

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2012

City HZC Present

Scott Busby
Faris Eid
Lorie Matthews
Sandra Martin
Melissa McAdams
Andie Ray
Melynda Whetsel
Jason Woodle

County HZC Present

David Butler
Linda Claussen
Kenneth Gresham
Carol Montgomery

Others Present:

Kaye Graybeal
Ethiel Garlington
James Pierce
Christopher King
Arin Streeter
Arthur Seymour, Jr.
Mary Ireland
Cheryl Ball
Ken Irvine
Lynne Sullivan
Jace Koelzer
Patty Ireland
Lisa Hatfield
Melvin Wright
Dori Caron
Renee Hewitt

Members Absent

Sean Bolen (ex.)

Members Absent

Steve Cotham (ex.)
Charles Faulkner (ex)

Commission Chair Scott Busby called the meeting to order. He noted to the attendees that the meeting was being broadcast as well as recorded and to please speak clearly. Comm. Busby asked all speakers to limit their presentations to 5 minutes. All attendees that wished to speak on an Agenda item were sworn in by Comm. Chair Busby. Attendees were also reminded to please sign in prior to speaking. Roll call was taken.

Kaye Graybeal introduced Dr. Heather Bailey, the Historic Preservation and Housing Planner with the East Tennessee Development District. Dr. Bailey provides technical assistance to districts in our region. Dr. Bailey noted she was here to observe and be a partner with our Historic Zoning Commission. Ms. Graybeal also introduced Mark Donaldson, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Action: A Motion was made by Comm. Eid and seconded by Comm. Whetsel to approve the August 16, 2012 minutes. The Motion carried unanimously.

Reports to Commission: Lisa Hatfield, Chair Scott Busby, Melvin Wright. Melvin Wright, City of Knoxville Plans, Review and Inspections reviewed several Code Enforcement Cases: 940 Eleanor, 1239 Armstrong, 1021 Tulip, 1417 Clinch.

Mr. Wright noted that the required notice of violation had not been given to the listed property owners due to the department being inundated and resources depleted. The contractor at 1417 Clinch has been notified of the violation verbally and has been instructed to contact MPC staff for clarification on how they are to proceed.

Staff Reports (Levels I, II, III & IV): Kaye Graybeal, MPC Historic Preservation Planner. Ms. Graybeal reviewed this month's Level I Certificates that were approved by staff.

Decertification of portions of the H-1 Historic Overlay District –request to postpone 9320 Kingston Pike (portion of the Kennedy-Baker-Walker-Sherrill House H-1 Overlay boundaries)

Discussion: Ms. Graybeal noted that the Applicants have put in a proposal to decertify a portion of the property removing the H-1 overlay, which would be considered rezoning of the property. The MPC approved postponement of the application at their September meeting last week. Developer representative, Arthur Seymour, Jr. has asked the HZC for postponement of the application as well. Ethiel Garlington, Director of Preservation Field Services for Knox Heritage, reported that they support postponement of the application. Mr. Garlington stated that Knox Heritage has been working with the owner and contractor to find a long-term preservation solution for the house, and they simply need more time. Mr. Seymour reiterated that the parties involved are working towards a long term solution and again asked the Commission for at least a 30 day postponement.

Action: A Motion was made by Comm. Ray and seconded by Comm. Whetsel to postpone the application for one month until the October HZC meeting. The Motion carried unanimously.

CITY of KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION

Old North Knoxville Historic District (H-1)

411 E. Scott Avenue (082812ONK)

Remodel garage into 2-story side-gable with wood frame, board & batten siding (8"-centers), asphalt shingle roof, rafter tails, wood staircase & deck, wood 1-over-1 windows & existing concrete pad. Add 2 garage doors as depicted in drawing. Condition for at least 7/12 roof pitch.

Discussion: Owner Mary Ireland was present and stated that she was alright with staff recommendation and the stated conditions. Ms. Ireland confirmed the pitch would be the same as the house, she believes it is 7/12. Neighborhood representative, James Pierce stated the neighborhood agrees with staff recommendation on the auxiliary building. He further noted the garage doors represented in the rendering best fit the proposed style. Mr. Pierce stated he and Ms. Ireland have spoken about the doors and that she is looking at composite doors, which he said would meet the guidelines as long as the style is properly represented and also that the neighborhood would support a composite door that was paintable.

Action: Comm. Ray moved that the submitted application be approved, with conditions, based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. The conditions are all doors be approved by staff, with a composite material being acceptable as long as it is the appropriate style and paintable, and the roof is a 7/12 pitch. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Martin. The Motion carried unanimously.

Fourth and Gill Neighborhood (H-1)

822 Deery Street (0905124Ga)

Construct 10' x 10' overall footprint. 11" water table base w/ drip edge and 4.75" corner boards with quarter-round (similar to house). 5.5 - 7.5" -wide trim around door & windows (similar to house & period). 30" support brackets under gable roof overhang. Exposed rafter tails. Wide overhang to protect 1x6 poplar beveled siding from elements. Recycled/salvaged windows (restored). Restored 48" -wide single carriage house door with deadbolt and period-appropriate hinges. 3-tab basic shingles. All wood materials.

Discussion: Owner Renee Hewitt was present and had no additional comments. Neighborhood representative Arin Streeter stated the neighborhood is in agreement with the staff recommendation. It was clarified that a zoning variance would not be required as the original footprint of the outbuilding would be used.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Motion carried unanimously.

611 Gill Street (0905124G)

- 1) Replace early or original front entry door with similar wood door with half-light above
- 2) Install Craftsman-style wood door on east side of house within new addition.
- 3) Install wood frame ten-light French doors on 2nd floor rear balcony.
- 4) Install bronzed- detector on rear of home.

Discussion: Owner Cheryl Ball was present and stated they wanted to withdraw the part of the application seeking to replace the front door as they have been unable to find an appropriate replacement and they are worried about the amount of deterioration. They are now going to try and repair the existing door. Ms. Graybeal stated that if the Commission is agreeable, Ms. Ball can seek approval to replace the door with an appropriate one should the door turn out to be beyond repair and it was further suggested she work with staff on both the repairing of the door and future replacement options should that be the case. Arin Streeter, neighborhood representative, noted that the neighborhood was generally in agreement with the staff recommendation with there not being any particular neighborhood opinion offered about the style of the side door. It was noted that as the side door is quite visible. Staff further noted that the guidelines indicate that secondary doors not look like the front door (which the Applicant is now going to try and retain), and that a door that was less embellished than a Craftsman style one would

be more appropriate. It was clarified that a half-light door would be appropriate for the side door and that staff would need to approve the selection.

Action: Comm. Whetsel moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report, with the condition that the existing front door be repaired, and if it cannot be repaired, a replacement door is approved but will need prior staff approval. It was further moved that a half light door with panels below or a solid paneled door should be used for the side door. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Motion carried unanimously.

942 Luttrell Street (0904124G)

1. Support the existing house, remove existing crawl space/partial basement and excavate to provide new foundation walls to be covered in simulated stone.
2. Provide an addition to the rear of the existing home and new basement spaces.
3. Remove and rebuild the existing front porch with turned posts and balustrade, brackets, fretwork. The front steps are to be covered in simulated stone
4. Remove and replace siding to match existing.

Comm. Chair Busby recused himself and retired from the Commissioner's panel. Vice-Commission Chair Martin assumed the role of Chair.

Discussion:

Comm. Whetsel disclosed that she had spoken with the Applicants prior to their submission of the application. She and her husband are neighbors of the Applicants. Secondly, Comm. Whetsel also disclosed that work done to the house in the 1990s was done by her husband. She has had continued contact with the Applicant regarding the researching of evidence for the application. Comm. Whetsel offered to recuse herself as Lisa Hatfield of the Law Department for the City of Knoxville noted that legally Comm. Whetsel did not need to recuse herself as she made the disclosure and all information shared with Comm. Whetsel has/will be shared with the full Commission. There was no opposition from the Commission or the Public. Vice-Commission Chair Martin allowed Comm. Whetsel to remain seated as a voting member of the Commission for this application.

Ken Irvine owner was present and noted that he still supports the H-1 overlay of the neighborhood but expressed frustration that in he feels the standards now disallow realistic projects, and are surprised at and disagree with some of staff's findings.

Mr. Irvine stated the issue with the foundation is what initiated this project. He noted that it is in terrible shape and the bricks on it are crumbling. He further stated that the foundation must be fixed now and is at the top of their priorities with this project. Mr. Irvine clarified that their intent is to use more rectangular masonry than what is reflected on the drawings and he noted they will use bricks typical of the neighborhood.

Arin Streeter, neighborhood representative stated that, from a personal perspective, he felt that there are a number of residents that have moved into the neighborhood that rely on the guidelines to maintain its integrity. Speaking for the neighborhood, Mr. Streeter noted the neighborhood does not feel that the guidelines support changing the material of the foundation. He stated that the neighborhood would support any necessary repair of the foundation and subsequent use of replacement brick and repointing of any existing brick, and that any replacement bricks would need to match the pattern, size, color and texture (maintain the visual appearance) of the existing bricks.

Ms. Graybeal noted that the proposed windows to be added were in new locations and asked for more clarification. Chris King, representing the architectural firm, stated that the proposed windows were placed to meet code requirements for egress as the basement level will be like a Mother-in-Law suite, particularly for the bedroom. Mr. Irvine noted that there were windows in the basement originally. Mr. Streeter noted the neighborhood the neighborhood would like to see the double-hung window on the corner of the foundation be moved to the right (per the drawing) such that it would not indicate an obvious replacement of the foundation.

With regards to the front porch Ms. Graybeal noted that although not original, according to the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, it has been there sufficient time to have gained historical significance in its own right. She stated that there has been a historical trend in the neighborhood to replace original porches as they deteriorate with Craftsman porches. There is no documentation to support what the original porch looked like. If the foundation is to be replaced, it will be necessary to remove and rebuild the porch. Ms. Graybeal stated the staff recommendation is that the porch be rebuilt in a simpler and less embellished manner since there is no documentation. Mr. Irvine showed earlier photos of the house from the 1980s and 1990s. It was clarified by Comm. Whetsel that when the work was done on the porch during that period, and since the house was not in an historic overlay at the time, there was no requirement to consult with the MPC Historic Preservation Planner on staff. Mr. Irvine further noted that what is on the house now is clearly a combination of porches over time. He reiterated that they want to do the best they can to return the porch to a structure that would reflect the original configuration. They have been looking at Queen Anne homes that were built in the 1904-1905 period and have proposed a design that reflects what is on those homes.

Mr. Streeter stated that the neighborhood generally in agreement with staff recommendation with regards to the porch. He stated that the neighborhood's interpretation of the guidelines which would favor building a porch that was more simplified so as to not distract from the original materials which are basically the main body of the home. Mr. Streeter stated that there are multiple historical styles throughout the neighborhood over the years. He noted that the more ornate style that is being proposed is more reflective of an 1890s structure. He further stated the neighborhood would like to see the academic research to support the proposed ornate porch. Mr. King stated that this design could be academically appropriate.

Ms. Graybeal noted there was a recent precedent set with a home on Oklahoma Ave in Old North Knox in which the Commission approved the repair/upgrading of a non-original porch balustrade and posts with simple, unembellished features as there was no documentation of the original porch.

With regard to the rear addition, Ms. Graybeal noted the proposed structure is smaller and lower than the original home per the guidelines and although visible from the street there is heavy vegetation present. The addition is connected to the house and is offset. The proposed garage doors do adequately simulate carriage house doors. The material is in keeping with the house and guidelines. Ms. Graybeal noted that although the contemporary design of the connector clearly differentiates old and new, there is a concern with the connector design however and staff and the neighborhood offer that it would be more appropriate if lower than the eave of the porch addition. Ms. Graybeal noted that the details of the addition should not match the front of the home as the guidelines state that there must be differentiation between old and new. Ms. Graybeal stated the staff recommendation regarding the proposed addition is to approve it with the condition that the connector not come up over the eave of the porch it will be attached to, and the rear porch details be approved by staff with the railings and balustrades being different than those on the front porch.

Mr. Irvine stated they have tried very hard to stay within the guidelines with the design of the addition. He stated they were fine with the conditions noted above and agree with lowering the connector in principle, but would need to consult with the architect regarding changing the height of the connector. Mr. Streeter noted the neighborhood is generally in agreement with staff recommendation. Referencing the *Preservation Brief #14*, he noted the specifics for hyphens or connectors and further noted as the overall interpretation is subjective, the neighborhood does not want to impose a subjective standard on the Applicant. He noted they agree that the height of the connector should be equal or a little bit lower than the porch that it is butting up against. It was clarified that there was a dividing trim board on the north elevation side porch which delineates new verses old and that it should remain. Further that the proposed additional windows be limited to the space of the old infill. The neighborhood feels the material of the connector meets the standard for compatible yet different. It was also clarified that the owner would use similar brick on both the front and rear foundation. Mr. King felt that the conditions could be accommodated. He noted that the trim board could be kept. Mr. Irvine stated the side porch had also gone through multiple manifestations.

Ms. Graybeal then addressed the proposed replacement of the siding. Staff recommendation is to replace only areas that are deteriorated (rotted) with matching siding, retaining as much of the existing siding as possible. Mr. King stated that there are significant areas of deterioration and that part of the reason to remove the siding is to add insulation there is currently none. Mr. Streeter noted that the neighborhood was in agreement with the staff recommendation to replace only the deteriorated siding. He further noted there were several neighbors who had insulated their homes without pulling off all the siding and offered their assistance.

Action: Comms. Whetsel and Eid moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report with the following conditions: the new foundation walls shall be covered in brick to match the character of the original, the foundation of the rear addition will also be brick similar to the brick on the front foundation, the new foundation windows shall have wood brick-trim and the window on the north elevation (closest to the front of the house) shall be moved away from the corner of the original house, the connector shall be lowered on the north elevation where it abuts the house, the existing trim board (corner piece) on the corner of the house will remain, only the deteriorated wood siding is to be replaced, the rear porch details, balustrade and posts shall be of a simplified design approved by staff and will be dissimilar to that of the front porch, the redesign of the side porch shall be approved by staff, the design of the replacement front porch shall be approved by the Commission. The proposed construction of a more ornate front porch is denied without prejudice pending the Applicant providing adequate documentation to support such a design to the Commission for approval. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously.

Commission Chair Busby resumed chairing the meeting.

Edgewood Park City Historic District (H-1)
1912 Washington Street (083012EDG)

Replace original slate roofing with metal faux slate roofing. Fabricate custom ridge caps that will replicate the plain (not embossed) metal ridge caps that are currently on the house. The new ones will be solid gray in color. The original finials will be returned to their original positions and better secured. Replace guttering.

Discussion: Owner Lynne Sullivan was present stated that she had been making repairs to the slate roof on this house for 13 years. Ms. Sullivan stated the roof is now beyond repair as noted by her contractor. She noted the felt under the slate is falling apart and the slate is literally falling off. Ms. Sullivan noted that in her research she looked at roof replacement options (including an estimate of approximately \$60,000 to replace the roof with slate, which is not an option financially) and found rubber, asphalt and metal shingles. She found that metal most closely resembles the color and character of the original slate shingles. Ms. Sullivan stated she would use a metal variety that would be a charcoal gray color with enhanced dimensional shading which would be very close in color to the original slate. She noted the rubber options were monochromatic and has been known to curl. The configuration of the roof will remain the same. The metal ridge caps will be fabricated by the contractor as they are beyond repair and the original finials will be put back as well. Ms. Sullivan noted that it is within the historic character of the neighborhood to have a variety of roofing materials throughout it as well as the fact that there is an ongoing national dialogue among preservationists about the use of alternate materials for replacement of slate roofs and what is practical and feasible for homeowners.

Neighborhood property owner Jace Koelzer, Vice-President of the park City-Park Ridge Community Action Organization, has spoken to literally dozens of neighbors and stated that the neighborhood is in agreement with this project and the upcoming project with the Irelands (1724 Washington Street). It was clarified that the only part of the roof that will not look the same is the one profile showing the scalloped shingles as the only replacement materials with the scalloped shape were rubber or asphalt. Concern was expressed that the edge of the faux metal shingles would look fabricated and it was suggested the Applicant work with staff on addressing that concern. Ms. Sullivan then stated that the proposal includes replacement guttering which will be suspended under the metal roof and matched to the color of the eaves to better blend into the house, and this guttering will be at the edge of the faux metal shingles. The faux shingles will be overlapped horizontally which will cover approximately one third of the guttering.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Whetsel. It was clarified that the Edgewood Park City guidelines do allow for use of alternative replacement materials under certain parameters. The Motion carried unanimously.

Edgewood Park City Historic District (H-1)
1724 Washington Avenue (090412EDG)

Removal of original slate roof shingles and replace with decorative composite metal shingles.

Discussion: It was clarified that the intent of these shingles is to be decorative and that they are not intended to simulate slate shingles. Owner Patty Ireland was present and stated that the slate roof has been repaired multiple times but the slate is now brittle and further repair is no longer an option. She stated the roof must be replaced. Ms. Ireland also noted that the cost of replacing the roof with slate shingles is prohibitive. Noting the reasons she and her husband chose the decorative metal shingles used, she stated that Barber himself (this is a George Barber designed house) approved the use of decorative metal shingles. She stated the materials used actually came from a Barber catalog. She also referenced that in their evidence submitted she and her husband offered proof that these types of ornamental shingles have been used on Queen Anne style homes across the US during the period of their home, 1889-1890, as well as proof that these types of shingles were used on Barber homes across the US, whom she stated praised the use of metal shingles during his lifetime. Ms. Ireland also noted they have provided pictorial evidence that metal materials had been used on a portion their home at one time and metal material still exists on that portion. Ms. Ireland stated they had the support of the majority of the homeowners in their neighborhood.

She noted that their home is a quite decorative Queen Anne and further noted the original roof on the home was a highly decorative slate. Ms. Ireland stated the pressed metal shingles they have chosen are historically accurate to both the style and period of the home and reiterated they were recommended on these homes by Barber himself.

Neighborhood property owner Jace Koelzer noted that the neighborhood supports the use of these decorative metal shingles.

A discussion ensued regarding the neighborhood guidelines and whether or not it was the intention of the neighborhood to approve all similar roof replacements as a precedent. Mr. Koelzer stated that the neighborhood should continue to review roof replacements on a case-by-case basis and he could not make a blanket statement for the neighborhood. It was clarified that the design guidelines denote preferred use of roof material that were darker. He noted that the neighborhood guidelines suggest --not mandate here and that the neighborhood supports this project. Mr. Koezler stated that the neighborhood would continue to look at projects on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Graybeal re-stated the *Further Staff Recommendations for approving this application: If there is a desire in the Edgewood-Park City Historic District to make the exception and set the precedent that alternative materials are not required to simulate or replicate the original material or design in that district, staff recommends that this exception be limited to slate roofing materials due to their expense, rather than setting the precedent for changes in appearance and material for all building materials. If this application for replacing slate with decorative metal shingles is approved, then the neighborhood and HZC accepts that the basis for approval is that since decorative metal shingles were utilized on similar houses in other cities and manufactured as nearby as Chattanooga, it is reasonable to deduce that they may have been utilized in Knoxville, and may be approved, even if no evidence exists that they were utilized on the particular house subject to review.*

Comm. Chair Busby stated that he thought the issue under discussion was not the material used (tin) but the color.

Action: Comm. McAdams moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report with the condition that this approval is limited to the replacement of slate roofs on George Barber / Queen Anne houses because they are difficult to replicate, and that the evidence shows that the neighborhood supports waiving the guidelines in this case. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Whetsel. It was noted that this project did not have an approved COA. Comm. Eid and Comm. Matthews abstained. The Motion carried with two Commissioners voting yes and one Commissioner voting no.

Frazier Bend Draft National Register Nomination Update

Ms. Graybeal noted that there was going to be a neighborhood meeting to discuss the benefits of including their property in the Frazier Bend National Register Historic District on Saturday, October 6, 2012 at the Riverdale School Gymnasium, at 2:00 p.m.

Preservation Fund Grants

Ms. Graybeal also stated that copies are available of two grants submitted to the Tennessee Historical Commission, one for design guidelines update including those for alternate materials, and the other for a window repair workshop to be conducted by Bob Yapp, a nationally known restoration expert.

Action: Comm. Chair moved to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Whetsel. The Motion carried unanimously.