

The regular meeting of the **Historic District Commission** was held on Thursday April 28, 2016, at 5:05 p.m. in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, 500 Poplar View Parkway.

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

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Lee 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 (Joined 5:44pm), Cox – present, Rozanski – present, Lee – present, Todd – absent, Brooks – absent.

**Quorum present.**

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Lee asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from March 22, 2016 meeting.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to accept the minutes from the March 22, 2016 meeting.

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Cox – abstain, Rozanski – yes, Lee – yes.

**Motion approved.**

**Approval of the Agenda**

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

Mr. Jaime Groce stated there are none.

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

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Cox – yes, Rozanski – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

**Formal Agenda:**

Commissioner Kelsey Recused himself at this time.

**HDC 16-10 275 N. Main Street - Request a Certificate of Appropriateness for Fencing**

Mr. Scott Henninger gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated this solid white board fence has been partially constructed. The properties next to the applicant, 255 & 257 N. Main Street, have been recently sold by the applicant and this fence goes behind that property. Mr. Henninger stated the applicant has applied for a fence permit; however, a permit has not been issued and construction

- |  |
|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>EXHIBITS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Application (received 3/22/16)</li><li>2. Applicants Cover Letter (dated 3/11/16)</li><li>3. Applicants Fence Exhibits (rcv'd 3/22/16)</li><li>4. Staff Photos of 275 North Main &amp; Fencing</li><li>5. Gothic Fence Example</li></ol> |
|--|

had started without having it approved. This construction was halted at the request of Staff. The structural side of the fence is visible from Main Street, which is not allowed. The fence is a “dog-eared” treated pine fence and may not meet the Historic District Guidelines. The applicant has pointed out there are several (horizontal supports) similar fences found throughout the Historic District. He stated the Historic District Guidelines call for “fencing to match existing fencing in material, height, and detail. The scale and level of ornateness of the design of any new fences should relate to the scale and ornateness of the existing house.”

Mr. Groce gave an overview of a slide that was presented as training for the HDC in 2009 and 2010. He went into detail about the types of wide board fences that can meet the Historic District Guidelines, such as with ornamental detailing or use of evergreen landscaping to hide the solid fence.

Mr. Henninger showed some examples of gothic and capped fences asking if the HDC found these types of fences to be more appropriate than the “dog-eared” treated pine. He stated the Historic District Design Guidelines state that “the design of new fences should blend with materials and designs found in the district.” He stated materials used by neighbors and the existing fence are similar to the “dog-eared” fence.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

Commissioner Cox asked to clarify the fence location.

Mr. Henninger stated the new fence is behind the applicant’s home on the lot to the south that was recently sold.

Chairman Lee stated, at this point, there is no plan to provide fencing on 255 & 257 N. Main Street to screen the fence at the back.

Mr. Henninger stated that is correct it is a different property owner.

Chairman Lee asked if the applicant would be willing to turn the fence boards around at the east west portion of the fence out.

Mr. Henninger stated the applicant would like to leave that portion as it is.

Commissioner Rozanski asked if the fence is going in a new location or is it replacing a fence in an existing location.

Mr. Henninger stated he believed it is an all new fence in a new location.

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

Mr. Alan Rawie, 275 N. Main Street, stated originally the property line running east and west had an old wire fence that received storm damaged by a tree. Since then they had the tree caught down and sold the property. They replaced the privacy fence from a wired post.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Chairman Lee asked if the applicant would turn the fence boards on the east west portion of the fence.

Mr. Rawie stated they are nailed in and the boards on the north south are screwed in. If he takes the boards down he will probably destroy more than half of them.

Commissioner Cox stated he would have put a fence across the drive way where you can't see in the back yard.

Mr. Rawie stated that no longer is his property.

There was a discussion over why it would be more difficult to turn the boards around on the east west portion than the north south portion.

A discussion ensued about Mr. Rawie asking the new property owner of 255 & 257 N. Main Street if he can put up a fence to block views of the non-conforming portions from Main Street.

Chairman Lee asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

There was a discussion about requiring turning of the boards but not requiring painting.

Commissioner Rozanski stated it is unfortunate that the east west section is nailed in. Flipping these nailed in boards is not easy but it is doable. He said he does not think they should be required to screen the solid fence with evergreen landscaping.

Chairman Lee stated he sympathizes that this will be extra work if he does have to turn those boards around but, in his opinion the fence is so visible from the street that it should be done to meet the guidelines.

Commissioner Cox stated this is a hard one and is unfortunate. If that 15 ft. stretch of fence was on 255 & 257 N. Main Street then this wouldn't be an issue.

Chairman Lee stated that would be the best solution for the applicant to work with the owner of 255 & 257 N. Main Street to put up a fence across the driveway.

There was a discussion over the standard way to put up a fence with the horizontal boards & posts are inside facing the property owners.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing (Exhibits 1, 2, & 3) at 275 North Main Street, subject to the following conditions.

Commissioner Cox asked if we could include if the applicant contacts the land owner next door and they agree to put up a fence across the driveway the applicant no longer has to turn their boards.

Commissioner Rozanski agreed to the friendly amendment to the motion and the Commissioner who seconded agreed to the following amended motion.

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing (Exhibits 1, 2, & 3) at 275 North 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 beginning work.
2. Turn the decorative (finished) side of the fence to face outward from the 275 property (§ 151.006, C., 10.). Applicant does not have to turn fence outward if they work with the property owner of 255 & 257 N. Main Street to build a fence that would connect from the property line of 275 N. Main Street to the house on the adjacent property which would shield the back fence.
3. ~~To match the scale and level of ornateness of the existing house (Historic District Guidelines Chapter II, B., 7.), either screen (from view from Main Street) the fence as constructed with 6' tall upright evergreen shrubs such as the Emerald Green Arborvitae or install a new section of fence between 255/257 North Main and 275 North Main that includes:~~
  - a. ~~Either a cap rail or decorative "Gothic" picket spears (similar to the existing decorative fencing at 275 North Main (see Exhibit 4) and other fences indicated in Exhibit 5, and~~
  - b. ~~Painting the fence between the two facades white and softening by adding a minimum 24" evergreen hedge.~~
4. A fence permit, with exhibits consistent with the HDC's Certificate of Appropriates, must be obtained before construction of the fencing begins.

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

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – recused, Cox – yes, Rozanski – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

**HDC 16-05 Resolution 2016-14- A resolution to amend the Historic District Commission's Design Guidelines for the purpose of preventing repetitious architectural designs for residential infill subdivisions.**

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. The HDC formerly considered this Resolution at the last formal meeting on March 22, 2016, but deferred action to hold non-voting work session to get some feedback and work on language. The non-voting work session was held on April 18, 2016 which the HDC received great feedback and some suggestions from the HDC and local property owners, designers, and builders on how to pair back the language. The tone of the discussion at the work session was to keep the change simple and to focus on houses and to make it very clear in the guidelines that we don't want to see the same front façade in an area over and over.

EXHIBITS
1. Resolution 2016-14, 4/20/16: -Attachment A, 4/40/16
2. HDC Meeting Minutes related to request
3. Michael Green 4/28/16 Email

He stated the BMA will adapt this Resolution after the HDC makes a formal recommendation. The BMA will have the final say. He stated the HDC has had guidelines since 1989. These guidelines have been amended several times since then.

He recapped that the new guidelines change will apply just to new home construction with in the Historic District. He read the new language being added to the guidelines from Exhibit 1 verbatim.

He stated he received an email (Exhibit 3) from local property owner and real estate professional Michael Green which expressed concern over any changes. The email expressed the opinion that the guidelines are strong enough without this amendment to be able to prevent a repetitious home design. The email also express concern about having pre-application conferences as a requirement before submitting plans. Mr. Groce stated the pre-application conference is something Staff currently requires for all new home construction based on language already in the Guidelines, as it's just part of the way we do business. At these meetings the main purpose is to help people know what they need to submit, when deadlines are, and prepare them to be ready to submit to the HDC. The meetings are a form of "consumer protection."

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chairman Lee asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Cox stated he believed the new language for change to be less intrusive to potential developers and still accomplish what it is intended for when he proposed the idea earlier this year.

Commissioner Rozanski stated he agreed. The new text is consistent with the guidelines and doesn't add any extra burdens.

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

Motion by Commissioner Cox, and seconded, to recommend approval to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen (BMA) of Resolution 2016-14, a resolution to amend the Historic District Design Guidelines for the purpose of preventing repetitious architectural designs for new houses, as depicted in Exhibit 1.

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

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – yes, Cox – yes, Rozanski – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

There was a discussion about the purpose of pre-application conferences regarding HDC items.

**HDC 16-11 266 Natchez Street (Stratton Heights Subdivision Lot 12) - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an amendment to change the eastern side yard setback of Lot #12 from 12.5 feet to 10 feet.**

Commissioner Walker joined that meeting at this time. (5:44)

Mr. Matthew Wilkinson gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated this lot was created in 2015 as part of the Stratton Heights Subdivision. The current side yard setback was determined by staff and the HDC as means to preserve a traditional spacing between houses in this portion of the Historic District as infill housing is added. He explained the applicant is requesting this augmentation to the setback to allow the future property owner to build a home with a greater separation with the shared access easement. Also, by moving the house further east, this will maintain a more consistent development pattern in the area as the adjacent property to the east of lot 12 is outside of the Stratton Heights Subdivision and was approved

- | EXHIBITS  |
|---|
| 1. Cover letter (4/1/16)                        |
| 2. Lots #11 & #12 Conceptual Site Plan (4/1/16) |
| 3. Existing Conditions of site (4/13/16)        |
| 4. HDC Minutes from November 2013               |
| 5. Plot Plan for Freed Property (January 2013)  |

for a 40 ft. side yard setback along the shared boundary. He stated, under typical circumstances, a 10 ft. side yard setback would create a spacing that is inconsistent with the historic home spacing in this portion of the Historic District. If the side setback for lot 12 is reduced to 10 ft., the spacing between the two infill homes will be 50 ft., which is consistent with the Historic District Guidelines.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

There was a discussion over moving the house away from the shared lot line of lots 11 & 12 and how it would aid in the shared access driveway.

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

Mr. Corey Brady, 975 Fair Oaks Drive, stated they have one minor technically the Peeper family is the current owner of this lot. It shows the Parr family as the owner but Lot 12 has officially transferred to the Peepers family. He stated when they originally planned the subdivision, the shared access drive was a little narrower but they had widened it to allow for trucks the ability to use it as a turn around.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Chairman Lee asked if there was any issue with the slope down into the gully from moving the house closer to that and causing a future problem.

Mr. Brady stated, from a designers stand point, no sir.

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 the applicant's request (Exhibit 1) for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a plan amendment to change the eastern side yard setback of Lot #12 from 12.5 feet to 10 feet, with any changes or deviations from the approved plans will require staff and/or HDC approval prior to construction.

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

**Roll Call:**

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

**Motion Approved.**

**HDC 16-15 254 Natchez Street (Stratton Heights Subdivision Lot 11) - Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of an accessory structure and semi-attached garage**

Mr. Matthew Wilkinson gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated this is the original house for this larger tract that was incorporated into the Stratton Heights Subdivision and is a contributing structure within the National Historic District. Neither the garage nor accessory structures were mentioned in the nomination form for this structure. He stated the key questions he will cover are:

**EXHIBITS**

1. Applicant's Cover Letter (4/1/16)
2. Demolition Plan (4/1/16)
3. Conceptual Site Layout (4/1/16)
4. Existing Garage Images (4/1/16)
5. Existing Accessory Structure Images (4/1/16)
6. 2004 Town Historic District Survey
7. Collierville National Register Historic District Nomination form

1. Why does the property owner want to demolish these structures?
2. Is it appropriate to demolish the semi-attached garage?
3. Is it appropriate to demolish the accessory structure?

He stated the property owner wants to remove these structures to allow for the construction of a future carport or garage constructed in a carriage house style. He stated by removing the existing garage it will allow for easier access for turnaround in the shared driveway. He stated the garage is located on the eastern side of the house and is partially attached to the house by an informal cover. He stated Staff doesn't have an exact record of when this garage was built but the applicant believes it was constructed in the 1980s. Demolition of the garage would be considered appropriate given the garage isn't a contributing element in any preservation document that the Town possess. By removing the garage the house will return to its original visual appearance.

The second structure is an accessory structure located in the rear eastern corner of the property. The age of this structure is undetermined. The property owner Hampton Parr commissioned a study of the structure to look if it can be eventually turned into a carport or some other structure made useable. The results of that study recommended the structure be removed due to severe state of dilapidation. Staff has not conducted a study and cannot verify the results of the consultant. Due to the dilapidated state and not contributing to historical integrity it would be appropriate to remove this structure.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

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

Mr. Corey Brady, 975 Fair Oaks Drive, stated he is here to answer any questions the HDC may have.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Chairman Lee asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Cox stated he thinks the additions were made in the 1960s. He believes he remembers the house without them, or at least the garage. He believes these structures detract from the house. He thinks they should tear them down, especially since one is dilapidated.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing semi-attached garage and accessory structure located at 254 Natchez Street, subject to the following conditions.

1. A demolition permit shall be obtained prior to any demolition.
2. Any changes/deviations from this request will require staff and/or HDC approval prior to the work commencing.

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

**Roll Call:**

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

**Motion Approved.**

**HDC 16-12 266 Natchez Street (Stratton Heights Subdivision Lot 12) - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Residential Construction**

Commissioner Kelsey Recused himself at this time.

Mr. Matthew Wilkinson gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated the property is located within the National Register District. The lot was subdivided with Stratton Heights Subdivision from a property at 254 Natchez Street. He stated the key questions he will be addressing:

1. Do the proposed bulk requirements produce contextual building setbacks and spacing?
2. Will the exterior design (arrangement, texture, and materials), be generally compatible with the historic structures in the surrounding area?
3. Will this home have a façade design that too closely resembles home facades on this block?
4. Is it appropriate to have a parking area in front of the house?
5. Does the proposed residence meet the Single Family Design Standards for the TN district?

**EXHIBITS**

1. Cover Letter (4/1/16)
2. Material samples, colors, and light fixtures (4/1/16)
3. Plot Plan & Construction plan packet(4/1/16)
  - a. Plot Plan
  - b. Foundation Plan
  - c. Floor Plans
  - d. Roof Plan and Construction Details
  - e. Elevations
4. December 2014 HDC meeting minutes
5. Historic District Boundaries Map
6. Stratton Heights Subdivision, Final Plat (recorded 8/11/15)
7. Stratton Heights Architectural Control Committee Approval Letter (4/21/16)
8. Front Façade of houses on this block of Natchez Street.

He stated the HDC Certificate of Appropriateness for Stratton Heights Subdivision created building envelopes to establish setbacks and spacing patterns along this portion of Natchez Street to conform to the established patterns. He explained the setbacks for Lot 12. He stated the architecture style of this house is a mixture of several styles but is most similar to that of Neo Colonial Revival with some characteristics of Greek Revival. He stated the Greek revival style is not currently found formerly within the Historic District, but this style was predominate in the Pre-Civil War architecture. He stated the circular windows may not be appropriate for the design of the house and there may not be enough architectural detail on the left side elevation. He explained the texture and materials are compatible and explained what they are to be. He stated the Historic District Guidelines state that new parking should be located to the sides and rears of existing buildings and should be screened with landscaping if the area is predominately visible from public right-a-way. The proposed parking pad does not meet guidelines; however, at the 2014 December HDC meeting the HDC determined that Lot #9 could have front yard parking, which was justified due to the lack of on street parking along Natchez Street and the small size of the lot. The house being proposed on Lot #12 shares the both the small lot size and the location on Natchez Street.

Mr. Jaime Groce explained how all the houses facades that were built on Natchez Street are different from each other.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

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

Mr. Cade Peeper, 1297 Bridgepointe Drive, stated he is the applicant's son and is their building consultant.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Chairman Lee asked why they were planning on using brick columns that accentuate the parking pad instead of landscape that hides the parking pad.

Mr. Peeper stated the columns are not half columns, they are more along the line of a 1/8 of a column, almost a pedestal to act as a base for New Orleans cast iron flower pots. There will be English Boxwoods in front of the pad. These will help accentuate the landscaping in the front yard and somewhat help camouflage the pad.

Commissioner Cox stated the house looks odd with not having anything on the left side and then have the door offset on the front side.

Mr. Peeper stated it was typical in the design of a Federal Greek Revival to have an offset front door.

There was a discussion over Colonial Revival vs Greek Revival styles.

Commissioner Cox asked if the oval windows could be changed to square.

Mr. Peepers stated they could be but they chose oval because of the floor plan.

Commissioner Rozanski stated the master bedroom is bricked in with wood pilasters but there is little recess and no fenestration. In his opinion it looks like an addition.

Mr. Peepers stated they want it to look like an addition because there is a desire to make something look like it was added onto. They are trying to go back with landscaping with vine and ivy.

Commissioner Rozanski state he felt the oval windows add interest and is not detrimental to the elevation. The east side seems odd with the two story section that is bricked from the right side elevation but on the front elevation that portion is siding.

Mr. Peepers stated it was a personal preference. His parents liked it and wanted the side to look somewhat like an addition to the house.

There was a discussion over the mixing siding and brick along the different elevations and how to change it to be more appropriate.

A discussion ensued over shutters not on all the windows on the left side elevations. This discussion evolved into a discussion if wood and PVC shutters are acceptable in the Historic District.

There was discussion over the French doors and if they will be clear light. In this discussion it was determined that they would be.

Chairman Lee asked if there was any concern about moving the house closer to the ditch to the east that you would lose some structural integrity of the house.

Mr. Peeper stated he doesn't think they will have any structural integrity. They are considering a small retaining wall along the east property line to help maintain the ditch. The two feet that they needed with HDC 16-11 was to help with the shared common drive between Lot #s 11 & 12.

There was a discussion over the height of the pedestals.

Chairman Lee asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the applicant's request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for new residential construction, including related fencing, at 266 Natchez Street, Lot #12 of Stratton Heights Subdivision (per Exhibits 2, 3, 4 & 5), 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. To ensure that paving materials are compatible with the character of the area the concrete in the shared drive extension, parking pad, and turnaround shall include a washed aggregate having a similar mix to what is currently being constructed on other lots in Stratton Heights Subdivision.
3. Require siding on east side of the house for the dining room and rec room two-story element, with veneer siding on the first and second floor with a brick water table.
4. Provide & maintain the landscaping (Ivy similar to Carolina Jasmine) of the south east corner.

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

**Roll Call:**

Kelsey – recused, Cox – yes, Rozanski – yes, Walker – yes, Lee – yes

**Motion Approved.**

**Other Business**

Chairman Lee asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Jaime Groce stated Mathew is reviewing a house being renovated on Center Street. On Monday night the BMA approved a development agreement for the exterior changes to 148 N. Main. They don't have a building permit yet but it should happen very soon.

Chairman Lee asked if there was going to be a presentation on the restroom design on the Square.

Mr. Groce stated Derick Honeycutt was not able to make that presentation tonight.

There was a discussion about constructing such a building on the Square without it coming before the HDC.

Commissioner Cox stated he believes it should come to the HDC for review and approval.

Mr. Groce stated they had a pre-application conference for the two-story building to go next to 148 N. Main building and it may be coming to the HDC soon. He stated there is training on July 14, 2016 at the Morton Museum where they want to add the Porter House on the National Register of Historic Places.

With no further business, Chairman Lee adjourned the meeting at 6:34 p.m.

---

Secretary, Laura Todd