious asphalt, is permitted, but only if the HDC grants a certificate of appropriateness." The HDC permitted gravel at the Stratton House B & B because it was an adaptive reuse and to minimize impact on existing trees. He stated this site does have some trees around it. Most nearby parking areas are paved with either asphalt or concrete.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman Lee called the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Mark Underwood, 784 Deans Creek Drive, stated the Square seems like it is really coming alive and this property is a really interesting piece of the continuing development around the Square. He stated this site is tight for what the needs of this use. They are working with Staff and have met the requirements from Engineering. He explained what they are planning for this site. There are some drainage issues that will need to be addressed in this area. These drainage issues are one of the reasons they decided to go with the stone based parking. It's not necessary a cost factor more so aesthetics and will look similar to what the Quonset Hut has on the front side of their building. He stated another reason they want to use gravel is because there are trees along the north side of the property. They don't want to pour asphalt over the drip lines of the trees. They agreed to dedicate the right-of-way, which will be consistent with what was done with the Fisher law firm.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Commissioner Cox asked if the use of gravel is a cost factor or the applicant's choice.

Mr. Underwood stated it is the clients' desire to use gravel. Because of drainage issues and being in an area with older infrastructure, he and Civil Engineer Rust Norvel thought this would be the perfect application for a stone gravel parking lot.

Commissioner Cox asked if the Guidelines state that there needs to be matting if gravel is used.

Mr. Henninger stated Zoning Ordinance does. He stated one of the conditions require the applicant to provide a detail showing that.

Chairman Lee stated he has seen the gravel used at the Stratton house and it doesn't look bad. He has walked on gravel in several parking lots and it's certainly not as comfortable as walking on asphalt or concrete. It seems if you are going to have a lot of clients walking on this that would be a consideration. He would want to keep the option open for the applicant to convert it to asphalt or concrete.

Mr. Underwood stated that would be fair and agreeable to the client.

Commissioner Cox stated the Quonset Hut was an existing condition and the gravel has been there for years. This is parking for a new building. He wonders what precedent they are setting for new construction around the Square. He doesn't particularly like gravel parking lots. He doesn't want to cost the applicant more money but would like to see asphalt parking. He is concerned all the other buildings will become gravel.

Commissioner Kelsey stated he agrees with Commissioner Cox. He would like to see asphalt used for the driveway and parking spaces connected to the concrete pad.

Chairman Lee stated part of the reason they approved gravel at the Stratton House was to save a tree, which didn't work. His preference is for them to use concrete or asphalt for this new building.

A discussion ensued over if the applicant would use asphalt or concrete over gravel which resulted in the applicant agreeing to use asphalt or concrete.

Mr. Michael Walker, WalkerArch, 105 N. Center Street, Ste. 201, stated he wanted to make clear he agreed with the fact if this were to be on the Square it should be keep to look more similar to the other buildings on the Square. Since they are in a transitional area, he thinks this building will work with the eclectic nature of the Historic District. He stated they are using a slab on grade with a turn down slab. They have lower the parging down to the floor line and it will be landscaped so less than a foot may not be seen. He discussed the required ceiling height and how they intend to meet the condition.

There was a discussion over the closed shutters on the north side of the building.

Commissioner Cox asked if they could add some columns or awning to break up the appearance of the building front.

Mr. Walker stated it was supposed to have an old row house, shack/shanty kind of feel.

There was a discussion over whether they should be required to add more decorative features to the front of the building.

Mr. Walker explained details about the simulated divided light windows they would like to use.

Mr. Walker explained the lighting details they would like to use.

Chairman Lee asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Lee called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Cox, and seconded, to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction for a 1,218 square foot, one-story hair salon on 0.208 acres located on the west side of South Main Street subject to the following conditions.

1. Any deviations from the approved Certificate of Appropriateness shall require the approval of the HDC and/or staff prior to work beginning.
2. The applicant shall address staff comments from the pending Final Site Plan application (DD 15-068), Conditions of Approval from the HDC Certificate of Appropriateness, and the approval of the rezoning of the property to Mixed Use complete prior to consideration by the BMA for a Development Agreement and issuance of Building Permits.
3. Per the requirements of the Mixed Use Zoning District, all floor space provided on the ground floor of a mixed use building shall have a minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 11 feet. Note this on Exhibit 4.
4. Provide an ingress/egress easement extending from the south property line to the north property line along the alignment of the rear drive isle allowing future access between properties.
5. Screen the utility structures, mechanical units, backflow preventers, and moveable trash can from view Main Street and adjacent properties.
6. If archaeological resources are discovered during construction the applicant shall notify staff prior to proceeding with construction Standards for Rehabilitation (HD Guidelines Chapter V. (Appendices B)).
7. LED lighting is likely too bright and may be out of character for the Historic District (HDG IV., C. & Lighting Ordinance). Use “warm” lighting and use fixtures where the light source is not visible.
8. A sign permit must be obtained prior to the installation of any signage.
9. Provide the following on the Architectural Plans (Exhibit 4) with the Final Site Plan Package:
  - a. ~~Incorporate brick into the base of the building instead of the parge material (HDG III., B., 8.).~~
  - b. The standing seam metal roof shall be of a non-reflective finish to be compatible with and complement historic buildings (HDG III., B., 8.). Specify material at the end of the standing seam roofs and if the building is to contain gutters and downspouts include and label on the elevations.
  - c. Provide details or manufacturers cut sheets on the plans with call outs of materials and colors of all openings. On the elevations, label all openings (material, color, etc.) including the false openings that appear to be shutters or vents (HDG III., B., 7., Checklist).
  - d. All openings shall meet the intent of the Historic District Guidelines and contain simulated divided lights and recessed door and window jambs. (H.D.G. III., B., 7., f.).
  - e. Modern wall mounted light fixtures are not appropriate in the historic district (HDG IV., C.). Use fixtures that are traditional in character similar other storefront lighting in the Historic District (§151.190 & HDG IV. C. 1.). Provide cut sheets of all fixtures a lighting schedule on the plans.
  - f. Show the wall mounted lighting, appurtenances, and rooftop penetrations on the elevations and roof plan and how they will be shielded or screened (Checklist). Paint rooftop vents and other appurtenances to match the surrounding roof color.
10. Provide an updated photometric plan to ensure adequate lighting (HDG IV. A. 8. & Zoning Ordinance § 151.190).
11. This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.

12. Approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness approval shall become null and void if the BMA has not adopted Ordinance 2016-04 by 02/25/17.
13. Include tree protection fencing to match the Town’s Standard Tree Protection Detail (TOC-601) around the trees to be preserved.
14. In order to mitigate the 5 large trees which will be removed, provide either 3 mitigation trees on-site in addition to the required plantings or make a \$300/tree payment in-lieu of tree mitigation into the Tree Bank as part of the Development Agreement (Tree Mitigation Policy requires 1 mitigation tree per 2 removed).
15. The parking lot shall be paved with either asphalt or concrete surface.

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Cox – yes, Lee – yes, Walker – recued.

**Motion Approved.**

**HDC16-01 Natchez Place Subdivision Lot 2– Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Residential Construction**

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. This is the last lot and approval of this house will complete this neighborhood. It is within the Historic District, but not within the National Register District. He showed the tree planting plan for Natchez Place and stated they will be able to save about three trees and plan to plant more to replace the ones lost. He stated there are several key questions he will address.

1. Will the house comply with the contextual front setbacks and spacing requirements approved by the HDC for the Natchez Place Subdivision in July 2014?
2. Will the exterior design (arrangement, texture, and materials), be generally compatible with the historic structures in the surrounding area?
3. Does the proposed residence meet the Single Family Design Standards for the TN district?

<b>EXHIBITS</b>	
1.	Cover Letter (2/9/16)
2.	Site Photos of Lot #2, Natchez Place (1/13/16)
3.	Aerial of Lot #2
4.	Material & Design Samples (1/13/16)
5.	Architectural Elevations (1/13/16)
6.	Site & Roof Plans (1/13/16)
7.	Natchez Place Subdivision, Final Plat (recorded August 2015)
8.	Examples of Bungalows in the Historic District (1/13/16)
9.	Examples of Bungalows with a Front Facing Gable
10.	Lot #2 in relationship to the Local Historic Overlay and National Register District

He sated they look carefully at the setting patterns and there was a façade zone established. This house meets the front façade zone. He explained the variety of materials that are being used. He stated there haven’t been too many bungalow styles for infill subdivisions, but it is a documented Collierville style within the Historic District Guidelines. He summarized the tone from the January 2015 Historic Commission meeting and the consensus of the Historic District Commission wanting to have an eclectic style Historic District when it comes to the style of residential infill needed. He stated there are clear examples of this style in the Historic District Guidelines. He stated this house has a front facing gable. Even though the Guidelines show side facing dormers, there is a bungalow on Walnut Street that has front facing gables. There also should be more detailing added to the west side as it will be visible from Natchez Street. The applicant is in agreement and would like to use fixed shutters. He stated in the plan it looked like the side walk leading to the public sidewalk was segmented with landscaping in between. The Guidelines state the sidewalks should be similar to what’s around it. He showed some examples of other sidewalks around the applicant. He explained the applicant will need to pull a fence permit because there is a pool request and they will have a “pool barrier.” If the fence is metal like others in Natchez, the Historic District Commission review won’t be needed.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

There was a discussion over the use of fixed shutters on the west faced to add the needed detailing.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman Lee called the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Jeff Bramlett, Custom Residential Design, 94 North Main Street, stated they are willing to add fixed shutters. They are reluctant to add windows because of the privacy needed on the master sweet side of the home. They were thinking of a balance of one pair of fixed shutters towards the front and balance out the elevation with another fixed set.

Chairman Lee asked if they would propose one pair of false windows with shutters to be in symmetry to the existing window.

Mr. Bralmett stated yes sir. He stated they will use the same proportions and balance with the roof line above.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Commissioner Walker stated he liked the design and having a bungalow in this area helps provide varied and eclectic roof lines in this neighborhood.

Chairman Lee stated the design tends to reflect the Stratton house across the street. He doesn't have any objections to the bungalow style.

Commissioner Cox stated Historic District homes were built over several decades which cause the architecture to vary. He believes that different architecture styles give the Historic District a lot of character and believes the bungalow style is great.

Chairman Lee asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Lee called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Kelsey, and seconded, to approve the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new residential construction at Natchez Place Lot #2 (per Exhibits 4, 5, 7 and 8), subject to the following conditions:

1. Any changes or deviations from the approved plans will require staff and/or HDC approval prior to construction.
2. Paving materials for the front walk shall be a continuous formed concrete surface to be compatible with the character of other walks on this block.
3. Add architectural detail to the west elevation of the home (adding one false window with fixed shutters to in balance with the existing window) as it will be visible from Natchez Street.
4. If the pool barrier is a metal fence and the design is similar to that of fence styles approved for other homes in the Natchez Place Subdivision, then staff can review and approve it administratively.

Chairman Lee stated if there is no other discussion then he will call for a vote.

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Walker – yes, Cox – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

## **Other Business**

Chairman Lee asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Groce stated the March 22, 2016 Historic Meeting will be on a Tuesday due to a Town holiday. At this meeting Derrick Honeycutt, General Services Director, will provide updates on the historic high school and share plans for the new bathrooms on the Square. He stated they have a sign permit pending for the building on the north side of the Square where Yolo was. He wanted their opinion on Stratton Heights Lot 8. He stated the property owner has redesigned the plans that didn't exactly meet one of the Historic District Commission conditions. He explained the requested change in plans to the Historic District Commission.

There was a discussion over wall thickness on the redesigned Stratton Heights Lot 8 plan.

A discussion ensued about adding a window or shutters to the long empty wall and redesigning of the two rear elevation are the same with an addition of two windows on the wall if the applicant wants to keep the carport on the west elevation.

There was a discussion over amending the Historic District Commission Guidelines to not allow repetitive elevation and floorplans for homes in the Historic District and Mr. Groce said he would confer with Administration about getting this on the next HDC agenda.

There was a discussion over MLGW cutting down trees in the Historic District and their tree trimming practices.

With no further business, Chairman Lee adjourned the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

---

Secretary, Laura Todd