

**MINUTES  
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING JULY 21, 2016**

<b>Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission</b>				
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Excused</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Sean Bolen, Vice Chair	x			
Bart Carey	x			
Steve Cotham	x			
Faris Eid	x			
Lorie Matthews, Chair	x			
Melissa McAdams	x			8:42
Sandi Swilley		x		
Stanton Webster	x			
Jason Woodle	x			

<b>Knox County Historic Zoning Commission</b>				
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Excused</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Bill Belser	N/A			
David Butler, Chair	N/A			
Mike Crowder	N/A			
George Ewart, Vice Chair	N/A			
Scott Smith	N/A			

<b>Staff/Others Present</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Crista Cuccaro	City Law Department
Marty Clay	City Plans Review and Inspections
Scott Elder	City Plans Review and Inspections
Kaye Graybeal	MPC
Dori Caron	MPC
Arin Streeter	Fourth and Gill Neighborhood Representative
Daniel Cooter	Sparkman & Associates Architect's, Inc.
Doug Hewitt	Applicant
William Exum	Jonathan Miller Architecture and Design
Jennifer Bookstaff	Applicant

Knoxville Historic Zoning Comm. Chair Matthews called the meeting to order at 8:34 am. City roll call was taken and it was noted there was a City quorum. It was then noted there was no County business and the Knox County Historic Zoning Commission would not convene. Comm. Matthews stated that the meeting was being televised and recorded. She also asked that speakers limit their presentations to five minutes and to sign in when they reached the podium. She then noted that any appeals to Commission decisions can be taken to Chancery Court if appealed within 60 days. Comm. Matthews then swore in all Applicants and visitors that planned to speak on any Agenda item.

## **Approval of Minutes**

**Action:** Comm. Eid moved to approve the June 16, 2016 Historic Zoning Minutes. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Bolen. The Motion carried unanimously.

**Result:** Approved.

**Staff Reports:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the Level 1 Certificates approved since the last meeting.

## **CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

### **City Hall (former) Landmark H-1**

601 W. Summit Hill Drive – Enclose portion of façade with windows (7-H-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report. Daniel Cooter added that the current porch configuration is actually historically inaccurate and what they propose to put back is much closer to being historically accurate. With regards to window replacement with aluminum clad windows, Ms. Graybeal noted that the Secretary of Interior Standards state that “the new feature shall match the old design, color, texture and visual qualities and where possible, materials”. She noted the Commission would need to decide, from this point of view, if the aluminum clad windows sufficiently depict wood. She noted the Commission has not approved aluminum clad windows in homes where houses are close to sidewalks, however it has approved them in larger scale, non-residential, commercial or public buildings that are downtown and with H-1 overlays. Mr. Cooter noted the existing windows in the other openings are aluminum, not aluminum clad. There was a brief discussion surrounding pane division and window size. There was discussion surrounding the size and pane division of the proposed replacement windows.

**Action:** Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 601 W. Summit Hill Drive be approved 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.

**Result:** Approved

### **Fourth and Gill H-1**

822 Deery Street – Construction of addition (7-C-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report. The Applicant was present and had nothing to add to the staff report. Arin Streeter, neighborhood representative, noted the neighborhood is in agreement with staff’s recommendation.

**Action:** Comm. McAdams moved that the application submitted for 822 Deery Street be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Eid. The Motion carried unanimously.

**Result:** Approved

### **Ft. Sanders NC-1**

1819 White Ave - Roof dormer addition (7-K-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report. The Applicant was present and had nothing further to add to the staff report.

Ms. Graybeal noted that she had been in contact with neighborhood representative Randall DeFord who made recommendations for the brackets and finishes on the dormer to help it blend in with the house better and with those considerations they felt that the dormer would look more appropriate. It was clarified the shingle siding on the dormer will match those on the front gable of the house.

**Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 1819 White Ave be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report with the following conditions: 1) the two eave brackets be mounted on the west side of the dormer, and 2) the window facing between the paired windows matches the width and type of that between paired windows on the main house. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Carey. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved with conditions**

**Glenn Craig (former) Landmark H-1**

6304 Westland Drive – Rear and side additions (7-L-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report. Project architect William Exum was present and added that their clients are excited about the preservation of this house. He stated that in studying neighboring properties he realized that even with the proposed additions this property would still be smaller than the surrounding properties. Referencing rendering VP – 1.2 he noted one would only minimally see the proposed additions even coming in the driveway and asked that the commission reconsider the staff recommendation to narrow the east addition by 3 feet. Discussion ensued surrounding the final size of the east addition and from a design standpoint there was consensus that the projection of the east addition would be best left as proposed. Further discussion ensued regarding placement of the windows on the proposed middle addition. Mr. Cooter noted the owner would prefer the versatility the proposed placement would allow and in fact, their spacing is done to the scale of the room. It was noted there will be substantial landscaping done around the house. There was a brief discussion on the proposed roof lines.

**Action: Comm. McAdams moved that the application submitted for 6304 Westland Drive be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report as submitted. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Carey.**

**Further Discussion:** Substantial discussion ensued surrounding preserving an existing exterior stone wall on the west side of the house which is proposed to become an interior space. Comm. Eid suggested that any stone that needs to be removed be preserved as it may be practical to remove it to properly flash the wall. Mr. Exum stressed that the owners are absolutely committed to preserving and reusing everything that is removed from the house. There was then discussion surrounding the Secretary of Interior Standards [regarding preserving the stone wall] which state that original material should not be destroyed/removed. Ms. Graybeal noted that the intent these standards is to ensure that the overall integrity of the structure is protected while recognizing that some alterations may need to be made to accommodate more modern lifestyles. It was again noted that the Applicant is committed to preserving and re-using any material removed and that it would only be a very small percentage of the overall project. Crista Cuccaro stated that if the Commission departs from the guidelines there needs to be a justifiable reason for that decision. There was discussion surrounding the fact that this marble wall will become interior space and no longer visible from the outside. It was also noted that the Commission has approved removal of historic material conditioned that the removed material be preserved. Ms. Bookstaff, in describing their intent in this proposed addition, noted they want to preserve the marble below the windows as is and plan to have the marble exposed on either side of French doors they plan to install at the wall [where the window is] once it

becomes interior space. She assured the Commission that any marble that needed to be removed would be preserved and used elsewhere.

**Comm. Chair Matthews called for a vote on the floor: The Motion on the floor was denied unanimously.**

**Action: Comm. Eid moved that application submitted for 6304 Westland Drive be approved as submitted based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report incorporating the clarification as stated by the owner [Ms. Bookstaff] that the existing marble will be preserved to the greatest extent possible with the exception of the areas that need to be removed to facilitate the addition and the connection to the roof as well as the [proposed installation of the] doorway. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved with clarification/condition**

### **Market Square H-1**

23 Market Square – Awning and signage (7-J-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report as appropriate with the most recent submission by the Applicant regarding revised proposed awning and signage. She noted they have now proposed a roll-up awning which is appropriate for the era of the building. They are also proposing the signage to go on the slope of the awning as this newly proposed awning will not have a valance (where they guidelines recommend they be placed). She noted this new awning will not require tie backs. Staff asserts that the awning will be part of the storefront and the guidelines state that the color and texture of storefront material shall be simple and unobtrusive whether they are wood, cast iron or anodized aluminum. She noted the Applicants assert that their proposed orange color is historic in nature as it has historically been associated with the University of Tennessee. She noted the guidelines also state that inappropriate historical themes should be avoided and staff feels the proposed orange color is not appropriate for Market Square. Ms. Graybeal further noted that the guidelines state that signs may be used on awnings but shall be of contrasting letters painted on sewn onto the awning's valance. Ms. Graybeal also noted the building also does not have a signboard; therefore, staff is recommending approval of the roll-up awning and the signage to be on the sloped part of the awning. Ms. Graybeal then clarified that the Historic Zoning Commission does not specify the color of paint for building facades however the staff report denotes 3 staff finding (#'s 4, 5 and 6) which support staff's recommendation that the color of the awning be less bright and more muted. She noted their recent submission (being considered today) addressed [negated] the concern noted in the staff recommendation that the valance depth be shortened. It was noted the Applicant was not present. A discussion ensued regarding the brightness of the proposed color.

**Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application recently submitted for 23 Market Square be approved [with the clarification that] the approved awning is the recently submitted/adjusted awning with the condition that a muted color must be used and that the new color will require staff approval. The Motion was seconded by Comm. McAdams.** A discussion ensued regarding the UT branding site/UT colors. It was noted the University of Tennessee used Pantone #151, part of their primary palette which includes orange, a smoky gray and white. It was also noted there was a secondary palette that includes an array of colors including a warm red like color. Ms. Graybeal noted she had suggested alternate color/options on the branding site to the Applicant who wanted to keep the proposed color which is an attempt to match the UT Pantone #151 as closely as possible.

**Comm. Chair Matthews called for a vote on the floor. The Motion on the floor was denied unanimously.**

**Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application recently submitted for 23 Market Square be approved with the clarification that the approved awning is the design most recently submitted and reviewed at today's meeting with that shape, size, scale and slope, based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report with the condition that staff can approve alternative colors that are listed on the UT branding site with a preference towards darker or muted colors with orange accents. He then further clarified the condition that rather than pantone 150 or 151 the Commission requires that the Applicant choose a color similar to the alternative UT branding colors available at the UT branding site with a preference towards a darker or muted awning with accent colors or a blending or combination of other muted colors, restating the final color(s) require staff approval. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Woodle. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved with condition**

**Other Business:**

- Ms. Graybeal noted she was in receipt of a letter from the Tennessee Historical Commission that the Giffin Grammar School will be considered by the State Review Board for nomination to the National and Tennessee Registers of Historic Places.
- Crista Cuccaro noted that City Council approved on second reading, a zoning change for the Cal Johnson building from C-2 with a D-1 overlay to C-2 with an H-1 overlay, effective August 5, 2016. She noted that the Downtown Design Review Board met yesterday (7.20.16) and had an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) to consider for improvements to the Cal Johnson building. The Board issued a Certificate of Appropriateness based on that submission. She noted that approval is valid for 3 years under the Tennessee Vested Rights Act. She then noted that there are triggers along the way if additional action is taken such that the vested period is extended. Ms. Cuccaro then noted the Applicant has the right to make improvements based on that Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the Downtown Design Review Board for 3 years (which again could be extended based on certain triggers). She further noted that any amendments to that Certificate of Appropriateness would go back before the Downtown Design Review Board as they were the initial approving body of that Certificate of Appropriateness. Beyond the initial or otherwise extended vested period any applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness would come before the Historic Zoning Commission to be considered using the Downtown Design Review Board Guidelines for Historic Resources along with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties.

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