

MINUTES

**KNOX COUNTY HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
KNOXVILLE HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

August 15, 2019

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

Staff/Others Present	Affiliation
N/A	

There was no county business therefore the Knox County Historic Zoning Commission did not convene.

Staff Reports

N/A

Reports to Commission

There was no report to Commission.

KNOX COUNTY CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Other Business

None

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

Staff/Others Present	Affiliation
Gerald Green	Knoxville-Knox County Planning
Amy Brooks	Knoxville-Knox County Planning
Lindsay Crockett	Knoxville- Knox County Planning
Michelle Portier	Knoxville- Knox County Planning
Mike Reynolds	Knoxville- Knox County Planning
Dori Caron	Knoxville- Knox County Planning
Christina Magrans	City Law Department
Lisa Hatfield	City Law Department
Scott Elder	City Plans Review and Building Inspections
DeAnn Bogus	City Plans Review and Building Inspections
Peter Ahrens	City Plans Review and Building Inspections
Arin Streeter	Fourth & Gill Neighborhood Representative
Travis Watson	Owner/Applicant
Logan Higgins	Logan Higgins, Aplos Home
George Ewart	George Armour Ewart Architect
Jim Klonaris	Owner/Applicant

Knoxville Historic Zoning Comm. Chair Bart Carey called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. Roll call was taken and it was noted there was a city quorum. Comm. Carey 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

Action: Comm. Matthews moved to approve the July 18, 2019 Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission Minutes. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Swilley. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Approved.

Chair Bart Carey began by stating that Staff received a request from Applicant Jim Klonaris to move Agenda Item #3, 707 Luttrell Street, to be moved to the end of the Agenda due to a scheduling conflict. The Applicant will be in the building attending another meeting, and would like to be present for his application for review. If there are no objections to the request, a motion is entertained.

Action: Comm. Matthews moved to modify the Agenda, moving Agenda Item #2, 707 Luttrell Street to be heard at the end of the Agenda per Applicant’s request. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Blackburn. The Motion carried unanimously.

Staff Reports

Lindsay Crockett reported the Level 1 Certificates approved since the last meeting.

Reports to Commission

There were no reports to Commission.

KNOXVILLE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Fourth & Gill H-1

810 Deery St. / Parcel ID 94 D E 012 – Porch repair; installation of doors on rear elevations (8-

D-19-HZ)

Discussion: Lindsay Crockett reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation of approval.

Travis Watson, 810 Deery Street, was present to discuss the application for review. Mr. Watson came before Commission in June requesting approval of windows in the rear side of the house. Due to a recent opening in the contractor's schedule, the Watsons were able to secure a contractor for additional projects which are the requested items before the Commission today. He specified that the front porch is a high priority due to significant deterioration. Lastly, he mentioned that Smart Homes Fixes is the subcontractor for the proposed projects.

Arin Streeter, 925 Eleanor Street, Fourth & Gill Neighborhood Representative was present to discuss the application for review. Mr. Streeter explained that the neighborhood is in support of the proposed project since the work will take place in the back of the house and is not visible from the street.

Action: Comm. Blackburn moved that the application submitted for 810 Deery Street be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided, and per staff recommendation. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Approved.

Fourth & Gill H-1

610 Caswell Ave. / Parcel ID 81 M N 003 - Rear addition; construction of rear porch (8-N-19-HZ)

Discussion: Lindsay Crockett reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation of approval.

Logan Higgins, 200 W. Jackson Avenue, #408, was present to discuss the application for review. Mr. Higgins stated that they wanted to be as subtle as possible in the design while also ensuring that one can differentiate between the original building and the addition as stated in the guidelines. Mr. Higgins explained that they were trying to respond to the needs of the homeowner, while also addressing and improving the conditions of the house, which in this case is the condition of the sagging hip roof. In regards to the window addressed in the Staff Recommendation; the applicant is ok with installing a window that is similar to what is proposed on the design. However, they would prefer not to for 2 reasons: 1) If you look at the original house, there is not a window in that particular location and 2) the addition is a bathroom vanity in a closet and he feels that neither of those uses are friendly to windows. Lastly, Mr. Higgins explained that he has not been able to find any historical evidence that there may have been windows in the back of the house.

Arin Streeter, 925 Eleanor Street, Fourth & Gill Neighborhood Representative, was present to discuss the application. The Neighborhood feels that the proposed addition on this house adequately respects the massing of the original house, and is compatible with the original configuration. They do agree with staff recommendation that a window in the addition will help. Lastly, the Neighborhood expressed concerns about the porch sitting a bit high being that it's above the existing eave at the back of house.

Comm. Eid explained that he would be more concerned about the window if it wasn't in the back of the house and/or was highly visible. Further discussion ensued amongst Commissioners about the visibility of the proposed work in the back of the house.

Mr. Higgins wanted to clarify for the record, that in the "Description of work" section in the staff report, it states that "one fixed, rectangular, single-light, wood window to be installed on rear elevation of addition." Mr. Higgins stated that the owner would like the horizontal window to be a casement window instead of fixed so that it's operable.

Comm. Eid said that he is in agreeance with the conditions in the staff recommendation, with the removal of condition #2, requiring a window to be installed on the right side of the addition's rear elevation. Comm. Matthews was also in agreeance since the rear of the house has limited to no visibility from the street or alley way.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 610 Caswell Avenue be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided, and per staff recommendation, removing condition #2, and with the clarification that in the "Description of work" portion of the Staff Report be corrected to "One rectangular, single-light, wood casement window be installed on the rear elevation of the addition." The Motion was seconded by Comm. Swilley. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Approved.

Ft. Sanders NC-1

1614 Forest Ave. / Parcel ID 94 N E 013 – Demolition of rear section and rear addition (8-C-19-HZ)

Discussion: Lindsay Crockett reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation of approval.

Comm. Matthews inquired if staff has heard from anyone in the Neighborhood in regards to this project. Historic Preservation Planner, Lindsay Crockett, answered by saying that no one has reached out to her expressing concern about the proposed project.

Comm. Eid requested some clarification from staff. Comm. Eid noted that there are no elevation drawings provided with this submission. Therefore, the proposed demolition and 16-foot rear addition will be built based on the plans approved in April 2019. In the existing floor plan, there is one window in the dining room and one in bedroom 2. In the proposed plan, the windows have been removed resulting in a long wall with no windows. Comm. Eid recommended that at least two windows be installed in each of the bathrooms assuming that it's acceptable from a Codes standpoint in regards to fire separation.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application for 1614 Forest Avenue be approved for the demolition of a 19-ft portion and reconstruction in kind with the same height, same look, and same roofline as what was existing, and in lieu of one window on the right side, which was in bedroom number 2, now have two windows of matching sizes which will be known as bathroom 1 and bathroom 2.

Peter Ahrens stated that if the walls are less than five feet from the property line, installing an opening would not be allowed based on fire separation. Mr. Ahrens explained that even though there used to be windows there, once the structure is demolished, it's no longer grandfathered in.

Comm. Eid amended his motion to remove the addition of the windows.

Comm. Blackburn asked why there is such a drastic difference in the previously proposed plan versus the one before them today, and why the house was partially demolished. Peter Ahrens answered by saying that City Plans Review and Inspections have been working closely with the applicant to provide detailed and quality drawings. The City has also modified their processes. In the past, applicants could request an over-the-counter maintenance, repair, or demolition permit. Now, when applicants exceed the scope of work they've been approved for, City Codes immediately inspects the property to try and catch these violations early instead of after-the-fact. As a result, this project is currently under a "Stop Work Order."

Christina Magrans, City Attorney, reminded the Commission that they have the option to postpone the application until further information has been provided by the applicant.

Peter Ahrens, corrected his statement earlier about the exact distance needed from the property line to install an opening. Windows cannot be installed if they are less than 3 feet away from the property based on fire separation. Comm. Eid pointed out that the site plan shows that the windows are 2.98 feet from the property line.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application for 1614 Forest Avenue be approved for the demolition of a 19-ft portion and reconstruction in kind with the same height, same look, and same roofline as what was existing, and in lieu of one window on the right side (which was in bedroom number 2), the applicant install two windows of matching sizes in the spaces to be known as bathroom 1 and bathroom 2. Also, the portion of the wall which is currently being shown as 2.98 feet away from the property line, be reconstructed at minimum of 3 feet away from the property line. This will allow for the installation of the two windows to be the same size as the existing windows that were removed on that wall, with one window being installed in each of the bathrooms. The motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Approved.

Ft. Sanders NC-1

1616 Forest Ave. / Parcel ID 94 N E 012 – Demolition of rear section and rear addition (8-J-19-HZ)

Discussion: Lindsay Crockett reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation of approval.

Comm. Matthews inquired if staff received an original floor plan with the application. Lindsay explained that she was not provided with an original floor plan for this house, but it is very similar to the documents submitted for 1614 Forest Avenue.

Comm. Eid asked if the existing wall of the demolished portion had a window or if there is documentation of one? Comm. Eid pointed out that the site plan shows the existing wall being right on the property line, at .1 ft. away from the property line. Staff projected Google Street View of the house, which does show windows on the right side of the house. Based on the images projected on the screen, it does appear that there is a window on the section being demolished.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application for 1616 Forest Avenue be approved subject to the following conditions: 1) the new wall of the new portion of the house that will be added, for the portion of the bathrooms be a minimum of 3 ft away from the property line, and a window of the same size being demolished be provided in each of the bathrooms, #1 and bathroom #2, and 2) the new additions being duplicate in size, portion, and material as the portion being demolished. 3) lastly, with the understanding that the roof line will be different, and the new roof being a gable or hip roof. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Blackburn.

Chair Bart Carey, wanted to ensure that he understood the motion. Chair Carey asked if the current site plan needs to be revised in order to show the change in distance from the property line proposed by Comm. Eid. Chair Carey noted that the current plan shows .9 ft, so the applicant would lose a couple of feet of width.

Comm. Eid explained that if it's the will of Commission to postpone the item until next month, he is comfortable in doing so. Chair Carey noted that with the applicant not being present, if they are not happy with the decision made at the meeting, they would be expected to reapply and produce more sufficient information describing what he wants to do with the addition. Lindsay reminded the

Commission that they already approved this 16-foot addition. Further discussion ensued amongst Commissioners about the proposed motion and the modification needed to the site plan to make the demolition and rear addition feasible.

Christina Magrans briefly requested that the Motion include the applicant to come back either before Commission or file a new application if the work being done is substantial. If the work is not extensive, Ms. Magrans suggested we request the applicant provide a detailed site plan and elevations for administrative approval. Comm. Eid requested that this language be added to his motion.

Chair Carey expressed additional concerns with the footprint of the house, the reduction of offsets on either side of the house, and whether or not the applicant would be required to come back based on the conditions proposed for approval.

Action: Comm. Eid amended his Motion and moved that the application for 1616 Forest Avenue be denied without prejudice to allow the applicant to resubmit an application where the floor plan and site plan match and to address the concerns addressed in this meeting. The motion was seconded by Comm. Blackburn. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Denied without prejudice.

Market Square H-1

31 Market Square / Parcel ID 94 L F 004 – Exterior modifications and signage (8-K-19-HZ)

Discussion: Lindsay Crockett reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation of approval.

George Ewart, George Armour Ewart Architect, 404 Bearden Park Circle, was present to discuss the application for review. Mr. Ewart stated he spoke with staff early on in the project and is in agreement with staff recommendation, and adjusting the size of the logo and lettering on the awning to meet the Sign Guidelines for a sign board. Mr. Ewart clarified that the proposed sign will remain on the top of the awning, but the lettering will be reduced and the TVA sign will be modified to 18 inches instead of 21 inches.

Mike Reynolds, Knoxville-Knox County Planning Staff, explained that when staff reviewed the project, they took into consideration that this building doesn't have a good area for a true sign board, so instead of putting the sign in the sign board area, we suggested taking the exact sign area and placing it on the valance with the understanding that they would not come back with a wall-mounted sign in the future.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application for 31 Market Square be approved based on the evidence submitted, the information provided, and per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Comm. Matthews. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Approved.

Fourth & Gill H-1

707 Luttrell St. / Parcel ID 94 D E 008 – Rear addition; construction of rear porch (8-M-19-HZ)

Discussion: Lindsay Crockett reviewed the staff report and staff recommendation of approval.

Logan Higgins, 200 W. Jackson Avenue, #408, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Higgins stated that the applicant is in agreement with staff recommendation. Mr. Higgins added that the applicant is requesting windows to the wall, and having more contributing elements such as the proposed v-shaped columns.

Arin Streeter, 925 Eleanor Street, Fourth & Gill Neighborhood Representative, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Streeter stated that this is a complicated proposal, and the neighborhood doesn't agree with it entirely. The neighborhood agrees that it's necessary to be able to differentiate from the original house and the addition, but feel that the design could be more subtle in regards to mass, materials, size, texture, scale, relationship of solids and voids, and color. Mr. Streeter explained that the addition has more components of modern architecture than historically compatible. The main concerns expressed from the neighborhood are: 1) from the visible direction of 3rd Avenue, the addition positions itself as windowless wall with a flat roof and neither of those elements are compatible with the materials, size, texture and relationship of solids to voids. 2) The proposed flat roof interrupts the existing roof form putting itself in a higher plane which can be interpreted as not being sufficiently subservient to historic architecture. 3) The roof plan does not show if the connecting hyphen is recessed, but does display that there's a difference in material which is more of a color issue which HZC does not regulate. 4) The sliding doors on the rear of the house overwhelm the corner of the pantry off of the kitchen, the corner boards are character-defining features, and it's important to denote where the original outlines of the house are. Mr. Streeter voiced that no one in the neighborhood disagreed with the work, but they do want the Commission to take into consideration their concerns.

Jim Klonaris, 719 Luttrell Street, owner of the property was also present to discuss the application. Mr. Klonaris stated that has been a homeowner in Fourth & Gill for over 11 years and is very proud to have an active neighborhood organization. However, he explained that he was not invited to take part in the neighborhood discussion or made aware of any concerns regarding the proposed rear addition. Mr. Klonaris shared that he met with adjoining neighbors and other homes within close proximity to discuss plans and encouraged feedback. He also mentioned that some neighbors provided written feedback expressing favor of the design including the flat roof in the contemporary nature as it stands.

Logan Higgins, 200 W. Jackson Avenue, #408, began by stating that everything about the design is intentional. Mr. Higgins described the design process and their efforts in finding the best approach to building a modern addition on a historic house. Mr. Higgins took into consideration the Design Guidelines and Secretary of Interior Standards in the design of this addition. The design team felt that a gable or hip roof would not interrupt the existing roof, and the flat roof would be most appropriate in terms of differentiating the new addition from the current house. The connecting hyphen is most important; however, they would be open to adjusting it as the Commission recommends. Mr. Higgins emphasized that there is very little to no visibility from street view. He explained that this design differentiates the original from the addition while being minimally impactful to the current historical features of the home.

Lindsay inquired if the applicant would be willing to keep and incorporate the corner board that the Neighborhood Representative expressed concern over. Mr. Klonaris clarified that he is not getting rid of the corner board but rather shrinking the clapboard by a foot. He emphasized that it is not feasible and integral to the design.

Comm. Eid inquired about the design of the roof and how the applicant plans to handle water drainage. Comm. Eid said that since the soffit line of the existing house is forward by 2 ft. from the eave of the new flat roof line, is there potential for that roof to be dropped at the vertical hyphen 1 ft. to 1.5 ft. vertically which will respect the eave line at that location and not detracting from it. Mr. Higgins was receptive to the suggestion and in agreement with Comm. Eid's recommendation.

Action: Comm. Eid moved that the application submitted for 707 Luttrell Street be approved per staff recommendation, modifying condition #2 to say "Add windows to the southeast elevation of the addition: either double-hung sash windows or small rectangular casement windows to the aligned with the existing double-hung sash window." Also, emphasizing that the windows do not have to be reused historic windows and leave that to the owners discretion, and once the applicant has resubmitted the design plans, they can be approved administratively by staff; removing condition #3 to allow the v-columns supports, and lastly, the portion of the roof immediately at the

hyphen shall be dropped in height by a foot plus or minus, as to allow the existing soffit line at the back end of the house and the gutter line to be continued and not affected by the addition. The motion was seconded by Comm. Swilley. The Motion carried unanimously.

Result: Approved.

Action: Comm. Matthews moved to adjourn the Knoxville Historic Zoning Commission meeting at 10:19 A.M. The Motion was seconded by Comm. Cotham. The Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.