

**MINUTES
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MAY 16, 2013**

City HZC Present

Sean Bolen
Scott Busby
Melissa McAdams
Andie Ray
Melynda Whetsel
Jason Woodle

County HZC Present

David Butler
Bart Carey
Carol Montgomery

Others Present

Bob Campbell
Kenn Davin
Ken Irvine
Michelle Mauer
JonathanNewberry
Haden Reid
Arin Streeter
Luke Wilkerson

City HZC Absent

Faris Eid
Sandra Martin (Excused)
Lorie Matthews (Excused)

County HZC Absent

Linda Claussen (Excused)

Staff Present

Dori Caron
Doug Gordon
Kaye Graybeal
Melvin Wright

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

Action: A Motion was made by Comm. Carey and seconded by Comm. Ray to approve the April 18, 2013 Minutes. The Motion carried unanimously.

Reports to Commission: Chair and Vice Chairs, Doug Gordon, Melvin Wright.

Doug Gordon, *for Lisa Hatfield*, stated there were no reports to commission this month.

Kaye Graybeal, MPC Historic Preservation Planner reviewed the Level One Certificates approved this month.

**CITY of KNOXVILLE and KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION:
Certificates of Appropriateness**

Market Square (H-1)

27 Market Square 03513MKT (resubmittal from April 18, 2013)

Replace three non-original wood windows with aluminum-clad windows

Discussion: Ms. Graybeal noted this Item was on the April 2013 Agenda. The Applicants made an attempt to attend the meeting but was misinformed by building security that the meeting was not being held. Hence, the Applicant asked to present the Item again today in order to afford the due process. The Applicant is an agent for the owner and is Jonathan Newberry of Lowe's Home Improvement Store. Ms. Graybeal noted that the Commission's vote last month on the vinyl windows currently installed was to deny the application. The revised application before the Commission today is for aluminum-clad wood, triple-glazed one-over-one windows, still on the second level. The windows that had been removed did not have the third section above (transom). There was not a representative from the Market Square District Association present nor did staff receive any comments from the Association.

Owner representative, Jonathan Newberry was present. He referred to 2 window samples he brought to the meeting today, both wood, with the same profile, one clad with aluminum and the other with paint. He also noted they propose to use a wooden brick mould around the windows, and although it is a higher maintenance product, it will allow them to scribe the brick mould to better fit in to the bricked opening around the proposed aluminum-clad wood window. It was clarified that the proposed aluminum-clad window would be off-white in color. He noted the aluminum cladding offers a somewhat better structural integrity allowing for a triple-paned window. He believed this subsequently offers better noise reduction.

The owner is seeking noise reduction without adding storm windows as she feels this would detract from the look of the property. Mr. Newberry also stated that they would use matched paint to alleviate the appearance of any textural differences. Discussion they moved onto the third sash now present on the currently installed windows. Ms. Graybeal noted that windows *without* a separate top section in the arch are more typical of the period. Mr. Newberry stated the manufacturer can make the proposed aluminum-clad windows without the transom (third sash) to have one continuous arch with no transom. It was clarified that the guidelines clearly state replacement windows need to be wood and although there is only a thin coat of aluminum cladding, the guidelines do not support its use. It was also clarified that the windows the current ones replaced were not original. Some discussion ensued regarding Market Square also being a commercial district and that that allowed more flexibility in what is typically approved for the first floor storefronts located on the Square. It was clarified that historically renovations on Market Square 2nd levels have only been approved for wood windows. It was again clarified that the use of storm windows is supported by the guidelines.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the submitted application be denied based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. He further moved to approve true one-over one-double sash wood windows without the horizontal transom bar separating the top arch section. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Whetsel. The Motion carried unanimously.

Further discussion. It was clarified that if the owner decides to proceed with the use of storm windows, they can be made of aluminum, and that they do need to match and/or be consistent with the existing window material.

28 Market Square 05012013MKT

Replace late-added, non-original wood doors with pair of new wood doors

Discussion: There was no owner or owner representative present nor a Market Square District representative present. This is the address of the Preservation Pub. Color photos of the recently installed doors were handed out. In the previously approved facade renovation, there was approval to replace the existing 6 ft. 8 in. tall, full light, non-original wood entry doors (square top) and frame with 8 ft. tall full light doors (square top) and frame. Ms. Graybeal noted the Applicant proceeded with the currently installed arched door with a bottom wood panel in order to reduce the likelihood that the door could be kicked out. The new doors also include muntins (6-light simulated divided lights) in the upper three quarters of the doors, also not approved, and not supported by the guidelines. It was also clarified that the muntins were both internal and external. It was noted that the guidelines did not specifically address the arch; however, they do state that inappropriate historical themes shall be avoided and the arch being a deviation from the historical style of the building would therefore be inappropriate, as is the large swath of wood surrounding the new doors, which now replace previously existing sidelights. It was clarified that the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness specifically stated that “the new front door and sidelight height shall be the same height as the adjacent storefront widows”.

Action: Comm. Ray moved that the submitted application be denied based on the evidence submitted, information provided in the staff report as they do not meet the guidelines, as well as new findings and as they do not meet what was previously approved by this body. Comm. Ray clarified her Motion noting the currently installed doors would need to be replaced with ones that met the HZC’s previous approval and the sidelights replaced also as noted in the previous approval. It was further clarified that if this application is denied, the previous approval would stand. **The Motion was seconded by Comm. Woodle.** It was further clarified that had the owner/Applicant wanted to do something outside of what was previously approved by the Commission, they would have needed to come back before the Commission. **The Motion carried unanimously.**

Concord Village (HZ)

10801 Lake Ridge Drive 042313CON

Construct addition on northwest side of earlier rear house addition

Discussion: As this Application is in the County, Knox County Historic Zoning Commission Chair David Butler, assumed chairing of the meeting. The owner, Bob Campbell was present and noted that they are requesting to keep the addition expansion at 8 feet due to owner health issues necessitating the need for the addition to be fully wheelchair accessible in the very near future. The additional 2 feet will significantly impact the capacity of the turning radius. Mr. Campbell noted they would landscape the outside of the proposed addition expansion to reduce the impact of its appearance. Comm. Carey suggested the Applicant revisit the window placement as noted in the submitted elevations as a center placement may be more appropriate. He also clarified with the Applicant that the new siding will be weaved in to the existing siding to appear as if it had always been there.

Action: Comm. Chair Butler moved that the submitted application be approved, as submitted, allowing the proposed expansion to remain at 8 feet, based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. **The Motion was seconded by Comm. Montgomery. The Motion carried unanimously.**

10903 Lake Ridge Drive 042413CON

Redesign and reconstruct entry vestibule for annex building

Discussion: As this Application is also in the County, Knox County Historic Zoning Commission Chair David Butler, continued to chair the meeting. Ms. Graybeal noted this application is for a former church that this is now an administrative office for a business. Haden Reid, project architect, noted that the large square window on the second level, seen on the drawings but not photos, was installed before the owner was aware they needed to bring the project before the Commission. It is reflective of recent interior renovations. It was clarified that the annex is a noncontributing addition, however changes should still come before the Commission. Brief discussion ensued regarding the shape of the new entryway being arched as opposed to matching the straight lines of the existing building. Mr. Reid noted the entryway was designed to be more appealing and to allow more light into the interior. Its design also keeps the parapet low enough to not impair the view out of the existing 2nd-level windows. Mr. Reid also noted the Applicant is in agreement with staff recommendation to use two full-light, storefront bronze finished doors. With regards to the bricks, he did not think they could match the brick but would have General Shell come out to the site and get 5 or 6 compatible bricks and offered to come back for approval and have the Concord Board out for approval.

Action: Comm. Montgomery moved to approve the submitted application based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report which includes approving staff recommendations for the doors and bricks. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Carey. The Motion carried unanimously.

Further Discussion: The Commission asked that the Applicant understand that any window replacement needs to be brought to staff for approval or before the Commission if applicable. The Commission further requested that the Applicant come back before the Commission with an application to review the after the fact installation of the large square second story window as well as for any other window(s) they intend to replace. Mr. Reid noted there was no indication of the building permit that they needed a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window, however, it was noted that since the building permit was for an internal renovation, a floor plan was submitted but an outside elevation may have not been included.

4th and Gill (H-1)

930 Luttrell Street 042913FG

Construct wood deck at rear and install pair of one-light doors. Reconstruct porte-cochere.

Discussion: Ms. Graybeal noted the drawing submitted for reconstruction of the porte-cochere is not adequate to describe the actual proposed work and further noted this would require additional delineation prior to approval. She stated its final design should reflect clear delineation from the original structure of the home to ensure it appears as new construction. She further noted the rear of the home has been altered many times over the years. General contractor representative, Luke Wilkerson, was present. He noted they have a meeting scheduled with Dwight Guinn who is an architect to seek his opinion on the porte-cochere design. The owner wants to keep it as it has functionality, but they don't want to make it look like it was part of the original part structure. He noted they want to use similar themes while making it look like a deliberate structure.

Arin Streeter, neighborhood representative, was present and noted the only concerns from the neighborhood were related to the porte-cochere but he now recognizes that staff and contractor are addressing those very issues.

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 exception that reconstruction of the porte-cochere is denied without prejudice. Comm. Whetsel further moved that the Applicant return to the Commission with the revised plans for reconstruction of the porte-cochere at the June Historic Zoning Commission meeting. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Motion carried unanimously.

942 Luttrell Street 050113FG

Remove and reconstruct front porch in classic style. Add stone porch steps. Enclose proposed rear addition with windows.

Discussion: *This Item was heard first as the Applicant had an unavoidable conflict. All present were in Agreement with moving this Item.* Scott Busby recused himself from this discussion and vote. Sean Bolen assumed chairing the meeting. Owner Ken Irvine was present and noted they felt they had addressed the concerns that arose at the September 2012 meeting, with the revised proposed porch being much simpler and stylistically true to the later Queen Anne style of the home. Mr. Irvine also stated he had no issues with any of the parameters outlined in the staff report in going forward to be able to proceed. Neighborhood representative, Arin Streeter, was present and noted the neighborhood was in general support of the application. He noted it is never ideal to reconstruct something where there is not documentation of the original structure; however, this proposal appears to create a porch that does not compete with the house architecturally. The neighborhood wants to make sure that the conditions of the prior approval were still going to be met even though they are not fully represented in these present drawings. Ms. Graybeal noted the previous Motion (September 2012) does reflect all of the conditions necessary for approval. She further noted that it was not necessarily clear that on the north-facing elevation of the porch the outside corner trim piece was to be retained and suggested that could be clarified in any Motion made today. Mr. Irvine stated they did not have a problem with that. Christopher King, representing Smee+Busby Architects, assisted in clarifying that the percentage of lot coverage of the addition did meet the zoning code.

Action: Comm. Ray 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 [previously approved] middle trim piece located on the north elevation of the enclosed porch is to be retained. Comm. Ray amended the Motion to also include that the front steps are to be made of a concrete or limestone material that would replicate what is already in the neighborhood or of that period, and are a single piece for each riser and tread with no mortar joints, and of a neutral color. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Whetsel. The Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Busby was the reinstated as Chair of the meeting.

815 N. 4th Street 020413FG (resubmittal from February 21, 2013)

Construct side stairwell addition and rear porches. Replace windows, siding and porch balustrade with composite material. Other miscellaneous repairs and replacements

Discussion: Ms. Graybeal noted this application was denied without prejudice in February 2013 and then postponed in April 2013. The Applicant has made some revisions and changes which Ms. Graybeal reviewed.

Owner Kevin Davin was present as was his assistant, Michelle Mauer. Mr. Davin stated that the rear and front porches were replaced 5-6 years ago. He noted the rear porch has already rotted and the siding installed in 2006 is also rotted on the south side. The rear porch door is rotted and will need to be replaced as well. Ms. Graybeal reviewed the nature and specifics of the April 2013 denial without prejudice. Arin Streeter, neighborhood representative, stated the neighborhood discussion on this application was very brief. He noted the neighborhood felt that what was denied was not substantially changed in accordance with what the Commission had requested be changed for a revised application. Ms. Graybeal noted the drawings submitted with the revised application differ from the ones originally submitted only with respect to the window configuration on the proposed addition. Mr. Davin noted that he needs to have an egress to the rear of the house within 2 weeks or his insurance company will cancel his insurance policy on the house and therefore he has to complete the rear porch in that timeframe.

There was significant discussion surrounding the enclosed stairwell and agreed that there should be clear delineation between the enclosed stairwell and garage. Comm. Chair Busby noted he would recommend they hire a designer to assist with the project. It was noted that the work that has been done is of good structural quality; however, permits were not obtained and subsequently there was no trigger to come before the commission. Comm. Bolen noted that had they come before the Commission, no part of the enclosed stairwell would have been approved as submitted. He noted the concern is the guidelines are not being met. The Applicant was asked if there was any other possible way to add a stairwell.

Comm. Chair Busby needed to leave and Comm. Whetsel assumed chairing of the meeting. It was discussed that there be a temporary design to allow for a rear egress for safety and insurance purposes. It was noted that the addition was quite large and did not reflect the historic nature of the house. It was further clarified that the Commission's purview covers the entire exterior of the structure, not just the front.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved to approve installation of a temporary wood stairwell and wood landing allowing egress from the rear of the structure. He further moved that this temporary structure not be readily visible from 4th Avenue. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Motion carried unanimously.

Further discussion: It was noted the main issue is the separation between the garage (carriage house) that was built and the original house. There needs to be a clean linear break between old and new. The Applicant was implored to hire a designer. Comm. Bolen proposed a site visit by the Commissioners. It was agreed that a site visit would occur and it was scheduled for 8:30 am on Friday, June 7th. A Public Notice announcing the visit will be published to satisfy legal requirements for holding a public meeting. It was reiterated that there was still a quorum present.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the submitted application be denied without prejudice based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Motion carried unanimously.

Action: There was no other business. Comm. Ray moved to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Bolen. The Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.