

**MINUTES  
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING SEPTEMBER 15, 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              |               |                |                |
| 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                                   |                |               | x              |                |
| David Butler, Chair                           | x              |               |                |                |
| Mike Crowder                                  | x              |               |                |                |
| George Ewart,<br>Vice Chair                   | x              |               |                |                |
| Scott Smith                                   |                |               | x              |                |

| <b>Staff/Others Present</b> | <b>Affiliation</b>                              |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Doug Gordon                 | 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     |
| James Pierce                | Old North Knoxville Neighborhood Representative |
| Raymond Morrow              | Applicant                                       |
| Monika Miller               | Elizabeth Eason Architects                      |
| Valerie Nipper              | Michael Brady Inc.                              |
| David Holmes                | Applicant                                       |
| Tim Parker                  | Applicant                                       |

Knox County Historic Zoning Comm. Chair Butler called the meeting to order at 8:36 am. County roll call was taken and it was noted there was a County quorum. City roll call was taken and it was noted there was a City quorum. Comm. Butler swore in all Applicants and visitors that planned to speak on any Agenda item. Comm. Butler 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.

Knox County Historic Zoning Commission Chair Butler turned the meeting over to Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission Chair Matthews.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**Action: Comm. Cotham moved to approve the August 18, 2016 Historic Zoning Commission 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.

Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission Chair Matthews turned the meeting back over to Knox County Historic Zoning Commission Chair Butler.

### **CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

#### **KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

##### **Concord Village HZ**

10721 Third Drive – New Construction (9-C-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation. She noted that the neighborhood is in support of the proposal. There was no discussion.

**Action: Comm. Ewart moved that the application submitted and as read today for 10721 Third Drive be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation, and the neighborhood support with the following conditions: 1) if a chimney is constructed, it will be of brick rather than sided and 2) that 1/1 double-hung windows will be utilized throughout the house as indicated on the front elevation. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Crowder. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved with conditions**

Knox County Historic Zoning Commission Chair Butler turned the meeting over to Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission Chair Matthews.

#### **KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

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

817 Deery Street – Infill construction (8-J-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation, highlighting the changes since the initial submission. These include the proposed house being a side-gabled craftsman rather than a front gabled design, abandoning the airplane style craftsman originally proposed. Unchanged is the crawlspace foundation, the distressed tumbled brick, the fiber cement board siding (proposed to be 6 inches) and the windows will be wooden 3 over 1 double hung. The front porch is still the same type of battered columns on paneled pedestals with tongue and groove floor. Also changed since the staff report was generated is the front door which is proposed to be a craftsman style with 3 top lights and 2 vertical panels below with a transom light and no sidelights.

The rear and side doors are proposed to be a full light and half-light respectively, and of painted fiberglass. The bank of 5 windows in the front gabled dormers are each 2 x 3 now, also changed since the staff report. The porte cochere on the south side has now been designed to be an extension of the front porch, supported on one side by 3 battered columns on paneled pedestals. The front porch and porte cochere eaves will feature exposed rafter tails and a driveway with 2 concrete wheel strips separated by grass will be constructed up to, but not through the porte cochere. It is also proposed that there will be fiber cement board shakes in the front gable. She noted that since the staff report was written staff has received information from the Board of Zoning Appeals that a 7 ft. porch (as per staff recommendation) would require additional BZA approval unless the Applicant can accommodate the increase in porch depth with a reduction in the square footage of the overall footprint. The Applicant, Raymond Morrow presented a PowerPoint giving an overview of their proposal and addressing each staff recommendation, which is available online and can be found here:

[http://archive.knoxmpc.org/historic/comm/agendas/Sep2016/8-J-16-HZ Applicant Presentation.pdf](http://archive.knoxmpc.org/historic/comm/agendas/Sep2016/8-J-16-HZ%20Applicant%20Presentation.pdf)

He noted the abutting church would only support an occasional use of their grounds for access and are not willing to give him a permanent [use agreement] hence the only opportunity for them to access their lot is from the front via a driveway from the street, noting 12 of the 16 houses on the street have them. After a substantial discussion on the proposed porch depth it was noted that the guidelines focus more on porch depth than overall porch square footage. Mr. Morrow noted they now propose to pull the columns off of the porch yielding a full 6 foot depth further noting this will not deduct from their living space nor require additional BZA approval. He also passed around a sample of the rear decking but was unable to provide a sample of the fiberglass column and stated he was willing to use wood columns as opposed to fiberglass ones. He then noted they would like be able to have the option to add a faux chimney as they plan to use a vent-less fireplace, however they have not priced them out yet and installing one may be cost prohibitive. It was clarified that a chimney would be visible from Deery St. and also noted it would be constructed of the same brick as the foundation. He also noted he had agreed with the City to repair the curbing and fix the grass between the curb and sidewalk in the front and the concrete will match the existing concrete. Comm. McAdams noted she did not see the importance of insisting on a deeper porch than the one currently proposed. There was further discussion surrounding alley access verses access from the front via a driveway.

Neighborhood representative Arin Streeter noted that the neighborhood is made up of several different developments, some with alleys, some not. He noted in the southern part of the neighborhood it is not atypical to have driveways added from the front. He stated the neighborhood commends the Morrows for continuing to pursue this project with redesigning this house based on the comments from the neighborhood and the workshop. They do feel the 6 feet depth of the porch is important and they appreciate the Applicant working to meet that 6 ft. minimum. Comm. Bolen noted concern with the columns being off of the porch on any house. Mr. Streeter suggested the Commission have any redesigned front column placement require staff approval. He noted the neighborhood recommends the columns be wood, not fiberglass. A concern was noted about the way the front enclosed area looks however, a real direction on that did not occur within the neighborhood. He then noted there was some discussion about setbacks and lot coverage as BZA approval is conditioned with an HZC approval though overall they do not have an issue with them as proposed. Mr. Morrow noted the columns being will not count against their lot coverage, per Plans Review and Inspections. Mr. Morrow again stated they are in agreement with using wood columns. Comm. Bolen noted that the east elevation windows are too small without a chimney, suggesting they be full length without a chimney, further noting the prosed size would be OK with the installation of a chimney. He also suggested removing the corner column so the jut out on the front porch does not appear to be enclosed. He also noted on the east elevation there is a board that separates the windows which suggests delineation of the space and room and further suggests that a porch was enclosed, noting it could be removed. Comm. Bolen stated he was unsure he could support the carport as it is inappropriate.

**Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 817 Deery Street be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation and based on the document submitted for today's meeting with red lines showing the design adjustments, with the following conditions: 1) that the columns are made of wood and not fiberglass as agreed by the Applicant, and 2) that the front porch be a minimum of 6 feet in depth whether the columns engage it or not, and 3) that the porte cochere and the driveway are approved as submitted, and 4) that the deck fiber sample is approved as submitted and provided at the meeting, and 5) the applicant will match the concrete color at the front [as existing], and 6) that approval of the chimney be deferred and not approved at this time as the Commission does not have specific information on it to consider, and if they want to add one to come back before the Commission with a design, and 7) that the final size of the east elevation windows will be worked out with the Applicant and staff and be approved by staff, and 8) that the lap on the siding will be 6 inches. The Motion was seconded by Comm. McAdams. The Motion carried with Comm. Bolen voting no.**

**Result: Approved with conditions.**

**Action: Comm. Ewart moved to adjourn the Knox County Historic Zoning Commission meeting. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Crowder. The Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.**

1025 Luttrell Street – Rear addition (9-E-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation. Owner Tim Parker was present and had nothing further to add. Neighborhood representative Arin Streeter noted the neighborhood is in support of the application and staff recommendation. They request that although the roof likely cannot be seen even from the back yard as the slope is so low, that if the roof was to be of vertical ribbed flat panel standing seam that it be recorded in the Findings of Fact that the panels are truly invisible from all vantage points. He further suggested the most historically appropriate standing seam metal would be a flat panel with a just a vertical seam. The Applicant stated the roof will be flat standing seam with no ribs.

**Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 1025 Luttrell Street be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation with the clarification that the roof will be flat panel minus the ribs. The Motion was seconded by Comm. McAdams. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved with clarification**

1112 Luttrell Street – Installation of roof dormers (9-F-16-HZ) -- Moved to immediately following 817 Deery per agreement from both Applicants

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and recommendation. She distributed a handout (National Park Services brief) submitted by neighborhood representative Arin Streeter concerning changes to the front of houses without an historic basis. Ms. Graybeal noted there is no evidence that there was ever a dormer in the roof. Monica Miller, project architect representing the owner, was present and noted regarding the door they will go with whatever material [the Commission] prefers. She noted fiberglass on the inside and wood on the outside is another option they would look at. Regarding the proposed renovation, she noted their approach was to utilize the existing attic to add a bedroom, also increasing the overall livable space. She also noted the proposed dormers will not increase the overall footprint. She then noted the proposed dormers align with the circulation space downstairs. Comm.

Bolen noted the PermaStone actually makes this house unique. He further noted that the Commission could not justify a front dormer on this house as there was never one there and adding one would substantially change the structure. He noted the Applicant could add additional dormers in the rear for egress. Neighborhood representative Arin Streeter noted the neighborhood had a question about egress with regards to code and whether the proposed windows met that code. Marty Clay noted there was both a dimensional and square footage requirement for them, 20 inches wide by 24 inches tall, and 5.7 sq. ft. total clearance, which is why casement windows are often used. Ms. Miller noted the proposed windows meet code. Mr. Streeter noted the neighborhood also had concerns with the use of fiber cement board siding for infill material. He noted that other than the fiber cement board the neighborhood does not have any issues with the proposed changes to the rear of the house. He stated the neighborhood does have concern with the addition of a dormer to the front of the house. Referencing the National Park Services standards and design guidelines, he described the reasoning behind the neighborhood not being in support of the installation of a front dormer on this house. Mr. Streeter stated he could not speak for the neighborhood with regards to the addition of side dormers. Discussion ensued surrounding the reasoning behind the proposed dormer placements and could there be design changes that would allow the necessary egress without a front dormer.

**Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 1112 Luttrell Street be denied without prejudice to allow the Applicant to study other design options. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Bolen. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Denied without prejudice**

**Knollwood Individual Landmark H-1**

140 Major Reynolds Place – Rear addition (9-D-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and recommendation. There was no discussion.

**Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 140 Major Reynolds Place 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. McAdams. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved**

**Old North Knoxville H-1**

405 E. Oklahoma Avenue – Rear addition (9-G-16-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and recommendation as appropriate. She noted the Applicant has agreed to make changes based on comments received by the neighborhood which were received after the staff report was written and these were reviewed. She later noted these changes could be conditioned for approval by the Commission: moving an original widow to the front to replace that window, retaining the front door and refinishing it, the sawnwork vent is to be retained (the egress will need to be added elsewhere), the porch ceiling is to be beadboard plank and retain and repair the original porch columns with only the rotted bases being repaired. Ms. Graybeal noted the neighborhood has expressed concern that the drawings and photographs submitted are not construction documents and as illustrated the rear addition proposal is not clear enough to have full understanding of the project and subsequently for consideration by the Commission today. Staff also recommends approval of the addition of a balustrade being added as there is evidence of one being attached before, and installed at the lower (original) height as the porch height is under 30 inches as well as staff believes that a rear dormer could be made to be appropriate for the house but would require more detailed, dimensioned drawings. Applicant David Holmes was present and noted he had nothing further to add.

Comm. Bolen noted the Commission could approve the proposal in concept and could require staff approval of completely dimensioned elevations, given that the proposed structure would not be visible from the street. He stressed that stained fish scales in gables it is historically inaccurate for Victorians, noting that if there is evidence of them found he asked that they not be stained. Mr. Holmes stated they would paint them if they were able to install them. Neighborhood representative James Pierce was present and wanted to address the addition noting it was hard to determine the impact of the addition on the existing rear roof eave as the drawings are not complete. He noted the scale appears to be appropriate however again dimensioned drawings would make it easier for the neighborhood to weigh in. They also request that whatever is found underneath the siding on the gable be repaired and if that is not possible, replaced in-kind. He noted the neighborhood was OK with the railings as submitted and support staff's revised recommendation. Mr. Pierce noted simple 2 x 2 balustrades would be most appropriate, although simply turned and not highly ornate ones would be OK as well. Comm. Eid also noted multiple reasons he felt that more detailed and dimensioned drawings were necessary for the Commission to consider a rear roof addition proposal.

**Action: Comm. Bolen moved that the application submitted for 405 E. Oklahoma Avenue be approved based on the evidence submitted and the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation with the following conditions/modification: 1) that the original window of the house be moved to the front as long as it is the same size, and 2) that the front door is retained, and 3) that the sawn work vent is retained, and 4) that breadboard planks be used thus no plywood, and 5) that the porch posts are retained, and 6) that an appropriate height railing be installed with that height being approved by staff and with spun [turned] spindles, and 7) that the rear addition in concept is acceptable however the Commission needs to see detailed, scaled drawings before it can be approved; and therefore, should be postponed. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Cotham. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result: Approved with conditions [approval does not include the rear addition] The applicant agreed to the postponement of the review of the rear addition.**

#### **Other Business:**

- Kaye Graybeal noted that the Commission's denial of the request to demolish 1717 White Avenue is being challenged by the Applicant and that they are moving forward with an appeal to Chancery Court. The City is also in negotiation with the Applicant Sunview Sunrooms regarding the sunroom on the 1700 block of Jefferson to try and mitigate [the denial of] the enclosed porch as they are challenging their denial.

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