

The regular meeting of the **Historic District Commission** was held on Thursday August 25, 2016, at 5:45 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. Matthew Wilkinson; and Administrative Specialist, Mrs. Sandi Robbins.

Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Rozanski led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call:

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

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

Quorum present.

Approval of Minutes

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

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

Motion by Commissioner Walker, and seconded, to accept the minutes from the July 28, 2016 meeting.

Roll Call:

Brooks – yes, Rozanski – abstain, Walker – abstain, Lee – yes.

Motion approved.

Approval of the Agenda

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

Mr. Jaime Groce stated the only change is to item 6. A. HDC 16-32 and that's the address. It was advertised as 138 Main Street, but we have heard from MLGW that the address will actual be known as 140 N. Main Street. From this point forward HDC 16-32 will be known as 140 N. Main.

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

Roll Call:

Brooks – yes, Rozanski – yes, Walker – yes, Lee – yes.

Motion Approved.

Consent Agenda:

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff, or if there was any one present who wished to have this item heard.

Hearing no further comments, he called for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Brooks, and seconded, to approve the Consent Agenda with the conditions of approval as attached to each staff report.

HDC16-19 – 274 W. Poplar Avenue – Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Fencing

To approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing (Exhibits 1, 2 and 3) at 274 W. Poplar Ave (Andrews Minor Subdivision, Lot 1) 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. A fence permit, with exhibits consistent with the HDC’s Certificate of Appropriates, must be obtained before construction of the fencing begins.

- | EXHIBITS |
|---|
| 1. Application (8/15/16) |
| 2. Site plan with fence location (8/15/16) |
| 3. Design of Proposed Fencing and Column (8/15/16) |
| 4. Photos of fencing location on property (8/15/16) |
| 5. Photo of proposed crossbuck fence style (8/15/16) |
| 6. Photos of brick on the house with detail (8/15/16) |
| 7. Example of proposed column with similar decorative features(8/15/16) |

HDC16-39 – 208 Washington Street (Natchez Place Lot 7) – Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Fencing

To approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing (Exhibits 2 and 4) on 208 Washington 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. A fence permit, with exhibits consistent with the HDC’s Certificate of Appropriates, must be obtained before construction of the fencing begins.
- 3. The proposed fence’s horizontal rails shall align with the existing fence’s rails to the maximum extent possible; however, at no point shall the fence height exceed 48 inches as defined by Section 151.006 (C) (3) (a) of the Town Code.

- | EXHIBITS |
|---|
| 1. Cover Letter & Description of Materials (8/9/16) |
| 2. Site Plan (8/9/16) |
| 3. Image of Existing Fence on Property |
| 4. Image with Proposed Design (8/9/16) |
| 5. Images of Subject Property (8/9/16) |

Roll Call:

Brooks – yes, Rozanski – yes, Walker – yes, Lee – yes.

Motion Approved.

Formal Agenda:

HDC16-32 – 140 Main Street – Request approval of a Preliminary Site Plan for a 13,485 square-foot, two-story nonresidential building located on the east side of North Main Street, south of Natchez Street, west of Mount Pleasant Road, and north of Washington Street.

Mr. Scott Henninger gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated there have been several applications in the recent past for this particular site. There were 4 accessory structures that were removed on the rear portion of this property in 2015. 148 N Main is an existing building on the property that is under conversion to house a restaurant called 148 North. The 140 N. Main will address some improvements along Main Street and the rear parking area for the entire property.

EXHIBITS
1. Applicant’s cover letter (08/09/16)
2. a. Preliminary Site Plan Exhibits (08/09/16)
b. Final Subdivision Plat (08/09/16)
3. Color Site Plan Rendering (08/09/16)
4. Existing Conditions Aerial (08/18/16)
5. Photos of surrounding buildings (08/18/16)

He stated the property is within the Historic Overlay which requires the HDC’s review. He explained the past applicants that were approved for this site. He stated it was noted in 2015 that this future infill building would be proposed on the vacant land south of the existing building. The HDC will primarily be concerned with the building and the streetscape along Main Street. The architecture, with some modifications noted in the conditions, does apply with the HDC design guidelines. The design respects the existing historic styles in Downtown Collierville. The form, storefront design, and canopies meet the specifics in the Guidelines and will produce a building that is compatible with the Historic District. He explained the materials, façade details and elevations for the proposed building. He stated the applicant needs to look over the building storefront for possible signage locations as project moves to Final Site Plan stage. He stated there will be an elevator shaft that will extend on the back portion of the building. He explained the light fixtures that are proposed and how there is an existing condition to make sure they are appropriate. He explained what plants will be used for the landscaping and where they would be placed. He stated there will be a broom finish concrete sidewalk built within the right-of-way. They are proposing a concrete and landscape bump out at the corner of Main & Natchez Street. They are providing landscaping along Main Street sidewalk back to the rear parking area. There are several on-street parking places along Main Street, along Natchez Street and in the rear parking. The CB: Central Business Zoning District does not require parking but the applicant has chosen to provide on-site parking. The proposed building is envisioned to be mostly office space. The office uses will typically take up parking space primarily during the day. The restaurant (148 North) will primarily take up parking spaces in the evening and weekends. There will be sharing of parking between the two buildings. The applicant will need to update the color elevations before the Development Agreement is submitted to the BMA.

He explained that two story buildings are appropriate at this location. The Historic District Design Guidelines recommend that new commercial buildings relate in mass, complexity of form, directional expression, height, width, and scale. The proposed building will be very similar in scale with surrounding buildings. Special Area 1 of the Downtown Collierville Small Area Plan (Downtown Core Place Type) says buildings on the Square should have a strong relationship to the street frontage, typically highly detailed on the street side, have a strong orientation towards pedestrians, the area has a historic commercial character typically at a scale of 1 to 2 stories, and that historically, 2 story buildings were common. The proposed building does and will match all those requirements.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

Commissioner Walker stated the exposed rear stair will need to be covered.

Mr. Henninger stated the stairs will be located inside, they were not depicted clearly on the site plan. The only part that would be outside is the underneath of the stairs which will be screened as depicted on the rear elevation.

There was a discussion over how these stairs will be placed.

Commissioner Walker stated he likes the front elevation because it is balanced and reflects what is going on above it.

Commissioner Rozanski stated he didn't understand why we were tying the color of this building to 148 North because they are not the same building. He is concerned some of the conditions in the example motion are an architecture critique.

Mr. Henninger stated the condition is intended to match the darker green that is on an adjacent building under renovation.

Commissioner Rozanski asked where the owner & the designers' flexibility comes into play and where does Staff have a role in making the calls on that.

Mr. Groce stated the Guidelines are not intended to dictate a certain style or exactly emulate buildings on the Square. Historic Preservation best practice even states you need to be able to tell when it is a newer building and not an exact copy of historic building. We are not trying to recreate something that was once there. It is more appropriate for it to be a modern building that acknowledges the Square. These conditions are used as an example motion, but the HDC does not have to agree with them and can add, alter, or delete conditions. The example conditions are intended to try and bring it as close as we can into the themes that we see on the Square and meet the Guideline.

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

Mr. John Leake, Architect, 555 Cherokee Circle, Oakland, TN 38060, stated he is here to answer questions. He stated the can light is out of character with the rest of the building but will be located between the two buildings as a wall wash. On the north side of the new building will be a trellis. They are trying to wash that area with light, not trying to make it characteristic of the downtown. It will be landscaped pretty heavily. The ultimate purpose is to put as much lighting in that area as possible. They want people to feel comfortable when walking from the parking lot up to the restaurant entrance.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

There was a discussion over what light fixtures that will be used, their purpose for that type of light and their location.

Rozanski asked if the applicant agreed with all the conditions.

Mr. Leake stated he agreed with the conditions and has no problem with any of them.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness and recommend approval of a Preliminary Site Plan (see Exhibit 2a) to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen (BMA) for a 13,485 square-foot, two-story nonresidential building located on the east side of North Main Street, south of Natchez Street, west of Mount Pleasant Road, and north of Washington Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall address any condition of approval from the prior Historic District Commission meetings (HDC 15-09 & HDC 15-10) as well as any conditions of approval for HDC 16-32 (Certificate of Appropriateness) meeting. Any deviations from the approved Certificate of Appropriateness shall require the approval of the HDC and/or staff prior to work beginning.
2. If archeological resources are discovered during construction the applicant shall notify staff prior to proceeding with construction.
3. The location of the handicap ramp in the “bump-out” island, at the corner of Main Street and Natchez Street shall be located in the Main Street right-of-way to the maximum extent possible to align with the handicap ramp and sidewalk north of the intersection of Main Street and Natchez Street (H.D.G. IV., B., 4. & 9.) and shall include a planter in the “bump-out” island for consistency (H.D.G. IV., 2. & D., 4.).
4. If tree grates or tree guards are to be used in front of 138 North Main Street, include a manufacturer’s cut sheet and any installation details. Ensure that the tree wells match up with the sidewalk grid pattern and provide details of all surfaces (H.D.G. IV. B. & D. & Checklist). Sidewalks located in the right-of-way shall be brushed concrete to match existing public sidewalks in the area. Remove the tree grates in front of the canopy of the 148 North Main Street building as there is not enough room to meet the minimum pedestrian clearances. If tree grates are not to be used, planting details shall be submitted to HDC for review prior to Development Agreement.
5. Incorporate new seating areas with planters, benches, trash receptacles, and bike racks at key locations in the Historic District such as in front of the infill building and along the sidewalks between the buildings where there is space to add such features (H.D.G. IV., C. 3. & 4.). Provide with the Final Site Plan manufacturer’s cut sheets of benches and other site furnishings to be incorporated (Checklist).
6. Add a parking island in the unused space north of the trash enclosure not striped for parking and include evergreen plantings to ensure adequate screening of the enclosure (H.D.G. IV., D. & G., 5.).
7. With the Final Site Plan on the Landscape Plan, indicate all landscaping not included in Phase I and label the plantings in all of the landscape beds as well as plantings added to screen any ground and wall mounted appurtenances such as mechanical equipment, utility structures, backflow preventers (H.D.G. IV., D. & G. & Checklist).
8. With the Final Site Plan, provide a plant schedule, planting details, planting notes, irrigation notes, and cut sheets including finishes of any site furnishing such as benches, bike racks, planter pots, and trash receptacles (Checklist).
9. The plans are unclear on how all utilitarian elements will be addressed (H.D.G. IV., G.). The following must be addressed with the Final Site Plan:
 - a. New service lines (electric, telephone, cable) for the infill building are required to be underground per the Subdivision Regulations (III–38).
 - b. Indicate the location of any mechanical equipment, utility structures, backflow preventers, or any other roof, ground, or wall mounted appurtenances as well as any furnishings, surface finish (concrete, pavers, stamped concrete, etc.), and related screening (H.D.G. IV., G. & Checklist).
 - c. Locate appurtenances such as utility structures, meters, transformers, generators, control panels, backflow preventers, HVAC equipment, to the maximum extent possible, behind buildings and indicate how they will be screened with fencing, walls, or evergreen landscaping.
 - d. Mechanical units, vents, and other roof appurtenances should be located at the back of buildings and screened by parapet walls to conceal visibility from streets and adjacent property.
 - e. Vents, meters, conduit, cameras, spouting and other roof and wall appurtenances shall be painted to match the surrounding architectural façade or roof color.
10. With Final Site Plan on the Lighting Plan:
 - a. Street and site lighting shall be “Traditional” and compatible with lighting in the Historic District (H.D.G. IV., C., 1. & 2. & Lighting Ordinance). If lighting cannot be found to replicate the light poles around the Town’s Square then use light fixtures used elsewhere in the district such as at Tom Brooks Park, the University of Memphis Satellite Campus, or the Police Courts.
 - b. Fixture style “A” and “B” is not compatible with style “E”. Furthermore, “Coach Style” (“A” and “B”) light fixtures should be avoided (H.D.G. III., A., 3., h.). Wall pack style “C” is contemporary and not

- compatible with the Historic District. Light fixture style “D” is also contemporary but may be acceptable, if not visible from Main Street or Natchez Street, as the fixtures are located and recessed under the outdoor dining canopy (H.D.G. IV., C., 1. & 2. & Lighting Ordinance).
- c. Light output is not indicated and non-cutoff fixtures are indicated that could produce glare if over 60 watts; fixtures “A”, “B”, and “E” would not be permitted if over 60 watts (Lighting Ordinance).
 - d. Provide a lighting photometric plan; be sure to include manufacturer’s cut sheets on that plan along with a luminaire schedule that indicates any symbol, description, model, lamp, ballast, mounting, wattage, shielding options, colors, etc. The pole mounted light fixture required for Natchez Street at the parking lot entry shall be similar to the light post used for Main Street and all other fixtures shall be compatible with the Historic District and meet the Lighting Ordinance (Site Plan Checklist, Lighting Ordinance, H.D.G. IV., C., 1. & 2.).
 - e. All new light poles (Fixture E) along Main Street should be painted “Collierville Green” to match other public fixtures in the area (H.D.G. IV., C., 5.).
 - f. Remove the phasing lines from the Lighting Plan as there was no site lighting approved for 148 North Main Street.
11. With the Final Site Plan on the Architectural Elevations and Plans:
 - a. The entrance to the middle storefront shall incorporate additional openings as it is out of proportion to the other openings (H.D.G. III., B., 7., a.).
 - b. Provide detail/specifications on the doors and windows. The storefront and double hung sash windows on the sides, rear, and second story windows (along Main Street) indicating any muntins shall contain true divided light (H.D.G. III., B., 7., c.).
 - c. Windows and doors shall contain recessed jambs (H.D.G. III., B., 7., d.).
 - d. Additional detailing such as the use of banding should be incorporated over the transom windows on the north storefront (H.D.G. III., B., 7., e.).
 - e. Provide a material schedule to clarify material and color locations and specify the masonry pattern, color, and size of any brick banding (H.D.G. III., B., 10.).
 - f. Correct the window trim labels on the elevations to match the beige sample provided (H.D.G. III., B., 10.).
 - g. Provide a color sample of the green to be used on the window casings, which shall match the color of green painted on the existing building at 148 North Main (H.D.G. III., B., 10.).
 - h. The pilasters for the south storefront will need to be raised above the roof deck to match the side elevation and conceal rooftop appurtenances as the side elevation indicates that the pilasters and parapet are raised significantly higher than the roof deck (H.D.G. III., B., 10.).
 - i. The pilasters and some of the details on the front elevation do not match those indicated on the color schematic rendering and will need to be corrected to match (H.D.G. III., B., 10.).
 - j. Some pilasters appear as not finished. Generally, pilasters should extend from the ground to the top of the façade (H.D.G. III., B., 10.).
 - k. Correct the canopy color on the elevations to match the “Jasper” color indicated on the sample board (H.D.G. III., F.).
 - l. The canopy over the middle storefront should be extended to the 7-foot, 8-inch dimension for the entry matching the width of the brick articulation (H.D.G. III., F.).
 - m. Identify the type of metal on the rear parapet wall, which shall be equivalent to the metal used on the rear of the 2005 infill building at 80 N. Main Street
 12. If a trellis structure is still proposed to tie the two buildings together, indicate the location of the trellis structure and provide details with the Final Site Plan.
 13. With the Final Site Plan, provide all 4 elevations and provide a roof plan indicating all appurtenances. No final Certificate of Occupancy (CO) can be obtained for the infill building until the rooftop equipment is screened from view from public streets (vents, mechanical, etc.). Roof elements and parapets shall be integrated into the building design and finished on all sides with materials and colors matching the primary facade to prevent any visible roof membrane.
 14. This review does not include any signage. A sign permit will be required for all signs and will be reviewed and approved separately (Sign Ordinance & H.D.G III., E.).

- 15. Provide with the Final Site Plan, an updated color schematic rendering that reflects all conditions of approval and final plan for hardscape in front of the building. Show overhead lines, light fixtures, street trees, and street furniture.
- 16. Resolve the proximity conflict between existing ornamental light fixtures on Main Street and the 3 proposed "Fixture E" posts.

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

Roll Call:

Brooks – yes, Rozanski – yes, Walker – yes, Lee – yes.

Motion Approved.

HDC16-40 – 148 Main Street – Consider an appeal an administrative decision of staff related to the use of metal awning materials for an existing nonresidential building located on the east side of North Main Street, south of Natchez Street, west of Mount Pleasant Road, and north of Washington Street.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. He stated that when the HDC approved this application to renovate 148 Main in August 2015 one of the conditions was before they make changes in the field they would have to get approval from Staff or the HDC prior to commencing work. Between August 2015 and April 2016, Staff worked with applicant on the architecture civil engineering plans, to make certain the conditions were met and turn the 2015 plans into something that would be approved by BMA with a Development Agreement. There were statements in the August 2015 Staff Report that talked about how the covering over the outdoor seating could be corrugated metal recycled from one of the buildings demolished from the site. The plans that actually went to the BMA talked about reusing metal on the back of the parapet and screen the roof top. The metal turned out to be a filled with holes and the applicant asked to use new corrugated metal but add muriatic acid to give it the same weathered look as the metal that came off the sheds. Staff approved this substitution and this is what was put in the BMA Development Agreement. A few weeks ago the applicant decided they didn't want to take the new corrugated metal and put muriatic acid on it because that would void the warranty. They want to use galvanized metal instead but Staff denied the request as that was not what was approved by the BMA. Staff said they can install it at their own risk and we will get them before the HDC to make sure the new metal idea will be appropriate. Mr. Groce showed examples of current canopies on the Square and stated historically a lot of our buildings didn't have canopies.

EXHIBITS
1. Applicant's Email/Request (8/3/16)
2. August 20, 2015 HDC Minutes
3. Elevations Conditionally Approved August 2015 by HDC
4. Elevations attached to April 2016 BMA Development Agreement
5. Photo of Demolished Shed Structures and Rear of Building with Reused Metal (8/17/16)
6. Photo of Front of Building with Galvanized Metal (8/17/16)

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

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

Mr. John Leake, Architect, 555 Cherokee Circle, Oakland, TN 38060, stated he believes Mr. Groce explained it best about how the old tin would not be useable over the outdoor seating area. It does add character to the building, but it was questionable from the beginning. The galvanized material that they have on the canopy now is not the same as the sample he brought to Staff for review. The sample he brought had a very high shine. The owner made the point that this galvanized steel has a 30 year warranty. He is concerned if we put the acid on the metal to soften it that will void the warranty.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Chairman Lee asked if anyone from the public would like to speak.

Mary Jean Smith, 118 N. Main, stated she believes the business at 148 N. Main is just wonderful and will be a great addition to the Square. She thinks the renovation to the outside of the building has been wonderful until they added the tin roof. She believes the tin roof to be inappropriate. She would hate to see it set a precedent in this area.

Chairman Lee stated we have heard from one of your neighbors that the metal is too shiny. He has heard the same comment from other people saying that it looks out of place. He asked the architect if they considered using the same metal that is being used on 140 N. Main.

Mr. Leake stated the new building on 140 N. Main will have metal awnings similar Brooks Collection. As Mr. Groce pointed out there are several different canopy styles on the Square. They just chose this one. There were several that were metal already but they were painted. He wanted it to be a colored roof like other ones on Mulberry Street. It was suggested by Staff that they reuse the old metal from the demolished buildings behind 148 N. Main building, so that's why we did it.

Chairman Lee stated he would have preferred a colored roof also. Would the applicant be in agreement with using a colored roof if Staff also agrees it would be appropriate for this building?

Mr. Thomas Scott, Main Street Development, 1715 Burnside Drive, Maryville, TN 37801, stated no because he would have to go back and repaint the roof every couple of years.

Mr. Leake stated time will change this roof. We don't know what the tenant may have in mind over the years. He may want to have an accent color up there. If you would allow the metal awning to remain how it is with the possibility in the future to be painted that would be acceptable to the owner. To do it right now would add a cost burden to the owner and they have essentially done everything they were told to do.

Chairman Lee stated the rest of the work they have done was an improvement to the building.

Commissioner Rozanski stated he doesn't know how they have gotten to this point. There is no other place on the Square that uses corrugated metal as a front façade. They showed reusing the old corrugated metal but then they said they couldn't do it. Now they are using new corrugated metal and not staying with the original idea. He is concerned that we do set precedent here by allowing this material to be on the Square. The HDC needs to revisit the Guidelines and adjust some language because 80% of the canopies currently on the Square do not comply with the Guidelines. He doesn't think what was installed looks appropriate.

Commissioner Walker stated in theory he likes it but now seeing the details of it he isn't as impressed.

Chairman Lee stated it is unfortunate that we have gotten here at this point. He doesn't believe it looks appropriate to the Historic District. It doesn't look like it fits in with the building. He asked for clarification on the Guidelines regarding allowing the use of metal awnings.

Mr. Groce stated the Guidelines states not to use metal roof awnings; however, he stated the Guidelines are flexible and they are not black or white.

Commissioner Walker asked if this was considered an awning because it is coming out to columns with a roof structure.

Mr. Groce read from the Guidelines, "Avoid using inappropriate elements such as mansard roofs, metal awnings, coach lanterns, small pane windows, plastic shutters."

There was a discussion if this was a roof or an awning and if it fit in with the building and Square surroundings.

Chairman Lee stated he has difficulty approving this as it stands.

Commissioner Brooks asked what the heat absorption under the metal awning is. She would think it would be horribly hot.

Mr. Leake stated it is very cool. The reflectivity is fantastic. He thinks it will be great when the tables are out there. The only time it will be hot is when it's about 4:00pm in the afternoon and that sun is coming in from the west. The reason it gets hot then is because the heat gets underneath there and can get out.

Commissioner Brooks stated it does put off a horrible glare.

There was a discussion about possibly putting a clear matte finish coat on the metal or some other method that would not cause the owner to lose the warranty on the metal used for the awning.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to overrule the August 3, 2016, administrative decision of staff related to the use of galvanized metal awning materials for the canopy over the outdoor seating area at 148 Main Street, approving the material for use on the canopy.

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

Roll Call:

Brooks – no, Rozanski – no, Walker – no, Lee – no.

Motion Denied & the August 3, 2016 Staff decision not to approve the galvanized material was upheld.

HDC16-38 – 74 - 78 N. Main Street (The Highlander) – Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Exterior Alterations and Partial Demolition of a Nonresidential Structure

Commissioner Walker recused himself at this time.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation as outlined in the staff report. The business that will go into this space is called The Highlander Pub. The zoning is Central Business (CB). 78 North Main Street was built circa 1938 or maybe up to the 1960s, as a replacement for an 1880's structure destroyed by fire. It is not listed on our National Register nomination form but it is eligible for the National Register per our 2004 Historic Resources survey. 74 Main Street was one of the Town's post offices. It was built circa 1944 and is also eligible for the National Register per the 2004 survey. These properties have been used as restaurants in the past. They did not ask for any outdoor seating in front of the building. The only changes are to the building itself. He explained the elevations of that the building as it looks today and compared them to the proposed elevations for the new restaurant. He stated the Square has changed significantly on the east side over the decades. He showed old building footprints and historical photos of this property and

- | EXHIBITS | |
|-----------------|--|
| 1. | Applicant's Cover Letter (7/26/16) |
| 2. | Color Rendering (7/26/16) |
| 3. | Site Layout |
| 4. | Interior Floor Plan |
| 5. | Exterior Elevations |
| 6. | 2004 Historic Resource Survey or 74 N. Main Street |
| 7. | 2004 Historic Resource Survey or 78 N. Main Street |
| 8. | Photos of Rear Façade Showing Metal Outbuilding Proposed for Demo |
| 9. | 74 - 78 N. Main St. in 2011 (prior to conversion to Allison Rodgers Photography) |

explained the history of the past occupants. He said the brick sizes don't match as these are different buildings, and the roof lines are not symmetrical. The applicant wants to rebuild the parapet wall and to repaint it with a two tone color scheme to accent the details. He explained the proposed details of the front elevation. The Guidelines say when working with the original building, try to restore it and use that's there, and try to use old photographic evidence. These buildings have been here so long that the parapet could be considered historical in its own right. The architect reports that there are some structural issues with the front façade and says something needs to happen to the façade to stabilize it.

He stated new buildings along the Square have been required to have true divided light windows if they replace the existing windows. He explained that the existing metal windows were added to this building and are not appropriate. The architect is concerned about being required to use true divided light over semi divided light windows. If they did have to use the true divided light they may use larger window panes & grids to be energy efficient. He described several buildings that have smaller windows around the Square.

The HDC Guidelines state fabric awnings shouldn't have patterns. The example motions says if the applicant chooses to have a solid color earth tone awning Staff could approve it but if it is pattern it would need to go before the HDC.

He read a statement earlier that coach fixtures are inappropriate, but there are no pictures in the Guidelines to show what that means. He stated there aren't many light fixtures around the Square. He is lead to believe the street fixtures were typically what illuminated the buildings. The proposed fixtures may be inappropriate if the HDC finds them to be coach fixtures.

The roof top units won't be as big of an issue when the new building comes in on the south of 74-78 Main, but if the building doesn't get built than the roof top units will be very visible. On the rear of the property there is a metal building and they have requested that it be demolished. That building is in disrepair. An argument could be made the metal building has no historical significance.

Mr. Groce explained the next steps for the applicant.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chairman Lee stated the drawing of the new building is attractive but it makes it look like one building instead of three historic buildings. If we changed façade to make it look like all one building would we destroy the historic nature of these three buildings?

Mr. Groce stated you do. If you make changes to a historic building it needs to be done in such a way that doesn't really alter, it and if you do alter it, it can be easily removed. If they rebuild the parapet it could not be easily removed.

Chairman Lee stated as nice as the unified building looks in the picture, he's not sure if they are preserving the historic building if they allow these changes. That's the only issue he has.

Commissioner Rozanski asked what Staff opinion on the condition of the parapets is.

Mr. Groce stated he had a brief conversation with Michael Walker a couple of days ago about the parapet. He mentioned there was concern about the stability of it. He has not personally seen any defects.

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

Mr. Michael Walker, Walker Arch, 105 N. Center Street, Suite 207, stated the owner of the pub business (Alan Mullen) is here is you have any questions for him. Mr. Walker stated he agrees with Chairman Lee in

some ways with the front of the building with it being three different size buildings built at different times with different brick. It was three buildings even though two were connected at one time. The parapet is not ready to fall over but it certainly needs some work. He thinks the precedent has already been set to make this look like one building when they approved to paint it one color. He wants to make some changes to the facade but still show that this was three buildings at one time. He explained how he was going to make that work while screening the roof units. With a two story building to the north and possible two-story building to the south they will raise the parapet up a bit to get some proportion. He explained the back entrance and the increasing of that area to have a true ramp for service needs.

There was a discussion over the rebuilt ramp encroaching into the public alley and how they will need to request approval from the Town.

Mr. Walker stated the metal honky tonk building is in bad shape and ready to fall down. He stated if they did have to use true divided light windows it would change their window pattern up so they don't have a ton of tiny windows. The proposed simulated divided light windows allow them to use a thin rail muntin to maximize the amount of glass. They will come back to the HDC for the awning once they have figured out the color schemes. He stated they wanted to use the proposed carriage lights to evoke a Scottish pub feel.

Mr. Alan Mullen, 139 N. Mt Pleasant, stated he is a new resident to the Town of Collierville. He is delighted to be a resident near the Square. He was born in Scotland and that is the origin for the Scottish Pub theme. He believes a pub is an asset to a neighborhood. He stated when he looked at past renderings of this site it looked to him as though it were two buildings and only looked like three when you painted them three different colors. He stated he has looked at the parapet and there are obvious cracks. The Square has changed enormously and what they are proposing with the parapet is an obvious improvement. As an appearance over all it provides more screening to the units on the roof. What changes they are mainly doing are on the inside of the building. He explained how he would like to reduce the thermal loads in the building and how simulated divided light windows would be beneficial.

There was a discussion over the difference in windows energy efficiency between true & simulated divided light windows in a commercial setting windows work.

Mr. Mullins stated in terms on the style of the light fixture they like what they have picked, but would be happy to work with the HDC to come up with something they find to be more appropriate. He stated it is dark on the Square at night. He believes there should be more light on the Square. They are backing off the tartan design awning and they will bring it back to the HDC.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any questions of applicant.

Commissioner Rozanski asked if the applicant would consider going back to the original parapet's profile and emulate what was there in the new design.

Mr. Walker agreed to that change and stated how in 30 years if the pub leaves you can still have the ability to go back to three separate store fronts.

Commissioner Rozanski stated he understands why they are asking for simulated divided lights since this is a pub.

There was a discussion over the proposed new parapet instead of restoring the original.

Chairman Lee stated he is very excited for this to be on the Square.

There was a discussion over the allowing the use of simulated divided light windows for this commercial building.

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

Motion by Commissioner Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Exterior Alterations and Partial Demolition of a Nonresidential Structure for 74 - 78 N. Main St. (The Highlander), 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. Provide details/specifications on the doors and windows prior the issuance of a building permit. Simulated or true divided light windows are approved for use. Windows and doors shall contain recessed jambs (H.D.G. III., B., 7., d.).
3. Provide side and rear elevations and a roof plan for the building with the Development Agreement set.
4. The rear elevation shall show the future patio addition as well as the concrete ramp and rails.
5. The entire building shall be repainted, including the south and rear elevations, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
6. Provide written statement prior the issuance of a building permit about the process to be used for cleaning and preparing the wall for painting prior to starting work (see D.G. Chapter III, A. 10. a. – Page 78).
7. The Development Agreement set shall address how solid waste needs for the restaurant will be met and how any dumpsters will be screened from view off-site.
8. All rooftop appurtenances shall be screened by the parapet and any wall mounted appurtenances shall be located to the rear of the building and painted to match the color of the surrounding building material (D.G. III.H.).
 - a. The location of the rooftop equipment shall be dashed in on the elevations and shown on the roof plan.
 - b. A rear elevation shall be provided that shows how this condition will be addressed.
 - c. For the south elevation, the following note shall be provided on the plans: *If a building permit has not been issued for 70 North Main Street by 3/15/18, then the applicant shall install a rooftop screen for the rooftop HVAC equipment and vents by 6/15/18. The HDC must review and approve the design of the screen wall prior to construction.*
9. This Certificate of Appropriateness does not approve the signage. A sign permit must be obtained prior to the installation of the sign.
10. This Certificate of Appropriateness does not approve the fabric awning color selection in Exhibit 2 at this time. If the proposed awning is to be a weather resistant fabric that is not shiny plastic-like fabric, a solid color, and a subdued and muted earth tone color, the Development Director (or his/her designee) can approve the choice administratively. Any other type of awning will require HDC approval of the final selection.
11. The parapet silhouette shall be modified to more closely match the original.

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

Roll Call:

Brooks – yes, Rozanski – yes, Walker – recused, Lee – yes.

Motion Approved.

Other Business

Chairman Lee asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Jaime Groce stated he had spoken with Chairman Lee about keeping the HDC more aware of administrative items. Between now and the next HDC meeting he would like to email out an update of all the administrative items from 2016 and begin to go over them at the end of each meeting, noting things that have been received over the month.

Chairman Lee stated they appreciate the administrative review and approval process. He thinks reading those approvals into the official minutes will help to document them.

Mr. Groce explained for HDC 16-40 how Staff did suggest using the left over metal from the demolished buildings behind 148 Main, but once a designer takes a suggestion and places it on their plans it no longer is becomes the a Staff suggestion. Staff never told them they had to reuse the metal that way.

Commissioner Rozanski stated he looked at the August 2015 meeting minutes and in those minutes he said it was an interesting idea but we need to see more detail. There was never an HDC condition telling them that's what they needed to do.

Commissioner Walker explained how he thought the awning is actually considered a roof.

There was a discussion over how the applicant took the suggestion to reuse the metal and the choices they have made since that decision. Commissioner Rozanski & Walker both expressed concern about providing very specific design solutions to applicants in the example conditions of approval as we begin to design projects for them.

With no further business, Chairman Lee adjourned the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Secretary, Laura Todd