

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING OCTOBER 15, 2015

City HZC Present

Sean Bolen
Scott Busby
Bart Carey
Lorie Matthews
Andie Ray
Jason Woodle

County HZC Present

Mike Crowder
George Ewart
Scott Smith

Others Present

Jan Clark
Christian Gain
Sean Martin
Doug McDaniel
Frank Sparkman
Arin Streeter
Kim Trent
Jenny Wright

City HZC Absent

Steve Cotham (Excused)
Faris Eid (Excused)
Melissa McAdams (Excused)

County HZC Absent

Bill Belser (Excused)
David Butler (Excused)

Staff Present

Dori Caron
Marty Clay
Crista Cuccaro
Scott Elder
Kaye Graybeal

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

Action: A Motion was made by Comm. Bolen to approve the September 17, 2015 Minutes. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Woodle. The Motion carried unanimously.

It was noted that there were no applications before the Knox County Historic Zoning Commission today.

Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission Chair Scott Busby turned the meeting over to Knox County Historic Zoning Commission Vice-Chair George Ewart.

Action: A Motion was made by Comm. Ewart and seconded by Comm. Smith to adjourn the Knox County Historic Zoning Commission. The Motion carried unanimously and the Knox County Historic Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned.

Reports to Commission: Ms. Graybeal referenced the attached Memorandum “Consideration of Economic Hardship” for discussion. She clarified that the application for demolition of the remaining structure located at 1633 Clinch Ave. being considered today is not being presented as an economic hardship. Crista Cuccaro from the City Law Department clarified that the attached Memorandum applied to the City of Knoxville only. She then noted the purpose of the Memorandum is to provide clarifying information regarding the evaluation of economic factors when the Commission is making a determination on an application requesting approval for a demolition within the Fort Sanders NC-1 District.

Staff Reports: Ms. Graybeal reviewed the Level I Certificates approved since the last meeting.

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENES:

City Hall (former) H-1

601 West Summit Ave. – Relocate fire escape; add parking lot (10-I-15-HZ)

Discussion: Frank Sparkman, project architect introduced several colleagues and then clarified that they received confirmation from Peter Ahrens that the additional fire stairs is not currently necessary and they are withdrawing that portion of the application. He noted they would be needed if they choose to utilize the third floor space in the future. He also clarified that the intent is to leave the railings (on the balconies) and that any mullions would align with the columns with the exception of the ground floor, at the door. Comm. Bolen noted that their proposal for glassing in the balconies can be considered as they are technically located on the rear of the building even though that is a prominently visible façade. Mr. Sparkman also noted their intent is to screen the parking lot with landscaping around the edge. He then noted they can pull the lot back 4 to 5 feet to create more green space between the building and lot. Ms. Graybeal noted that the parking lot itself would have to be approved by Plans Review and Inspections. It was clarified that the Commission can review the surrounding site plan for structures under consideration. There is no neighborhood representative for this area.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 601 West Summit Ave. be approved as submitted based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation with its stated conditions, noting the removal of the fire escape portion of the application per the Applicant [which is NOT part of the approval]. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Carey. The Motion carried unanimously.

Fort Sanders (NC-1)

1633 Clinch Ave. – Demolition of contributing structure (10-G-15-HZ)

Discussion: Owner Jon Clark was present and sworn in. He noted the structure not being accepted to be on the National Register of Historic Places nor eligible for receiving tax credits were “nails in the coffin” of a long and arduous effort to rebuild. He clarified that they are pursuing local salvage companies to see what can be salvaged safely and responsibly and they are going to do their very best to salvage what they can, further noting the structure is unsafe in its current condition. They have already salvaged some brick which was used in other projects. There was no neighborhood representative present. Kim Trent, Knox Heritage, noted she concurred with Mr. Clark and further noted they have been trying to save this structure since 2003.

She very briefly reviewed the efforts by many partners since 2003 and agreed it was simply too far gone.

Action: Comm. Busby moved that the application submitted for 1633 Clinch Ave. be approved as submitted based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Carey. The Motion carried unanimously.

Fourth and Gill (H-1)

1007 Luttrell St. – Modification to rear addition (10-H-15-HZ)

Discussion: Owner representative Sean Martin, project architect, was present and noted the current homeowners are dealing with changes made to the house prior to their owning it which likely did not come before the Commission, and portions of which are causing issues that need to be addressed, which he then described. He noted the rear addition is only seen from the alley and the current owners want to convert it from a screened porch to more of a family room. Upon further discussion surrounding the current half-moon window in the gable and its proposed removal, Ms. Graybeal added a condition to Staff Recommendation for any approval to include that something [like a vent] be added back to the gable to add interest. Neighborhood representative Arin Streeter noted the neighborhood was in agreement with staff recommendation and further noted that they recognize that although the use of the PVC trim piece was not in their design guidelines but agree it is a minimal accommodation to the longevity of the building. It was clarified that the eave boards on the gables are existing and not part of this application. Mr. Martin noted they may be replaced as part of a later project. Comm. Bolen noted as the Commission is not a precedent setting body it should be stated that any approval of the use of PVC with this application would be uniquely situated to this house/application.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 1007 Luttrell St. be approved as submitted based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. Ms. Graybeal reiterated that the condition was added today that any approval include that a vent type element be added to the gable. Comm. Bolen amended his Motion to include the condition that a vent type element be added to the gable. The Amended Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Amended Motion carried unanimously.

Jackson Ave. (H-1)

118 East Jackson Ave. – Exterior restoration and renovation (10-F-15-HZ)

Discussion: N/A The Applicant was unable to be present but had intended to be at the meeting.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the Level II portion of the application submitted for 118 East Jackson Ave. be postponed and that the Applicant be asked to submit better imaging of the streetscape with additional clarification of the detail prior to future consideration of the Application. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Chair Busby. The Motion carried unanimously.

Market Square (H-1)

36 Market Square – Signage and awning installation (10-J-15-HZ)

Discussion: Ms. Graybeal noted that although the Commission is a non-precedent setting body, this property is uniquely situated as one of 4 corner properties on Market Square [thereby differing from the

internally located Market Square properties] and therefore has two street faces to address as does 35 Market Square, for which a large sign had been approved. Awning contractor Christian Cain was present and represented the owners and noted the reason for the tiebacks was the move on Market Square from support posts to tiebacks. Noting the currently proposed 2-inch tiebacks he referenced Tupelo Honey and Shonos that have 2-inch square tiebacks. He further noted the diameter was simply a function of engineering also noting they were aware that they need approval from City Engineering with regards to the final size of the tiebacks in order to move forward in obtaining a building permit. He said he would be fine with using 1 ½ inches [or smaller] tiebacks and stated he would request such from Engineering. Addressing the condition stated by staff regarding the awning he stated the initial concept involved a solid navy blue color using a different color (likely black) over the third bay beyond the cafe entrance on Wall Street. Comm. Busby asked for clarification on the owner's intent to take the awning past the actual restaurant noting that originally, and pursuant to the previously granted and still active tax credits applied to the building, the awnings could not extend past the second bay (on Wall St.). He then suggested not having an additional sign on Wall. There was consensus that the Commission would prefer one color for the entire awning. There was discussion on the length of the awning on Wall resulting in a general consensus that it be reduced. It was clarified that the Industrial Development Board is holding the tax credits (and "ownership") for 5 years, and is leasing the building to the Gallery Group (Ken burns) who is sub-leasing the space to the owners of Market House Café. Mr. Cain noted they have verbal approval of this proposal from the Gallery Group.

In review and after multiple rounds of discussion the Commission generated the following considerations:

- Is OK with the general overall design
- Prefers a monochromatic color, even for the reveal
- Is OK with the front as designed (Market Square facade)
- On the Wall St. façade would like to see the awning broken up at each pilaster (similar to Café 4)
- On the Wall St. façade, see the awning extend to the first 2 bays, or is OK with extending to a third bay if it is separated by design, shape or color
- Asks the applicant to consider enlarging the half-round arched awning (domed gable) over the corner entrance
- Asks the Applicant to consider a separate awning over the residential bay (third) on Market Square, but it is otherwise OK as submitted
- Requires the Applicant to follow through with their agreement to seek approval for 1 ½ inch tiebacks from Engineering (Engineering has the final say)
- [Subsequent to a request by the City Law Department via Crista Cuccaro] Requires written approval from the Industrial Development Board [as holders of the tax credits] and the Gallery Group [original lessee] be on file (Ms. Graybeal to supply the appropriate form)

Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 36 Market Square be postponed until the November meeting, noting that there needs to be written approval from both the Gallery Group the Industrial Development Board to move forward, and giving the Applicant an opportunity to consider the above noted considerations generated during the Discussion and the submission of revised drawings. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously.

Bart Carey needed to leave at 10:20 a.m. A quorum remains.

Old Brownlow School (H-1)

140 East Glenwood Ave. – Signage installation (10-E-15-HZ)

Discussion: Jenny Wright, HOA secretary and Brownlow Lofts Board member, as well as Deborah Bean, owner and Board president, were present. Ms. Wright noted the first additional signs have been there for 18 months and when they installed the recent 2 signs in August (2015) they did not anticipate any issues. She noted that on a daily basis there are a lot of non-resident vehicles coming in and out of the [ungated] parking lot. They attempted to place signs similar to how they are placed around the neighborhood and stated they were respectful of creating any additional clutter. She further noted they used a professional sign company for their design and installation. She noted they wanted to make sure the public understands that this is private property as it doesn't necessarily look "residential". She reviewed the property signage in question, and the reasoning behind each sign, in some detail. They are exploring what would be most aesthetically pleasing per staff recommendation as well as what would be in their best interest financially. Ms. Wright reviewed their preferences regarding how they would respond to the staff recommendation. She asked for recommendations for which of the 3 signs they should remove. Ms. Wright noted they are seeking conditional approval today and would like to come back for staff approval once they complete their research with a proposal that would meet one of staff's proposed options. Ms. Graybeal noted that with individually landmarked buildings the Commission would review the entire property boundaries with regards to aesthetics. The Applicant was directed to the City [Plans Review and Inspections] for clarification on setbacks for the re-created Brownlow School sign.

Fourth and Gill neighborhood representative Arin Streeter clarified that Brownlow School is not under the neighborhood guidelines as it has an individual landmark designation however, he did make the neighborhood aware of the proposal and has not received any comments.

Doug McDaniel, who resides across the street from the parking area on Glenwood was present and spoke. He expressed his concern about any conditional approval of the historic Brownlow sign without a final proposed rendering that includes the actual sign panels as well as mounting structure(s). He is less concerned with its actual placement. It is his opinion that none of these signs are safety related but reflect a problem with trespassing. He then stated that in watching the traffic there they are not effective and further, they look like interstate signs in front of an historic building and are visually cluttering. He feels they are more of an overreaction to urban living. Mr. McDaniel noted people have been walking, biking and turning around in this lot for many years, and are not trespassing but are just being good neighbors. The neighborhood lobbied to see the school saved and feels the current residents don't realize that. He agrees with staff recommendation regarding removal but feels it should go further as the metal signs are obtrusive and painting the backs will not change that, and current sign placement on existing structures not only looks cluttered but is incompatible with an historic structure.

Comm. Bolen agreed the current signage is negative and visually cluttering and felt that could it also portray the wrong message to potential future owners and suggested they consider that going forward when creating long term goals for signage. Comm. Busby asked the Applicant if they have looked at a comprehensive sign package with a more aesthetically pleasing type of signage. Ms. Wright noted they had not but was in agreement with that as a long-term option. Ms. Graybeal clarified that the Commission can require fewer and smaller signs as well as what they are mounted on and their aesthetics but cannot approve larger or additional ones.

It was noted they did not obtain permits when the non-original signs were installed. There was continued discussion surrounding sign placement/removal. It was also clarified that any re-submittal will need to be limited to 2 signs [about parking] facing the street.

Action: Comm. Busby moved that the application submitted for 140 East Glenwood Ave. be denied without prejudice to give the Applicant time to work with staff to correct the aesthetics of the signage [to be more in concert with an historic building] and provide an actual final proposed design for the signs that also meets City Code. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Ray. The Motion carried unanimously.

Further Discussion: It was also clarified that a site plan and design need to be submitted for the re-created Brownlow Sign.

Other Business:

- Ms. Graybeal asked that Commissioners please RSVP to her ASAP with whether or not they can attend the Commissioner Workshop being held next week on October 22nd in conjunction with the East Tennessee Preservation Conference being held at the East Tennessee History Center October 22nd and 23rd.
- Comm. Ray suggested Commissioners share with each other via email if they have conflicts with attending the November and December meetings given the holidays.

Action: Comm. Bolen moved to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.