

MINUTES

KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION  
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 15, 2018

Knox County Historic Zoning Commission				
Commissioner	Present	Absent	Excused	Arrived
Bill Belser			X	
Mike Crowder	X			
George Ewart, Chair	X			
Kim Isenberg	X			
Scott Smith, Vice Chair	X			

Staff/Others Present	Affiliation
Kaye Graybeal	MPC
Dori Caron	MPC
Bill Threlkeld	Applicant Architect
Lisa Beer-Wigert	Applicant
Carol Montgomery	Concord resident

Knox County Zoning Comm. Chair Ewart called the meeting to order at 8:30 am. Roll call was taken and it was noted there was a quorum. Comm. Ewart stated that the meeting is being televised and recorded. He also asked that speakers limit their presentations to five minutes and to sign in when they reach the podium. Applicants or members of the public who wished to speak on an Agenda Item were sworn in. He further noted that any appeals to Commission decisions can be taken to Chancery Court if appealed within 60 days.

**Approval of Minutes**

There were no minutes to approve this month.

**Staff Reports**

There were no staff reports.

**Reports to Commission**

There were no reports to Commission.

**KNOX COUNTY CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**Concord Village HZ**

10817 Second Drive – New house and garage construction (2-F-18-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation. Staff felt the style of the house and garage as designed fit within the district, however the one incongruity of the project that does not meet with the context and development pattern of the neighborhood was the sizes of the house and garage and how they relate to each other. She noted the Applicant has now broken up their initial design to include the two “wings” on the sides of the garage to offer changes in roof height and pitch. They have also moved the garage further back on the lot away from the house.

She noted that if approved this proposal would set a precedent for similarly situated properties for new construction where an accessory building would have more square footage than the main house and a greater width as viewed from the street. There was no opposition present. Ms. Wigert was present and noted they were open to the staff recommendation for the proposed garage door to appear as two doors but plan for it to be one door. It was clarified that the door was 16 feet wide with 4 feet on either side of the door. Architect Bill Threlkeld was present and described their thinking behind the proposed 16 foot wide door. He noted there is a solid 16 foot wide garage door that does look like a carriage house door which does have a center mullion, and wood look like two doors, and proposed that they use that door. They also looked at one with the appearance of side hinges. Ms. Graybeal noted the Applicant would need sign-off on drawings submitted to Plans Review and Inspections if the Commission agrees that is an acceptable solution. There was discussion surrounding the possible chimney and that it would need to be constructed with masonry, brick rather than stucco. Mr. Threlkeld agreed and noted the Applicant will be pricing out the possibility of including a chimney with their contractor. Comm. Ewart suggested that be part of any Motion made today. Carol Montgomery noted that from Olive Road the garage would appear smaller (looking at the garage from the side and the house from the long view) and from Second Drive it will also appear smaller as it is further back. Ms. Wigert described their reasoning for not attaching the garage to the house. The proposed house, she noted, has the same footprint as the previous structure. Ms. Wigert stated they had no intention of running a business out of the garage.

**Action: Comm. Smith moved that the application submitted for 10817 Second Drive be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation.**

There was further discussion clarifying the staff recommendation including the alternate recommendations for the record. Ms. Graybeal noted with regards to the brick staff would recommend one that appears similar to the upper/top brick in the photograph of brick samples submitted by the Applicant today for the foundation brick (Boral Bricks – Old Guignard (queen) with dark mortar.)

**Comm. Smith withdrew his Motion.**

**Action: Comm. Isenberg moved that the application submitted for 10817 Second Drive be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation with the following conditions: 1) that there be one garage door that appears to be 2 doors, be of carriage house design as submitted and requires prior staff approval, and 2) that a sample of brick for foundation and chimney (if constructed) be provided to staff for approval. Staff recommends pricing a masonry chimney stack for the wood stove vent, but the chimney stack is not required as a condition of approval, and 3) The garage peak should be made to be more significantly lower than 1 foot than that of the house since no precedent has been discovered by staff or provided by the applicant for accessory structures that are nearly the same height as the main house.**

Mr. Threlkeld then offered possible remediation of the garage peak height as proposed. He noted they could lower the bearing of the garage from 10 ft to 9 ft (as opposed to reducing the width or the roof pitch at this point as they would like to maintain the 10/12 roof pitch). He also noted they could look at raising the finished floor of the house up 6 or 8 inches. He noted it would all be in the grading.

**Comm. Isenberg restated her revised Motion, removing and replacing condition #3 with the following condition: 3) that the front finished floor elevation of the house be raised 6 inches and the bearing height of the roof of the garage be lowered from 10 feet to 9 feet.** It was clarified that the total new difference would be somewhere between 2 feet and 2 feet 6 inches. **The Motion was seconded by Comm. Crowder. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result:** Approved with conditions.

There was no other business and the meeting was adjourned.

<b>Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission</b>				
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Excused</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Rick Blackburn			X	
Bart Carey, Vice Chair			X	
Steve Cotham	X			
Faris Eid	X			
Dasha Lundy	X			
Lorie Matthews, Chair	X			
Dationa Mitchell	X			
Sandi Swilley	X			
Stanton Webster	X			

<b>Staff/Others Present</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Lisa Hatfield	City Law Department
Kaye Graybeal	MPC
Dori Caron	MPC
DeAnn Bogus	City Plans Review and Building Inspections
Scott Elder	City Plans Review and Building Inspections
James Pierce	Old North Knoxville Neighborhood Representative
John Holmes	Applicant
Tricia Stuth	Applicant Architect
Ted Shelton	Applicant Architect
Scott Carpenter	Applicant

Knoxville Historic Zoning Comm. Chair Matthews called the meeting to order at 9:28 am. Roll call was taken and it was noted there was a quorum. Comm. Matthews stated that the meeting is being televised and recorded. She also asked that speakers limit their presentations to five minutes and to sign in when they reach the podium. Applicants or members of the public who wished to speak on an Agenda Item were sworn in. She further noted that any appeals to Commission decisions can be taken to Chancery Court if appealed within 60 days.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**Action: Comm. Webster moved to approve the January 18, 2018 Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission Minutes. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Cotham. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result:** Approved.

### **Staff Reports**

Ms. Graybeal reviewed the Level 1 Certificates approved since the last meeting.

### **Reports to Commission**

There were no reports to Commission.

## **KNOXVILLE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

### **Old North Knoxville H-1**

1403 Armstrong Avenue – New house construction (1-D-18-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed what occurred at the January meeting for this proposal noting the house size (length, width and height – a footprint of 24 feet wide, 64 feet long and 24 ft. 6 inches, plus 4 feet of grade, to the roof pitch.) and placement on the lot were approved with the architectural details being postponed to this meeting. The Commission at the January meeting felt the overall spacing of the houses on the street, as well as the narrow shape of the lot, lent weight to the proposal and therefore voted for a partial approval to allow the Applicant to focus on the architectural detail at today's meeting. For today, she noted the Commission will be looking at not only the architectural features of the house but also the general building massing which now includes a bump out or projection on the south side, not presented at the January meeting. Ms. Graybeal then reviewed the revised staff report and staff recommendation. She noted staff recommendation condition #6 has been met as the Applicant has provided window and door specifications for this meeting and staff would recommend approval of the doors #1, 8, 9, 10 and 11. Staff also have metal roof specifications (condition #7) although the Applicant has not yet chosen which of the 3 presented they want to use. She noted the proposed pool was not discussed last month, and as long as pools are not highly visible from the front they have been approved in the past.

Applicant architect Ted Shelton was present and stated that they felt that their design meets the design guidelines and is appropriate for the neighborhood and highlighted portions of the Secretary of Interior Standards that support their design. They feel there are many instances with the design and the guidelines where there is room for interpretation. He touched on the design elements made to articulate the massing and the additions made since the January meeting, the fencing and the bump out. Ms. Graybeal noted the newly proposed fencing elements are not reviewed by the Commission. Mr. Shelton stated the design takes cues from but does not mimic existing structures in the neighborhood. Their design intentionally attempts to give this smaller house more "weight" on the streetscape. He described their reasoning behind the proposed window placement as well as their front façade design and desired upper and lower symmetries. He clarified that they are proposing a metal flue, not a stove pipe and as proposed it is actually a common and contemporary way to expose a flue.

Neighborhood representative James Pierce was present and noted the house as designed is beautiful and contemporary. He noted the intent of the guidelines is to maintain the integrity of the historic neighborhood and preserve it. He noted the neighborhood wants to develop a compromise as they feel this design leans too far towards a contemporary house and they would like it to blend more with the historic character of the neighborhood. Beginning with the windows, he noted historically they are vertically oriented double-hung windows with 20% coverage. The proposed window configuration is not typical for the neighborhood. Wide window trims are also typical in the neighborhood and break up massing, as are [distinct] foundations of masonry. They are concerned with the abstract patterning and sizes of the south elevation windows and that they do not fit with any other homes in the district. He noted a 6-inch-above-grade foundation is not typical of the neighborhood and should be at the height of the porch joist, and be masonry. He stated the house should have a strong sense of entry. They also have concerns with regard to the recessed steps to the front porch, again atypical for the neighborhood. He again stated they would like to find a middle ground where the final design is not so far removed from the historic integrity found throughout the neighborhood. He reviewed the design guidelines they feel support these concerns. They would like to know how the Applicant would break up the shingles and other massing.

Mr. Shelton clarified that the small window on the south elevation leads into the library. He noted they were happy to move the break in the sidewalk wall and the alignment of the front walk north to align with the stairs going to the front porch to create a better sense of front entry. With regard to the porch stairs being recessed, Mr. Shelton shared their reasoning behind their proposed design and mentioned the room-like porches reference in the design guidelines for ONK. Ms. Stuth noted there are many variations in the neighborhood with regard to front entries. Ms. Graybeal mentioned that the narrowest porch entries in the district are 6 feet.

Ms. Graybeal clarified that her recommendation to eliminate the north façade wall at the stairs is because such a wall element is also not typical of the district. Comm. Mitchell stated her concern that there are at least five design elements that are not in compliance with the guidelines. Mr. Shelton acknowledged that their design does have atypical elements but the guidelines also denote new construction must be more contemporary in spirit and needs to distinguish it from the existing houses. He again noted some of their design elements are to mitigate its small stature. There was further discussion regarding the nature of the guidelines. Ms. Stuth noted their intent today was to present their interpretation of feedback from the January meeting and staff. Comm. Eid noted the windows on the south façade need to be addressed. Ms. Stuth noted the window design and placement is reflective of their goal of environmental compatibility. Further discussion ensued surrounding the foundation and window placement. Comm. Eid did not have an issue with the flue as long as it does not have a shiny finish. Mr. Shelton clarified the front rails are to be wood and that the porch support sides are 16 inches wide and 8 inches deep. Further, the north wall will be 8 inches thick. Mr. Shelton noted they would be happy to increase the visible part of the foundation to 8 inches in addition to revisiting the size and location of the small south elevation window. Discussion returned to the foundation and it was noted the visible foundation should match adjacent homes. There was continued discussion surrounding their intent behind the design regarding the foundation. Mr. Shelton noted the crawl space foundation does match adjacent houses it is just not expressed on the exterior.

A discussion then ensued regarding the best way to proceed with the details of the design and consideration of the proposal. Consensus was to visit each point discussed separately.

- Window size and placement
- Lack of exposed foundation
- Narrow size of the entry
- Solid wall on the north side of the porch
- Stairs being recessed behind the wall
- Submitted metal roof being OK, with a patina finish
- Stove pipe finish not shiny, darker, with a patina finish
- The rear design is a contemporary one but staff is OK with it as it is in the rear

Ms. Stuth explained their reasoning behind the more narrow front entry and door placement explaining the exterior symmetry and alignments as well as balancing the flow of the interior design elements. She clarified that they chose the front door location in order to align with the interior stair and for other reasons. Ms. Graybeal stated that design approval cannot be based on preference for interior design- in the historic districts, the exterior design is prioritized. After more discussion two elements were identified as more problematic than the rest which are mostly appropriate: the small low south elevation window which should be revisited or eliminated, and that the finish on the flue should not be a shiny finish. The Applicant agreed to remove the small low window on the south elevation.

Comm. Eid noted that there is a new finding; that the interpretation of these elements helps to support the fact that this is a contemporary structure of its time that distinguishes it from historic structures.

**Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 1403 Armstrong Avenue be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided in the staff report, and the Applicant's presentation with the following conditions/clarifications: 1) the foundation is approved as shown with the shingles going all the way down to within 6 inches of the ground; 2) the front porch entrance at 5 feet wide is approved, considering the small size of both the lot and the house on it; 3) The inward (as opposed to outward) stairway is approved as it is contemporary new construction and it does not need to mimic an historic house; 4) the front porch walls will be a minimum of 8 inches thick as noted by the Applicant; 5) the front porch rails will be made of wood pickets in the center of the wall instead of on the face of the wall [die into the side porch supports]; 6) coming the sidewalk element will connect and align with the front steps of the porch (north side of the house) to the public right-of-way, and the new opening in the stone wall will align with the front porch steps; 7) the small south elevation window will be eliminated; 8) the door and window specifications have been provided to**

**staff, meeting that original condition #6 in the staff report; 9) specifications on the galvalume metal roof have also been submitted to staff but the finish of the roof will require staff approval; 10) the all windows will be wood, and 11) the chimney flue is to have a low-sheen finish.** It was clarified that the north side wall can remain as submitted. **The Motion was seconded by Comm. Swilley.**

Ms. Graybeal noted the findings of the foundation, porch entry width, the resizing of the window and the flue are based on findings other than those proposed by staff. The new findings are that these elements contribute to the contemporary nature of the house to help distinguish it from the historic houses and are found to not detract from the historic character of the district. Comm. Eid noted that the design elements further sets the house apart from the existing homes and enhances the existing fabric. It was further stated in this situation that the narrowness of the lot has somewhat driven the design although the house could have been wider.

**Comm. Matthews called for a vote on the Motion on the floor. The Motion carried with Comm. Mitchell voting no.**

Ms. Graybeal clarified that the elements that require staff approval going forward are the finishes on the flue and metal roof. Any newly south elevation window would also require future approval.

**Result:** Approved with conditions.

412 E. Scott Avenue – Exterior renovations (2-B-18-HZ)

**Discussion:** Ms. Graybeal reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation. She noted some of what will be reviewed today will be “after the fact” elements. She noted there was misunderstanding with regards to the Applicants’ interpretation of the Level 1 COA previously issued and Ms. Graybeal clarified that whenever one removes something or takes it down it loses any grandfathering it may have had. Once something is removed it must be put back as approvable by the guidelines. Staff had approved window replacements with wood windows as well as “replacement” of rotted siding. The Applicant replaced all of the siding on the south side with what was there [6 inch, approved in the 90’s] which does not match the historic dimension of the 4 inch siding on the front. There was no mention of window framing in the COA. The Applicant has found columns that match the original pilasters he wishes to use in place of the existing wrought iron support posts. It was also noted the Applicant is now suggesting a 3-sq.-ft. egress window on the north façade for a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor bedroom (also as a third floor egress in general) in an attempt to keep the existing diamond shaped vent. Ms. Graybeal reviewed the work already completed. A substantial discussion ensued regarding the windows on the house. Mr. Holmes agreed to match a 2-inch casing all the way around the 4-inch frame on all of the windows, matching the existing detail on the north- and west- (front) façade windows. They plan to replace the horizontal rectangular window on the south side (now covered) with a casement window. Re-installing the second window covered up on the south side presents an issue as there is now an internal stairwell behind where it was. Possible mitigating solutions on replacing the window in front of the stairwell were discussed, such as covering the window with solid wall on the inside.

Mr. Holmes stated they were open to however the Commission may suggest an opening on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor in order to obtain the required egress and a discussion on possible options ensued. Ms. Bogus of City Plans Review and Inspections clarified that there have not been any plans submitted for review and that there are ceiling height and other requirements that need to be reviewed. Neighborhood representative James Pierce was present and noted the neighborhood is mostly in agreement with staff recommendations but would like some other conditions. The neighborhood would like to have staff or the Commission review the exact column placement on the front porch. They agree with installation of the rear deck but would like to see the deck floor even with the rear door, and with balusters set into upper and lower rails. The neighborhood agrees with deferring consideration of the north elevation egress window noting they feel that adding a window there would negatively impact the house. Mr. Pierce suggested a dormer or skylight instead, not visible from the street. The neighborhood also defers to staff to work with the Applicant to determine the final south elevation windows placement and size, working out what is most appropriate and balanced, and most likely what was there originally.

**Action:** Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 412 E. Scott Avenue be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided in the staff report and per staff recommendation with the following conditions: 1) Approve new porch balustrade on the condition that a design drawing be submitted for staff approval; 2) Approve porch columns on condition that design be submitted for capitals; 3) Approve new siding (reviewed after-the-fact) based on the original having already been replaced and the new siding matching the existing siding to be retained on the north side; and 4) rear deck floor to be at level of rear door. Regarding the windows, Comm. Eid further moved to approve window replacements with the following conditions, and with the following exceptions, based on the fact that the grandfathered window framing status was lost: 1) Re-construct the two windows on the south side that have been recently covered over, based on earlier Google earth photo with muntin pattern to be approved by staff; 2) Re-construct the south side upper level window closest to front of house (westernmost) to be the same size as, and align with, the window to its east; 3) Install 1/1 wood windows to fit the original openings as indicated by the existing framing on all of the street-level windows on the north side; and 4) Replace the small square double-hung window on the rear of the house toward the north side with square wood casement or stationary window and consider aligning it with the window above.

**Deny without prejudice installation of 1/1 egress window in attic gable on north side allowing the Applicant to resubmit at a later time. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Cotham. The Motion carried unanimously.**

**Result:** Approved with conditions.

#### **Other Business**

- Comm. Matthews asked staff to further explore requiring Applicants to participate in a Pre-Application Review for infill proposals. Ms. Graybeal noted it needs to be codified to be required. Ms. Graybeal will explore with this with the City Law Department.
- Ms. Graybeal asked Commissioners to please RSVP for the March 15, 2018 workshop by March 8<sup>th</sup> if they had not already. Lunch will be served.

**Action:** Comm. Webster moved to adjourn the Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission meeting. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Swilley. The Motion carried unanimously the meeting was adjourned.