

**MINUTES  
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING OF JUNE 18, 2009**

**City HZC Present**

Nic Arning  
Sean Bolen  
Scott Busby  
Duane Grieve  
Melissa McAdams  
Sandra Martin  
Finbarr Saunders  
Melynda Whetsel

**Members Absent:**

Herb Donaldson

**County HZC Present**

Steve Cotham  
Charles Faulkner  
Kenneth Gresham  
Carol Montgomery

**Members Absent:**

Linda Claussen (ex.)

**Others Present:**

Tom Reynolds  
William McGowan  
Daniel Hugh  
James Pierce  
Cynthia Stancil  
Jordan Wilkerson  
Scott Schimmel  
Jeff Rusk  
Vanessa Todd  
Jayne Burritt  
Steve Heatherly  
Mike St. John  
Craig Belitz  
Blaine Hopkins  
Stacy Cox  
Ann Bennett  
Charlotte West

Whetsel called the meeting to order and reminded members regarding conflicts of interest.

- Approval of Minutes – May 21, 2009, meeting

**MOTION BY GRIEVE AND SECOND BY SAUNDERS TO APPROVE THE MAY 21 MINUTES. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- Certificates of Appropriateness

**KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

**Old North Knoxville – H-1**

***522 E. Scott Avenue*** – William McGowan (Applicant/Owner) – Certificate No. 51509ONK

**Work Description**

Replace siding, fascia, soffit and trim boards in kind, as necessary; replace roof on bay and over the kitchen on the southwest side of house with slate look alike shingles to allow

adequate drainage from shallow pitched roof (APPROVED - LEVEL I); and, add 10' x 16' accessory structure at the rear of the house 13' off of the alley. Accessory building to have weatherboard or board and batten wall covering, asphalt shingle roof covering, gable roof with 18" overhang, and 6/12 slope, 2/2 double hung wood windows, and a pier foundation.

### **Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 51509ONK if roof slope is modified. (Level I portion of Certificate application was issued on 5/21/2009). Design guidelines for accessory buildings specifically require 12/12 roof pitch.

### **Additional Comments**

All details of the proposed accessory building are appropriate except the roof pitch, which the design guidelines list as one of the elements. Alternative roof pitches are not included in the list. Mr. McGowan recounted that the application for the lower pitched roof was for two reasons: 1) the house is a corner lot, and reducing the pitch of the roof would result in a lower profile and less obvious installation; and 2) lowering the pitch would make installing a roof covering and working on the roof later much easier to accomplish.

William McGowan, 522 E. Scott, stated that the 12/12 roof pitch is a little steep to work on and a 9x12 would be easier. James Piece, 122 Leonard Place, representing the neighborhood, stated that he talked to Mr. McGowan who agreed with the staff that the roof needs to be closer to the guidelines, suggesting a 9/12 roof. Pierce asked if there could be exposed rafter tails. The doors should represent shed doors with an X or Z on them. Whetsel asked Mr. McGowan if he would consider a hip roof since the house has a hip roof.

**MOTION BY GRIEVE AND SECOND BY BUSBY TO APPROVE A 9/12 PITCH ROOF, ADD RAFTER TAILS ON THE OVERHANGS AND CROSS BRACING FOR THE SHED DOORS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**309 E. Oklahoma Avenue** – Dan Hugh (Applicant/Owner) – Certificate No. 60209ONK

### **Work Description**

Demolish existing garage and construct new garage using stuccoed foundation, wood board and batten type wall covering, windows duplicating the existing (6 light single sash) facing house and on each side elevation; board and batten door facing house, 10/12 hipped roof with dimensional shingles, and paired overhead doors resembling carriage doors with six lights and cross bracing facing alley. New garage dimensions 30'x22' with 11' setback from alley and six feet from south side property line.

### **Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 60209ONK. Information contained in the attached Sanborn maps show a garage constructed between 1924 and the 1950s.

### **Additional Comments**

Mr. Hugh's request for demolition of an existing garage and construction of a replacement structure was denied without prejudice at the May 21 meeting of the Commission; the Old North Knoxville representative reported that the Board had not had time to meet and consider the application. This delay created a negative change in Mr. Hugh's schedule, since he would like to have this matter resolved and the garage constructed before he is called out of the country on business later this summer.

The board of Old North Knoxville met on Monday, June 1 to consider the Hughs' request. After a very lengthy discussion, the ONK Board agreed with the demolition request and with the request for a replacement structure. Mr. Hugh presented a design of the replacement structure to more nearly duplicate the building being demolished. It was presented as a 22'x24' board and batten design with a hip roof with dimensional shingle covering, two carriage style garage doors facing the alley, complete with cross bracing, six light windows on each elevation and a board and batten door facing the house. That design was also approved by the Board.

On Tuesday, June 2, Mr. Hugh met with Tom Reynolds, who advised him that the Knoxville Zoning Ordinance would allow a building with a maximum size of 750 sq. ft. Following the meeting with Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Hugh modified the size of the structure to the information that is included in this Certificate application. The design details of the building (board and batten, hip roof, doors and windows) did not change. Only the size of the structure was modified by increasing the length from 24' to 30'. The ONK Board did not specifically discuss the proposed size of the building - only the design details. The proposal before you contains the design details that were discussed by the Board at the June 1 meeting.

Daniel Hugh, 309 E. Oklahoma, stated that he made attempt to have the building moved, but could not find anyone to move it. His only option is to demolish it. The man door will be on the side. James Pierce stated that the board met with Mr. Hugh regarding his demolishing the structure, and the vote was 8-3 to demolish. They voted on the preliminary design. Mr. Pierce apologized to Mr. Hugh for taking so much of his time on this project. The neighborhood would like for an applicant to meet with them before they come before the Historic Zoning Commission.

Arning stated that he wanted affirm the reason for tearing it down. Is termite damage the justification for tearing down or is this just so his cars will fit? Mr. Hugh stated that, for structural considerations and size, it cannot function as a garage.

**MOTION BY SAUNDERS AND SECOND BY GRIEVE TO APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING CHANGING THE MAN DOOR TO THE LEFT ELEVATION. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH ARNING AND BOLEN OPPOSING.**

### **Edgewood-Park City H-1**

*2019 Washington Avenue* – Jordan Wilkerson (Applicant/Owner) – Certificate No. 60409EDG

**Work Description**

Restore front of burned structure, including repair or replace wood siding, as necessary; repoint brick using Preservation Brief, No. 2 (low-content Portland) as necessary; reroofing using asphalt shingles and retaining or repairing bargeboard in front gable and wood attic vents; replacing or repairing wood windows (one over one double hung); repair original front porch with beadboard ceiling, wood tongue in groove floor, turned wood columns with sawn wood trim with front porch supported by existing brick foundation; construct read addition with duplicate roof slope and materials as shown on attached plan with covered stoop.

**Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 60409EDG. Proposed work is consistent with adopted design guidelines and will result in a rehabilitated building that is significant to the Edgewood-Park City H-1 district.

**Additional Comments**

Design Guidelines, Roofs, pg. 15; Windows, pg. 16; Porches, pg. 19; Entrances, pg. 21, Wall Coverings, pg. 23, Masonry, pg. 25

Cynthia Stancil stated that the neighborhood is glad the house is going to be redone.

**MOTION BY GRIEVE AND SECOND BY SAUNDERS TO APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Market Square H-1**

*24 Market Square* – Scott Schimmel (Applicant) – Mahastie Vafaie (Owner) – Certificate No. 52809MKT

**Work Description**

Replace failed double-pane shop windows, reducing number of windows from 12 to 4 by removing central dividing mullions. Transoms and kick panels will remain unchanged. There will now be four storefront windows tall enough to cover the distance from the kick panels to the bottom of the transoms; three will be on the left side of the entry and one on the right side; each will be tall enough to stretch from kick panel to transom, divided where the transom lines are now divided.

**Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 52809MKT. Proposed work will modify the alterations that were made c. 1985, and bring the windows into alignment with the existing transoms.

Scott Schimmel, 4215 Holston Hills Road, stated that the window seals have failed, and consolidating the panes would be better. He has talked to John Craig who is the President of the Market Square Association.

**MOTION BY BUSBY AND SECOND BY MARTIN TO APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4<sup>th</sup> & Gill H-1**

**805 Eleanor Street** – Jeff Rusk (Applicant) – John Wampler (Owner) – Certificate No. 526094&G

**Work Description**

Construct new accessory building, 24'x24', with 20' setback from alley, sitting behind primary structure. 12/12 roof with wood siding, garage door opening to alley, one over one windows, and covered walkway supported by square wood columns.

**Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 526094&G. Proposed work is consistent with recommendation for Outbuildings, P. 19 of adopted design guidelines.

Jeff Rusk, 10613 Summit Mountain Court, stated he will close on the house next week and will use fishscale shingles in gable facing the house. Bolen suggested that he install fish scales on the alley-facing gable. Rusk estimated they would add \$2,000 to the cost. Whetsel suggested the alternative of installing a full cornice return board on the alley elevation.

Tina Rolen, the 4<sup>th</sup> & Gill representative, sent an email to Bennett stating that the neighborhood approves.

**MOTION BY SAUNDERS AND SECOND BY MARTIN TO APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION ADDING THE CHANGES THAT WHETSEL SUGGESTED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**940 Eleanor Street** – Vanessa Todd (Applicant/Owner) – Certificate No. 512094&G

**Work Description**

1) Remove side door and replace with wood window, matching design of remaining original windows but smaller, and with siding to match original; 2) repair or replace in kind, as necessary, siding, soffit, and trim; 3) on rear of house, add French doors on first floor level to access deck; 4) install gutters; 5) remove rear, side stairs that led to second story landing and enclosed rear porch; 6) remove second story rear porch enclosure to open rear porch and install spindled railing with spindles matching originals and remove second story doors finishing with wood siding to match remainder of house; 7) remove metal windows added to basement, replacing most with wood single hung windows and eliminating two windows under stairs, rebrick foundation using soft mortar in accordance with Preservation Brief No. 2; 8) remove metal windows on rear of house and replace

with wood double hung windows matching other windows on house; 9) repair garage foundation, removing metal siding that was obscuring it and replacing with concrete block foundation, repairing siding and framing as necessary, and adding new garage door appropriate to style of house.

### **Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 512094&G. Proposed work is consistent with adopted design guidelines.

### **Additional Comments**

Application includes both existing garage and house. Restoration of exterior is consistent with provisions under Wall Coverings, Wood, pgs. 13 and 14, Porches, pg. 12, Windows, pg. 10 and 11, Masonry, pg. 15, and Entrances, pg. 13. Alterations to existing rear elements will remove inappropriately placed elements that occurred when house was converted to multi-family housing; these elements have not acquired significance.

Vanessa Todd 940 Eleanor distributed photos of the proposed work. She also wants to replace the metal basement windows with wood windows. She wants to install the exterior door on garage facing the house and not the alley. She has a 6' fence that wraps around the house and plans to enclose the yard with a fence from the garage to the side walkway accessing the side of the house.

Bolen stated we can accept minor changes to the original application, but these are substantial changes that we had not seen before. Bennett stated that the applicant is not changing the items originally applied for, but has brought supplemental materials explaining what was already included in the application and staff report. Bolen asked about the door being made into a window, and Todd explained it will be in a bathroom. Bolen suggested she put a stained glass window there. Todd said one stained glass window would not look right with the rest of the house. Bennett added that none of the original windows were stained glass. Montgomery stated that pictures should have been provided with the application. Busby stated that he is having trouble putting all these pictures together to see the whole house. Todd explained that the house was broken up into nine apartments, and had undergone a partial conversion to single family; she wants to complete the conversion to single family. Bennett suggested approving the application, excluding the modifications on the rear balcony and deck. The remaining application concerns trying to correct alterations made thirty years ago. Arning asked if she was going to be the general contractor, and she stated that she is. She plans to have all the work completed by March 2010.

The neighborhood also approves of this proposed work.

Gresham stated that these photos should be added as exhibits for the work proposed. The application should be approved because she is not changing it but clarifying the work.

**MOTION BY GRIEVE AND SECOND BY BUSBY TO APPROVE WORK ITEMS NOS. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 & 9 WITH THE ADDITION OF THE INFORMATION GIVEN TO US AND DRAWINGS PRESENTED WILL BE INCLUDED AND**

**DENY WITHOUT PREJUDICE NO. 6. BUSBY SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Mechanicsville H-1**

*213 Deaderick Street* – Meadow Ridge Investments, Blaine Hopkins (Applicant/Owner)  
– Certificate No. 60409MEC

**Work Description**

Siding: Repair existing siding, skirt board, corner boards, window trim and imbricated shingles in front gable as necessary.

Windows: 2/2 wood replacements. Replace missing ocular window on NW elevation.

Doors: Remove added front door on front elevation, replacing with paired windows and trim to mimic original window placement and trim. Replace primary front door with half or full view front door, either salvage or design to mimic appropriate entry.

Front porch: Repair beadboard ceiling as necessary. Repair or replace tongue in groove wood porch floor. Install new tapered 8" wood columns with Doric capitals, spaced to frame front steps and tripled on corner.

Roof: Install asphalt or fiberglass shingles.

**Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 60409MEC with modifications to the proposed porch columns. The remainder of the proposed work is consistent with the adopted Mechanicsville Design Guidelines.

**Additional Comments**

The columns that were removed were large brick columns, inappropriate to the structure but heavy enough to support the large roof entablature. In order to balance that entablature, the columns need to be much larger in diameter, or they can be doubled and used in their proposed size. Columns should be paired, one on each side of the front entry, with paired or tripled columns at the corner of the porch.

Bennett talked to the neighborhood representative and they agree with the proposed work.

Blaine Hopkins, 7613 Nubbin Ridge, stated that he will take Bennett's suggestion of using double columns and triple columns on the corners. He will install one over one windows.

**MOTION BY GRIEVE AND SECOND BY SAUNDERS TO APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION WITH THE CHANGE OF THE COLUMNS AND ONE OVER ONE WINDOWS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**General**

*300 Main Street* – Public Building Authority, Jayne Burrirt (Applicant) – Knox County Government (Owner) – Certificate No. 60109GEN

### **Work Description**

Review window mock-up PBA was authorized to execute for possible replacement windows (Certificate No. 40209GEN); determine if one or both of the mock-ups, with some modification, is an acceptable replacement window.

### **Staff Recommendation**

APPROVE Certificate No. 60109GEN if modifications are possible.

### **Additional Comments**

Two manufacturers are represented - Marvin and Eagle. Because tooling up to produce the windows is extremely expensive, each has brought a sample window, nearly but not exactly a copy of the replacement. My comments address the issues I thought prevented the windows from being exact enough to be approvable. You may have additional issues. Representatives of each manufacturer will be present to answer questions about whether the exact duplicates are possible in these materials.

#### Eagle:

- 1) The window stoops are too small and have obvious piecing.
- 2) The horizontal beaded molding that separates the window from the transom is not an accurate reproduction of any of the courthouse windows.
- 3) The lugs (shaped pieces at the bottom of the upper sash) are too small.
- 4) The top window sash rails on each side should run the length of the sash with the lugs a continuation of that line; the top and bottom rails should be butted into the top rail.
- 5) The muntins in the transom should be wider and deeper to reflect the dimension of the existing.
- 6) The pattern of separation in the transom should duplicate the original.
- 7) The hardware, including pulls and sash locks, should replicate the original in size and weight, and may be reused from the existing windows or may be new.

#### Marvin:

- 1) The window stoops are too small and have obvious piecing.
- 2) The horizontal beaded molding that separates the window from the transom is not an accurate reproduction of any of the courthouse windows.
- 3) There is too obvious a line visually separating the lugs from the sash.
- 4) The top window sash rails on each side should run the length of the sash with the lugs a continuation of that line; the top and bottom rails should be butted into the top rail.
- 5) The muntins in the transom should be wider and deeper to reflect the dimension of the existing.

In addition, it should be determined whether the metal framed windows can be reused.

Bennett stated that the mock up in brick is the Eagle window, and the other is the Marvin window. She reviewed her list of concerns with each of the windows. PBA is asking that the commission decide whether either window can be made to replicate the originals.



Jayne Burritt with PBA stated that both manufacturers have come with their best design and can make changes. Bolen asked if everything is aluminum clad; the response was that it is. Grieve asked if both meet the specifications that was sent to the contractors. Stacy Cox, 414 Clinch, is the architect, and he stated that they are trying to determine that and are working on the aesthetics. There is no estimate to repair the old windows. Arning stated that the Commission is concerned that you are sidestepping repairing the originals.

Steve Heatherly, Meritt Construction, Dutchtown Road, stated his company has worked on many historic properties downtown. He stated that the window engineers will draw the windows exactly how they should be. The wood trim on the model will become metal trim and they can put any color in the top. The shop drawing will be more exact. The sill can be made taller and everything that Bennett mentioned can be changed. Some hardware is missing. Original hardware could be used if it meets codes. There is a 10-year warranty on workmanship and 20 years on the paint finish. Their estimate was \$1.5 million. Gresham asked why they are not replacing with a dividing mullion. Heatherly stated that PBA asked they replace them without the division. Cox stated that we are going to be consistent all over the building. The original windows have been replaced in some portions and may not have had the division. Gresham stated that this would change the look of the original building. Cox answered that the earliest pictures of the building do not show divisions within the sashes.

Mike St. John, Marvin Concepts, and Craig Belitz, 1717 Amherst, general contractor, stated there is a 10-year warranty on the workmanship of the replacement windows they represent, with 20 years on the glass. If the new windows are maintained, they could last indefinitely. Both sashes will tilt and open. Stops are put in the window to control how far the window can be raised or lowered from the top. Within the transom, bars to simulate true divided lights are glued to glass. Some of the round tops are rectangular round tops, but their samples are all round tops. Replacement windows will duplicate the rectangular round tops, with accurately sized lugs. The replacement window is designed for commercial use.

Bolen asked about the divided lights, and both companies stated the bars are glued. Bolen asked what the standard colors are going to be. Marvin proposes to match each window exactly because many of the windows have different colors and designs. Eagle said they can do the same. The colored transom is an extended part of the original windows so the whole window has to be replaced.

Grieve stated that there are materials today that are superior to some existing materials, even though they are historic. Energy and maintenance costs, particularly in a large commercial installation, must be considered differently than individual homes in designated neighborhoods, where design guidelines may address the question of replacement materials. He also suggested that the guidelines should be looked at to consider new materials.

The Marvin representative stated they can provide an all wood product that is less expensive, but costs more to maintain. They bid on wood windows, but aluminum meets the criteria better.

**MOTION BY GRIEVE AND SECOND BY SAUNDERS TO ACCEPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION THAT A METAL CLAD REPLACEMENT WINDOW CAN BE USED AND MAKE SURE WINDOWS REPLICATE THE EXISTING WINDOWS AND THAT THE DISTRIBUTORS WILL COME BACK TO THE COMMISSION WITH A TRUE SAMPLE OF THE WINDOWS IN PLACE. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH ARNING OPPOSING.**

The Eagle representative stated that neither manufacturer can do all the things that Bennett suggested. Grieve stated that we have approved the aluminum clad. PBA and the architect have to look at the list of what they can and cannot do and decide which company to choose. An in-place mockup will be prepared for the commission to look at. Arning is opposed because the Old Court House is one of the most important buildings in this town that has been neglected over the years. Other architects he has talked to are surprised the windows are being replaced instead of repairing them. These wood windows have lasted 150 years. Montgomery stated that the cost savings has to be considered for aluminum windows. Whetsel stated that the commission cannot rule on the interior windows.

**Other Business**

**Solar Cities Presentation**

Bennett introduced Erin Burns from the City of Knoxville who works on solar technology for historic property. Burns addressed the idea of solar retrofitting historic properties, and noted that Knox Heritage is proposing to install solar technology for the house at 1011 Laurel Avenue.

Saunders stated that this idea may help us to update our neighborhood guidelines. The commission needs to consider the materials to be used. Bennett suggested that the commission needs to lead a discussion to change the design guidelines to accommodate solar retrofitting, and possibly to consider materials changes as well. Bolen stated that a workshop might be helpful to learn more about solar and have an installer come to talk to us. Whetsel asked when we could have a workshop. Bennett will work with Ms. Burns to set up a workshop, probably with a late afternoon meeting would be in this room to inform the commissioners and members of the public who wish to attend, although it will probably be desirable to hold separate neighborhood meetings later in the process.

**Discussion of fee increase**

Bennett stated that the current economy has resulted in cuts to MPC's budget from development fees and from county appropriations. It will be necessary to raise fees for certificate applications. Level I will go from \$30 to \$40, Level II from \$70 to 85, Level III from \$100 to \$125 and Level IV from \$200 to \$250. MPC will vote on these changes on July 9.

The next meeting of the Knoxville and Knox County Historic Zoning Commissions will be held on July 16, at 8:30 a.m. in the Small Assembly Room of the City-County Building.