

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 16, 2012

City HZC Present

Sean Bolen
Scott Busby

Lorie Huff

Melissa McAdams
Andie Ray
Jason Woodle
Melynda Whetsel

Members Absent

Sandra Martin

Faris Eid

County HZC Present

Steve Cotham
Kenneth Gresham
Carol Montgomery
Charles Faulkner

Members Absent

Linda Claussen

Others Present:

Mark Donaldson
Melvin Wright
Mike Reynolds
Arin Streeter
James Pierce
Tom Reynolds
Bernadette West

Brett Honeycutt
Joel McDonald
John Craig

Comm. Chair Scott Busby called the meeting to order. Scott introduced Jason Woodle, Tennessee Valley Authority, who will be replacing Comm. Finbarr Saunders through at least October, 2012. Kaye Graybeal introduced the new Administrative Assistant, Dori Caron.

Roll call by Kaye Graybeal.

A motion was made by Comm. Bolen and seconded by Comm. Whetsel, to approve the January 19, 2012 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Comm. Whetsel and seconded by Comm. McAdams to approve the January 12, 2012 Special Meeting Minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

Reports to Commission:

Tom Reynolds, Deputy Director of Building Inspections & Plan Review. He received a complaint about the continuing condition of a structure on South High School via an e-mail last week. He had visited the property about 2 years ago after having received a complaint about it then. He noted that his department is responsible for commercial condemnation. At that time he had deemed the property a candidate for condemnation and recommended the structure be referred to the Better Building Board, which did condemn the structure. The demolition-by-neglect ordinance is a different process. Once

it is initiated, at some point in time, either the owner would be required to stabilize the structure or the city would do that for the owner and place liens against the property.

He went to the property yesterday and noted that the structure had deteriorated even further in the last 2 years. He went inside this time and noted that people have been staying there. It can be seen that there is continued leakage from the roof. The owner did roof part of the structure. Even a small leak will invade the whole structure. Fortunately this is a one-story structure. Tom feels that after looking at it yesterday it is a candidate for demolition-by-neglect ordinance. It is his understanding that the Administration has supported this so he will be moving forward with that process.

Comm. Chair Busby noted that the structure now has an H1 overlay which was not the case when the city initially condemned it. Tom offered photos of the structure. Some differences he noted were that the boards are buckling and that he now has serious concerns about the roof. Comm. Chair Busby stated that if there was any way the Historic Zoning Commission (HZC) could assist to let him know and that they would keep the property under discussion

Melvin Wright and Lisa Hatfield stated to Comm. Chair Busby that they did not have any reports to the Commission at this time.

Level I Certificate of Appropriateness Approvals: Kaye Graybeal

Kaye Graybeal noted that there was only one this month, 303 East Oklahoma Avenue in Old North Knoxville H1. The application was for replacing roof shingles with in-kind material.

KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION

Market Square H-1

28 Market Square – 3-G Studios (Applicant) – Certificate No. 010512MKT

Work Description

Install photovoltaic panels on the south roof slope of the existing rear penthouse extending beyond the slope at the same angle to an intersecting point on the south party wall. These panels are proposed to be at the rear of the roof deck and therefore are not expected to be visible from the square or any public right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation

Approve Certificate No. 010512MKT with the condition that any solar panels installed on north party wall will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way.

Discussion: Kaye Graybeal noted that this was a re-review and that it was Denied Without Prejudice at the last meeting. The HZC asked the applicant to put some indicator on the building where the panels would be installed to indicate their location and to give the commissioners some idea of the degree of visibility for the public right-of-way from within the square. The applicant

did put up a tape line and photos of the tape line were sent out to the commissioners. There was a photo submitted that was taken from within another building which was not the public right-of-way but it gives some idea of where the tape line is located. Mr. Eid did send out another photograph that showed the visibility of the tapeline from one position in Market Square that was a public right-of-way.

Comm. Bolen provided a relatively new set of standards from the Secretary of the Interior for Rehabilitation that address sustainability and under the Solar Technology Section, under the "Recommended" column it says that it is recommended to install a solar device or addition where it will have minimal impact on the historic building and its site. Under the "Not Recommended" column it says placement of a solar device in a highly visible location where it will negatively impact the historic building and its site, and that information is located on page 14. On page 15, under "Not Recommended" it mentions installing a solar device in a prominent location on the building where it will negatively impact its historic character is not recommended. The printed information has been provided to the Historic Zoning Commissioners. Last month the HZC noted that the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, ITS Bulletin Number 52, mentions solar panels on buildings should not be visible from the public right-of-way such as nearby streets, sidewalks or other public spaces. The ITS Bulletin Number 47 states that any rooftop additions must be set far enough back from the primary elevation of the building, usually one bay, so that it is not highly visible from the public right-of-way. Comm. Chair Busby asked if there was an owner's representative present. Brett Honeycutt, the applicant's architect, identified himself. Mr. Honeycutt noted that the question is how far back they need to pull the solar panels, and do they need to be completely non-visible or can they be "not highly" visible. Comm. Whetsel noted the term was "minimally visible". It was noted that the first 8 panels had already been conceded.

Comm. Ray noted her concern and referenced ITS Bulletin Number 32 that states that solar panels on historic buildings not should be visible from the public right of way such as nearby streets, sidewalks or other public spaces. She noted in theory she liked the idea of making the buildings more sustainable and the use of green energy but that she had a problem with the 45 degree angle off the building next to it. She noted that the Applicant wanted the solar panels while keeping as much deck space as possible. She stated that if the installation was horizontal and therefore not visible she would be 100% for this. As it stands right now she did not feel she could vote for it.

Comm. Chair Busby asked if there was anyone present for Market Square Association. John Craig, from the Market Square Association, stated that this did circulate before their Board and that the feedback was that they were very supportive of what the Applicants were trying to do. They applaud the use of sustainable energy and they feel Market Square is uniquely positioned to have solar panels because of the relatively unobstructed southern views from many of the roofs on the square. They would like to see more of this. Mr. Craig further noted the only questions that came up involved visibility and that for any of the projects the question is what the clear, consistent standard will be.

Comm. Whetsel noted we should not have a precedent-setting ruling; therefore, the HZC needs to be extremely careful as it makes this an important decision. She went to Market Square multiple times and subsequently feels this will be more visible than it should be. Referencing Historic Zoning Commission minutes from February 2011, Comm. Whetsel noted that what the staff recommendations was, and what she approved then, was to allow modifications to disallow installations of awnings, umbrella tables, planters or other improvements that were visible from

the street. She stated she would still support that. She further stated she felt that they needed to continue to preserve the historical character and keep things as transparent as possible.

Comm. Bolen stated he dislikes defaulting to the Secretary of Interior Standards as they have conflicting comments within them reflecting “can be minimally visible” as well as “cannot be visible”. He felt that needs to be addressed when these guidelines are updated. He felt that since there are 2 conflicting statements in the standards that as a Commission they should vote towards the minimal standard as opposed to the highest standard. Since both statements are there it is unfair to hold the owners to the higher standard. Comm. Bolen did not want to get into the semantics of what is or is not “minimally visible”. He suggested removing the 3 “marked panels” making the rest “rationally visible”.

Comm. Chair Busby suggested a compromise and suggested taking all the panels out that are in front of the first pilaster. Removal of those 4 panels would make the rest of the panels such that they are not visible. The owner noted that they already know they cannot power the building entirely by the solar panels so removing a few more would not be an issue.

Bernadette West, Highland Avenue, stated that the panels themselves will be a dark color and that as far as she knew, the hardware itself was black. The panels themselves will not be not bright green. She felt the impact on Market Square was minimal and that one would need to actively look for the panels to see them. There are only 2 locations on Market Square where one can see the green tape. Ms. West felt the panels would only be visible from the roof of Market Street garage and perhaps some other roofs, but that is all.

John Craig noted that Market Square is not a pristine historic district and there are some eclectic elements there now and a few panels being visible does not seem overly officious.

Comm. Huff questioned where the line is regarding visibility since the tables and planters are very visible and they were not approved.

Comm. Montgomery noted we need to get used to seeing solar panels and that the more a building is weatherized the less solar panels you will need.

Comm. Whetsel asked about the total number of panels that were going to be put up, including the ones in the rear in an effort to establish the amount of power that would be generated for the different panels. Mr. Honeycutt stated he did not know the total amount of square footage.

Comm. McAdams felt the HZC needs to stay within the Secretary of Interior guidelines. Ms. West agreed and again reiterated that these were minimally visible and noted several examples of Market Square locations from where they cannot be seen.

Ms. West indicated that she would remove whatever panels were necessary to meet the HZC’s approval.

Comm. Bolen motioned to allow for the entire swath of solar panels under the tape. Comm. Chair Busby clarified that the motion now on the table included the removal of the first eight panels. The motion failed as they was no second.

Comm. Bolen made a second motion, which was seconded by Comm. McAdams, to allow for panels beyond the 2nd pilaster, which requires removing the 3-4 panels indicated by the

green tapeline. The motion carried with Comm. Whetsel and Comm. McAdams voting against the motion.

32 Market Square – 3-G Studios (Applicant) – Certificate No. 020112MKT

Work Description

Reconstruct existing brick portion on the second level façade to closely recreate the original 1890s appearance as indicated in 1910s photos documenting the appearance. The owners propose to rebuild the brickwork on the second level from the existing steel structural beam at approximately 12'-0" above grade, to the top of the existing parapet, approximately 31'-2". The recently renovated lower portion of the existing façade will remain un-altered and accessible throughout the demolition and construction process. The new brick façade will be identical in height to the current façade, and will have 3 structural bays with a built-up cornice. The cornicework at the top of the building will be painted hardiboard (or equivalent low-maintenance material) with a dentil pattern at the base of the cornice. The window headers will feature corbelled arches. Wood trim resembling that which is currently installed along the top of the ground floor entrance will be replicated and installed in the same location. Windows will be arched-top and double-hung, with full-height fixed sidelights.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL for COA #020212MKT to closely recreate the 2nd level façade with the condition that the new brick match the original in dimension and color.

Discussion: Kaye Graybeal noted that the initial window openings were not cut correctly and that earlier renovations were not done correctly, causing structural damage. The owners want to correct it.

Applicant wants workable windows and more light, not complete restoration, but a modern interpretation of the original windows. Drawings of the original facade were handed out for this case.

The owner's architect, Brett Honeycutt, had no further comment about the description of the proposal.

John Craig, Market Square Association, stated that the Association unanimously supports and welcomes this proposal.

Comm. Chair Busby commented on the windows themselves and the actual openings. He noted historically there were 2 layers of brick which included one that was inset and formed on the inside. Discussion noted the original window was most likely a one over one double hung the size of the original opening. He suggested they add another layer of brick that looked like the picture it would reflect the original size window. Mr. Honeycutt stated they were trying to get a more modern interpretation as well as more light.

Comm. Bolen reiterated his dislike of the Secretary of Interior standards and agreed with Comm. Chair Busby however also stated he felt the sidelights were inappropriate. He further stated he felt the size and scale of the window were fine and if the entire window was double hung he would be supportive of the proposal but couldn't support the sidelights. He stated he felt they were jarringly inappropriate.

Bernadette West noted that other several buildings on the square that have the same style of windows, some larger, that have the 2 side panels. She specifically referenced above Latitude.

Kaye Graybeal stated that, referencing the Secretary of Interior standards, if the original windows were intact, and those were the ones being replaced, they would need to be replaced in-kind. Since they no longer exist, one could determine that that opens the door for some historic interpretation that doesn't necessarily require museum restoration. The concern is setting a precedent that could open the door for similar requests.

Ms. West clarified that the center part of the window where it will be arched would be the same size as the original, but why they bumped it out with the side panels was to add more light as the building does not have many windows. Ms. West stated that it was their intent to rebuild the roof here as well. She further stated there were no plans for skylights and that the existing skylight had been roofed over multiple times.

Comm. Bolen and Comm. Chair Busby both noted they fundamentally disagree with the side panels.

Comm. Bolen motioned to approve the cornice, the size and scale of the window openings, with the modification that the windows that fill the openings are one over one that fit the entire opening, but with the omission of the sidelights.

Mr. Honeycutt noted his concern that he cannot get a one-over-one that wide as the opening is 5 feet wide. Comm. Ray asked Mr. Honeycutt if it would be hardship if the HZC denies without prejudice to give them additional time to explore replacement windows. Comm. Chair Busby stated he does not think a pair of windows in the openings would be historically appropriate. Comm. Bolen proposed that if Ms. West wanted to further research the windows and come back to the HZC, that he would recant his motion and propose that they deny without prejudice. He further stated that the HZC wants to work with them. He asked Ms. West her preference and she stated "deny without prejudice" and that she would like to do more research as she would really like the sidelights for more light.

Comm. Chair Busby noted that Comm. Bolen's original motioned failed with no second. Comm. Bolen motioned and Comm. Ray seconded, to Deny Without Prejudice.

Discussion ensued regarding the color that brick is to be painted. It was noted that was not under the purview of the HZC.

The motion carried unanimously.

Knox County Landmarks

9000 Kingston Pike - 3-G Studios (Applicant) — Certificate No. 020112GEN

Work Description

Fixed-glass enclosure of the second floor roof deck area on east addition. The butt-joined glass enclosure will be installed over the existing modern railing and pickets, along with slider windows installed from the top of the railing to the bottom of the roof structure. The rear unfinished metal fire escape door on the second level will be replaced with a paneled metal door.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of COA #020112GEN - enclose roof deck of east addition w/fixed glass panels with the condition that aluminum posts be painted white, or a white-painted wood trim piece be affixed to the front of each post. Replace rear door with paneled metal door.

Discussion: Comm. Montgomery stated that the property was actually in the city and is zoned C-3, but is in the county as well by default.

Brett Honeycutt identified himself as the owner representative. There was no neighborhood representative present.

Kaye Graybeal noted the staff recommendation reflects painting aluminum frame white or have some white trim placed over it as condition of approval.

Comm. Faulkner noted that years ago there was a public outcry to save this building. It was his understanding that this was the first building in Knoxville that people objected to being torn down. Kaye Graybeal noted she thought it was 1989. She further noted that the second story was a non-historic addition added since 1989.

It was agreed that glass was better than plastic.

Comm. Whetsel motioned and Comm. Ray seconded to approve the certificate with staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

Old North Knoxville H-1

409 W. Glenwood Ave – Laurence Eaton (Owner) – Certificate No. 012612ONK

Work Description

Level I Routine Repair

Replace shingle roof on garage with in-kind shingles (30-year dimensional).

Level II Addition of features

Addition of solar panels on garage roof in areas that will not be seen from the public right-of-way. The panels will be installed to coincide with the pitch of the roof and will not cover the entire roof surface.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of COA#012612ONK to install solar panels on the northwest-facing slope of the garage roof since it cannot be seen from the public r-o-w.

APPROVAL to replace existing asphalt shingles on garage with in-kind asphalt shingles.

Discussion: The Applicant was not present.

James Pierce, Leonard Place, identified himself as the neighborhood representative for Old North Knoxville, stated they agree with the staff recommendation in regards to the panels. They would also ask that if available, the solar panels be ordered with a dark

frame instead of the metal frame that appears on the specifications so as to further blend with the roof and be less visible from the street or right of way. Kaye Graybeal clarified that the recommendation was to approve the panels only on the northwest facing slope of the garage which is not seen from the public right of way. Though the application requested approval for installation on both pitches of the roof, there was no specific recommendation for approval of the other slope in keeping with the guidelines that they not be visible from the street. Mr. Pierce stated that visibility from the street was most important.

Comm. Bolen stated he thought the slope the applicant was requesting approval on was the south slope. Mr. Pierce indicated the neighborhood would not have a problem with installation on both sides of the roof as long as they were not visible from the street. He noted their guidelines which state “do not place solar collectors or modern skylights on roof areas that are visible from the street and do not install where they interfere with decorative rooftops.” He further stated that no matter which slope the panels are on they would not be highly visible. Kaye Graybeal noted photo showing the southeast side from an adjacent house on the corner.

Comm. Bolen motioned and Comm. Ray seconded, to approve the staff recommendation with the modification that the metal framing, if feasible, be dark in color to blend in with the roof, and that the solar panels can be added to the roof in its entirety. Kaye Graybeal clarified that the motion included that the solar panels can be added to both slopes. Comm. Bolen indicated that was correct.
The motion carried unanimously as modified.

Edgewood/Park City H-1

2106 Jefferson Ave – Tina & Dorn Brinker (Owners) – Certificate No. 020412EDG

Work Description

Replace existing damaged asphalt tile roofing (damaged by fallen tree) with corrugated metal roofing or asphalt shingles.

Replace deteriorated asbestos and any remaining wood weatherboard siding to match original wood siding evident on the house.

Replace severely deteriorated windows (all) with wood one-over-one light to match originals. Fill in twin window opening on the west side of the house and create two new window openings of the same proportions, but spaced approximately two feet apart to accommodate new interior wall. Due to the narrow side yard, this change will not be visible from r-o-w.

Repair existing original half-light over one-panel wooden front door which is somewhat rotted. If not repairable, replace with in-kind wooden door but with two vertical panels below the half-light.

Replace/replicate the porch design utilizing corrugated metal roofing or asphalt shingles.

Replace late-added battered stone porch columns with simple Doric-style round-in-section porch columns, similar to the middle porch column at 2306 Jefferson (photo included).

Reconstruct exterior wall framing of former rear screened porch damaged by fallen tree to create enclosed rear addition (not visible from r-o-w). The rear porch had been previously enclosed and the damaged wallboard has been removed as indicated by the submitted photos. Sheath rear addition walls with horizontal wood siding to match original on main house and construct shed roof sheathed with corrugated metal or asphalt shingles. Construct foundation with distressed brick for rear addition.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of COA #020412 EDG to restore house to original appearance as much as possible utilizing like materials to match original or are appropriate to the period of the house. Re-enclose rear porch with siding and roofing to match main block of house.

Discussion: Applicant was not present. There was not a neighborhood representative present.

Comm. Whetsel noted that this was a great undertaking. Comm. Bolen felt that the proposed addition on the back will not be noticeable. Comm. Whetsel noted there is small addition on the back now.

There was discussion regarding corrugated metal roofs and that they are not allowed; only standing seam metal roofing is allowed.

Kaye Graybeal noted that staff is recommending asphalt shingles per the rest of the neighborhood.

Comm. Ray motioned to approve staff recommendation.

Comm. Bolen asked to amend the motion to specifically disallow corrugated roofing. The motion was modified to include standing seam or shingles be used for roofing material.

Comm. Ray restated the motion, and Comm. Bolen seconded, to approve staff recommendation with allowance for either standing seam or shingles but specifically not the allowance of corrugated metal.

The motion carried unanimously as modified.

Lisa Hatfield, Assistant City Attorney, introduced Tim Johnson whom she asked to assist her today. He is from the law office but works primarily with Codes Enforcement.

Fourth and Gill H-1

710 Deery Street – Joe McDonald / City Community Development (Applicant)
Certificate No. 0129124G

Work Description

Replace front façade windows with wood simulated divided lite with shadow bar. Replace windows on all other elevations with wood two-over-two simulated divided lite with NO shadow bar. Replace front porch roof with corrugated metal as per included cut sheet or EPDM (Ethylene Propylene Diene Monomer) rubberized roofing membrane.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of COA # 0129124G to replace windows on NW side and rear with wood simulated divided lites. The two foremost windows on NW side are to include a shadow bar between muntins. Repair windows on the front and SE side.

APPROVAL for porch roofing to be asphalt shingles or dark corrugated metal.

Discussion: It was clarified that the northwest and rear windows were the most severely deteriorated and that the windows on the front and southeast side did not appear deteriorated or rotted and appear repairable.

Kaye Graybeal discussed multiple character defining windows that exist on the structure. There was no owner present.

Joel McDonald, Community Development introduced himself. His department tries and assist people with low or moderate income rehabilitate their houses. They strive for safety, sanitary conditions and energy efficiency and do operate on a limited budget. Mr. McDonald stated that they had proposed to replace all of the windows with a window from Ply Gem that did not have the spacers in them. The windows with spacers cost significantly more. They are both good windows that are efficient and code compliant. The proposed windows would be wooden and custom. Since they are aware that they cannot do that they now propose to use the windows with the spacers in them on the windows facing the street, and replace the others with the more economical windows. Mr. McDonald stated he felt it would require a very close examination to tell the difference. He feels they cannot do an adequate job with repairing the existing windows. The proposed windows will be custom-made to be identical to the existing ones. They will not need storm windows. They would use the recommended standing seam roof.

Comm. Whetsel inquired about the Jefferson window in the front of the home. Mr. McDonald noted it would be replicated and further clarified that it would have the shadow bar. He further stated all four front windows would have the “expensive windows”. Comm. Whetsel noted this is a nice compromise and she would support doing that. She further clarified Mr. McDonald utilizing standing seam for the roof.

Comm. Bolen stated that there was a neighborhood representative present. He further stated he disagreed with the proposal as the guidelines state that the windows need to be replaced “in-kind”. Comm. Bolen noted that he understands the fiduciary responsibilities of the city and taxpayers but felt that they cannot overwrite the guidelines that are in place because of that duty. He noted that they are not a precedent-setting Commission and that any past decision can be used by anyone to argue their point. He stated that if they start to waive on the true-divided lites or shadow bars that every single person that comes before them is going to ask for the same thing, which is in conflict with the guidelines, and that is what they are here to protect. The guidelines are the sole reason the Commission was created and they need to protect those guidelines.

Mr. McDonald stated that his interpretation of the guidelines is that they state “should” not “must”. Comm. Bolen again disagreed and felt that “should” does mean ‘must’. Mr. McDonald felt that it meant “reasonable”. Kaye Graybeal clarified that within the guidelines should allows for different situations and contexts.

Comm. Whetsel noted further clarification that the guidelines do not demand true divided lites but they ask that windows be of the same size and pane configuration and that snap on dividers not be used. She felt the only distinction between the front and other windows is the lack of a shadow bar on windows other than the front ones.

Arin Streeter, neighborhood representative, Eleanor Street, representing 4th and Gill, noted he was glad that standing seam would be used instead of corrugated metal on the roof. Regarding the windows, it was unclear in the submission due to the complexity of the proposal, so they narrowed it down to a philosophy that the guidelines contain with respect to windows: If they are repairable they should be repaired. If they need to be replaced they should be replaced with windows that replicate the original in size, pane division, mutton style and profile in material. False muttons or snap on muttons should not be used.

Kaye Graybeal and Mr. McDonald both clarified that the windows would not be aluminum but would be all wood. There was discussion regarding replacement of jams and seals. Mr. McDonald noted that the seals would also have similar profiles.

Comm. Chair Busby asked for clarification as the staff recommendation states that the front four windows need to be replaced and was the HZC going to allow for replacement of them instead. He stated he was otherwise comfortable with the compromise.

Comm. Bolen stated he was not comfortable with the compromise.

Comm. Whetsel noted similar issue last year in the 4th and Gill area where the final compromise was everything in the front was three-over-ones and all other windows could be one-over-ones. She further stated she felt it looked horrible and that this was a step in a better direction as this would result in two-over-twos throughout the entire house.

Comm. Chair Busby agreed with Comm. Whetsel that the proposal meets the intent of the guidelines.

Comm. Montgomery asked if there were guidelines with regards to keeping the old glass. Comm. Chair Busby stated that this proposal reflects trying to bring energy efficiency to the house.

Comm. Bolen requested that Mr. McDonald offer the soon-to-be-replaced windows to Knox Heritage or to someone in the community as they are rare.

Comm. Whetsel motioned to approve replacing the windows with wood simulated divided lights, and to approve the porch roofing to be replaced with standing seam panel roof, and that it be further requested window that the sills on these windows have matching profile to what is correct or historic. The motion is also to further distinguish that the replaced front windows shall have shadow bars but the others are not required to have them.

Kaye Graybeal, reflecting the staff recommendation, suggested that the 2 top and bottom windows on each side of the home closest to the front of the house that can be seen from the street also be included in the purview of the motion to include shadow bars. Ms. Graybeal suggested it be further specified that it be the PAC-CLAD Peterson Aluminum UL 90 classified standing seam roof be used as indicated by the submitted cut sheet because it is less commercial looking.

Comm. Chair Busby called for a second to the motion on the table. The motion was seconded by Comm. McAdams. The motion was carried as modified with Comm. Bolen voting against the motion.

Other Business

1) Process Improvements for the Certificate of Appropriateness Application Process

Sean

Kaye Graybeal stated that there was a member of the public who wanted to address the HZC regarding the policy on replacement windows. There is a pending application at 810 Deery Street next month for replacement windows. The intent of the Applicant was to come before the HZC this month but a complete application was not received in time. According to Lisa Hatfield, Assistant City Attorney, the HZC can discuss general policy on the replacement of windows when there are two different kinds of windows on the house, one original and the other not appropriate. However, the HZC cannot allude to how they may vote on the item. Ms. Graybeal stated that the discussion must be general.

David Kearn, Contractor, addressed the HZC regarding replacement of windows in a home located at 810 Derry Street. Discussion ensued among HZC members on the policy of whether windows needed to match on the upper or lower stories of houses, but no consensus or conclusion was presented.

Kaye Graybeal asked the HZC members if they wanted to do a work session regarding window replacement as well as one to discuss process improvement. She will send out potential dates.

Comm. Chair Busby stated he will not be at the March meeting. As there was no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

The next meeting of the Knoxville and Knox County Historic Zoning Commissions will be held on March 15, at 8:30 a.m. in the Small Assembly Room of the City-County Building.