

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING AUGUST 15, 2013

City HZC Present

Sean Bolen
Lorie Matthews
Melissa McAdams
Andie Ray
Melynda Whetsel
Jason Woodle

County HZC Present

David Butler
Bart Carey
Mike Crowder
Carol Montgomery

Others Present

Bonny Braly
Michael Gilcrist
Eric Huffstetler
John King
Sean Martin
Scott Schimmel
Arin Streeter
Kim Trent
Bernadette West

City HZC Absent

Scott Busby (Excused)
Faris Eid (Excused)
Sandra Martin (Excused)

County HZC Absent

None

Staff Present

Dori Caron
Kaye Graybeal
Lisa Hatfield
Melvin Wright

Acting Comm. Chair Whetsel called the meeting to order and noted there was a quorum. Roll call was taken. She stated that the meeting was being televised and recorded. She also asked that speakers limit their presentations to 5 minutes and to sign in when they reached the podium. She also noted that any decisions can be taken to Chancery Court if appealed within 60 days. Acting Comm. Chair Whetsel then swore in all visitors and Applicants that planned to speak on any Agenda item.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved to approve the July 18, 2013 Minutes. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Woodle. The Motion carried unanimously.

Reports to Commission: Chair and Vice Chairs, Lisa Hatfield, Melvin Wright. There were no reports.

Christa Cuccaro introduced herself as a new clerk in the city law department and noted she will be assisting with the Historic Zoning Commission proceedings.

Staff Reports: Kaye Graybeal, MPC Historic Preservation Planner reviewed the Level One Certificates approved by staff this month.

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Market Square (H-1)

32 Market Square 070113MKT

Storefront and upper level facade revisions

Discussion: Comm. Bolen clarified that the balcony at 5 Market Square is an example of a balcony that is original to the building. It was clarified that the other example of a balcony/loggia was added after the building facade for the Chamber at 17-21 Market Square was completely demolished and rebuilt. Ms. Graybeal noted that the submitted revised drawings do address some of the conditions proposed in the Staff Recommendation showing that the glass-paneled door on the recessed facade of the second level has been revised to a more traditional muntin configuration and that the arched openings have added detail. She further recommended that the proposed condition that “the brick be painted” be eliminated, and instead a mock-up of the brick be provided for staff approval. Although not part of the written Staff Recommendation, she stated that a muntin is recommended in the first-level storefront windows to divide the opening, even when the windows are open. Owner-applicant representative John was present. He noted that he was filling in for Brett Honeycutt, the project architect, who is out of town. He stated that the revised proposal addresses the earlier identified issues. He handed out renderings to illustrate the current and proposed facade for both the first and second levels (these renderings had been included in the mailed HZC package). Scott Schimmel, representative for the Market Square District Association, stated they had met with Mr. Honeycutt earlier but had not taken a position on the project as they did not have enough information. He said they were excited to see the project moving forward as the façade does need attention. He noted that since the meeting they have been presented with revisions and it appears that the revisions now proposed have addressed the two issues that the Association had: the upper-level exposed garage door has been changed and the lower-level facade the doors are now recessed. Discussion ensued regarding actual placement of the knee wall and railing. Bernadette West, owner, was sworn in and attempted to clarify the knee wall and railing. She thought the railing would go right into the facade. Ms. Graybeal noted a condition of approval could include review and approval by staff and codes of a detailed rendering of the knee wall and railing. It was also clarified that the railing and knee wall, per code, need a combined height of 42 inches. There was a general consensus that further clarification from Mr. Honeycutt, the architect, would be helpful. Ms. West stated she would be fine with a 42-inch railing alone without the knee wall.

Ms. Graybeal noted that the muntin pattern on the proposed French doors at the second level is not period to the building but does reflect an earlier period than the horizontal-patterned garage doors. Ms. West was open to fewer panels in the second-level French doors. She felt they would most likely be new doors as the chance of finding three similar ones would be difficult. It was clarified that the interior garage door on the lower level was not under the purview of the Commission. A condition of approval also denoted that the entry doors are to be recessed. Ms. West stated they would be 3 to 6 feet back. She stated that she would agree to a condition that included they be recessed a minimum of 3 feet and that the entry doors be made of wood with surrounding wood trim. It was clarified that the style and rails of the door need to be of a width more in keeping with other wood frame doors on Market Square, and Ms. West also agreed to the trim being at least 4-1/2 to 5 inches.

Comm. Bolen stated that he felt the Market Square District (MSD) Design Guidelines supersede the Secretary of Interior standards. His opinion is that there is no justification for the balcony and that it is outside of the MSD Design guidelines. Comm. McAdams noted she agreed with Comm. Bolen and that Market Square, unlike for example, Jackson Square in New Orleans, has only one building with an original balcony. She felt it was, and remains, an anomaly and felt that allowing further new balconies would change the character of Market Square. She stated that it's against the guidelines to replace windows with balconies as well as against the Secretary of Interiors Standards which say that such design must be compatible with property in the neighborhood and the environment. She stated that the windows could open wide much like opening the proposed bottom-level windows next to the entry door which could provide the same aesthetic as a balcony. Comm. McAdams noted that typically, the upper stories of buildings on Market Square are enclosed with windows.

Significant discussion ensued with regard to whether or not a balcony/loggia is appropriate on Market Square. Mr. King stated that he felt the proposed balcony feature already exists that this proposal is much better than the one on the Chamber rebuilding. He stated that he felt the facades the building's facade need to be made more appealing to the pedestrian public, especially in an area as compact as the Square. He stated that he felt they were not breaking new ground with this proposal. Comm. Bolen reiterated that the Commission was tasked with adhering to the guidelines and that previously poorly designed and inappropriate features on the Square are not precedents for future applications. It was also clarified that although this building does have original bricks its facade configuration is not original. Ms. Graybeal noted the proposed three arched openings are more indicative of what was there originally. Ms. West was potentially open to installing windows down the road; however, noted that expense was an issue. Ms. Graybeal offered the suggestion that perhaps the owner could fund custom windows in the arched openings as opposed to the custom-arched French doors on the innermost second-story wall. It was further clarified that documentation of the building's original arched window openings exists in the photos from a 2005 submittal, which were included in the HZC package.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved to approve staff recommendation with respect to the roof cornice and the first-floor facade, with the conditions that the entry doors be wood and recessed at least 3 feet and further that the width of the wood trim be approximately 5 inches. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray.

Further Discussion: Ms. West stated that the cornice height would be as close as possible to what the original height was. Lisa Hatfield stated that there may be enough questions to warrant the Applicant considering coming back with more details to address these questions, particularly as the architect is not present. She further clarified that the Applicant can agree to a approval for only a portion of the project (partial approval). Mr. King stated the Applicant does not want to split the application for a vote.

Action: Comm. Bolen withdrew his prior motion.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the submitted application be denied with the understanding that the first-floor modifications and cornice are supported by the Commission but that the application is denied based the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report that the second-story balcony creation is not consistent with the Market Square District guidelines.

Action: Comm. Ray moved to deny without prejudice; however, the Motion on the floor had not yet been seconded or identified as having died without a second.

The Motion was seconded by Comm. McAdams.

Further Discussion: Mr. Schimmel stated in their conversations with Mr. Honeycutt that the district is not looking at this as an existing facade but as a demolition and infill with a new facade. He stated it was their understanding that one should not be looking to “recreate” an older facade. Comm. Bolen clarified his Motion was based on B2 of the district guidelines, not on the Secretary of Interior standards. County Comms. Montgomery and Butler voiced their support of the application, as did City Comm. Matthews.

Action: Acting Comm. Chair Whetsel called for a voice vote for the Motion on the floor.

Comm. McAdams Yes

Comm. Matthews No

Acting Comm. Chair Whetsel No

Comm. Bolen Yes

Comm. Ray No

Comm. Woodle No

The Motion failed by a 4 to 2 vote.

Action: Comm. Ray’s previous Motion was now taken up and she moved that the application be denied without prejudice, based on the evidence submitted, the testimony presented, the guidelines, and the ensuing discussions. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Bolen.

Further Discussion: The Applicant stated if the application was denied without prejudice she did not know what else she could do that would reflect what they wanted to do with the building. Mr. King felt they had addressed the issues and that the balcony as proposed preserves the overall storefronts by making it a recessed and not projecting balcony. He further noted he felt the existing balconies did not constitute a problem on the Square. Ms. West stated she was willing to postpone the application until next month (September 19th), come back before the Commission with more clarification, and have the architect attend as well, as requested by the Commission.

The Motion and second were withdrawn, respectively, by Comms. Ray and Bolen.

2 Market Square/325 Union Avenue 072913MKT

Entry door / penthouse revision

Discussion: Eric Huffstetler, architect, stated the owner has requested the roof of the penthouse be flat and higher – not sloped as proposed. The back eave against the adjacent building would be the same height as existing. He stated that he did not have a rendering of that current request. Ms. Graybeal stated that one would only see the penthouse from outside of the district but that the building itself is in the district. Mr. Huffstetler noted that this proposal further modifies an addition done in approximately 2000. It was clarified that the Market Square District Association (MSDA) had not had a chance to discuss this. Mr. Huffstetler agreed to return with revised renderings

Action: Comm. Ray moved to deny based on the National Park Service brief that notes that rooftop additions be minimally visible. Mr. Huffstetler clarified that the current proposal reflects a 10-foot ceiling and that that it can be reduced. It was noted that the MSDA's opinion would be sought. Comm. Ray amended her Motion to deny without prejudice. The Amended Motion was seconded by Comm. Woodle. The Motion carried unanimously.

Old North Knox (H-1)

311 Scott Avenue 072913ONK

Rear door installation

Discussion: Sean Martin, owner-representative reviewed the proposal. He noted the owners want to be able to access the rear patio and will be using this egress regularly and frequently. James Pierce, neighborhood representative, noted there was language in the guidelines to support retaining the existing door, but the Neighborhood understands the need to adapt the use of these homes. He noted it was not visible from the street and may or may not be character-defining, but overall they support staff's decision to approve the application. He further noted that they do not want to set a precedent regarding not saving rear doors. Ms. Graybeal noted the recommendation was based on the fact that this portion of the home is not original, is not particularly character-defining, and is not seen from the public right-of-way.

Action: Comm. Ray moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the evidence provided in the staff report. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried with Comm. McAdams abstaining.

Edgewood – Park City (H-1)

2009 Jefferson Avenue 072613EDG

Rear porch / deck / window & door installation

Discussion: Staff distributed a revised drawing that clarified the intent for the form of the existing rear roof eave where it covered the deck to remain intact. Comm. Bolen recused himself as he was working with the applicant's contractor on another project. Michael Gilcrest, owner, was present and sworn in. He noted the original front door was inside the structure and will be retained. The rear door is also to be repaired and retained. Neighborhood representative Bobby Braly stated that the neighborhood very much supports this project and staff recommendation as a whole. Mr. Gilcrest noted that the non-original side rear casement window will be removed and replaced with a wood louvered vent.

Action: Comm. Ray moved that the submitted application be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report with note that as agreed by the Applicant, the rear window be placed below the eave of the roof overhang and such that the corner board is retained. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Mathews. The Motion carried unanimously.

Individual Landmark (H-1)

3425 Kingston Pike a.k.a. Westwood 072913GEN

Rear addition

Discussion: Kim Trent, Executive Director, Knox Heritage, stated they are thrilled to move forward with this entire project and the current proposal addresses their egress and ADA requirements. It was clarified that the demolition of the fireplace was for a very late and atrocious structure in the kitchen. She noted that the resulting space will be re-interpreted to reflect its original use. Comm. McAdams disclosed that her husband is a pro-bono consultant for Knox Heritage. Arin Streeter, representing the architect, clarified the reason for the use of different brick in some places—to help distinguish the new structure from the old materials.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the submitted application be approved as submitted based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried with Comm. McAdams abstaining.

Mechanicsville (H-1)

229 Deaderick Avenue 072913MEC
Utility shed in rear yard

Discussion: There was no significant discussion.

Action: Acting Comm. Chair Whetsel 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.

Other Business:

Comm. Ray requested that the record reflect her displeasure and sadness with regards to the demolition of the two buildings on Walnut St. owned by St. John's Church.

Ms. Graybeal announced that the Commission has been awarded the grants from the Tennessee Historical Commission to work on neighborhood guideline updates as well as to hold a workshop on window repair with Bob Yapp. She noted staff was looking to hold the workshop in cooperation with Knox Heritage and Mabry-Hazen House in May, which is preservation month. She noted staff will begin to explore retaining of a consultant to assist us in the process of updating the design guidelines.

There was no other business.

Action: A Motion was made by Comm. Montgomery and seconded by Comm. Crowder to adjourn the meeting. The Motion carried unanimously.