

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2013
SMALL ASSEMBLY ROOM
4:00 P.M.

<i>Bob Alcorn</i>	Architect, Resident Representative
<i>Mark Heinz</i>	Downtown Property Owner
<i>Kim Henry</i>	APA Representative
<i>Lorie Matthews</i>	Historic Zoning Commission
<i>Joe Petre</i>	Business Representative
<i>Matt Synowicz</i>	CBID Representative
<i>Anne Wallace</i>	City of Knoxville
Rick Emmett	City of Knoxville
Jeff Galyon	PBA
Brady Greene	Conversion Properties
Nathan Honeycutt	McCarthy Holsaple McCarthy Architects
Camden Turner	Benchmark Development, LLC
Craig Belitz	Benchmark Development, LLC
Mike Reynolds	MPC
Dori Caron	MPC

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kim Henry. It was established that there was a quorum. Board members were asked to introduce themselves. Attendees who wished to speak were asked to sign in. Board members present are shown in italics. Rick Emmett, City of Knoxville, was recognized.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Matt Synowicz to approve the February 20, 2013 Minutes. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificates of Appropriateness:

Certificate No. 10-H-11-DT

710 Walnut St. – 710 and 712 Walnut Street (Total Demolition Services, Inc.)
Pre-development – 10/18/2011

Description of Work

Demolition of 710 and 712 Walnut Street and removal of all structures, foundations and footings.

Add new landscaping, fencing and pedestrian gateway as shown in the attached plans. There will be a courtyard that is accessible by the public.

Staff Comments

These two buildings are not in a National Register Historic District or individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places, so Section 1.B.8 (page 19) of the Downtown Knoxville Design Guidelines would apply. The Downtown Knoxville Design Guidelines state that “The demolition of buildings... may be appropriate when in compliance with the guidelines”. It also states, “If a building is demolished, all visible unutilized building material must be removed and the site must be vegetated or otherwise brought into compliance with the guidelines”.

Minutes - Downtown Design Review Board
March 20, 2013

Staff Recommendation

APPROVE Certificate 10-H-11-DT as submitted.

Discussion: The Applicant has asked for a 30 day postponement due to a Board member being ill and the inability to convene in a timely manner.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Lorie Matthews to postpone this application until the April meeting. The Motion carried with Joe Petre opposing.

Certificate No. 3-A-13-DT

130 S. Central St, 200 S Gay St, and 420 Union Ave – Trash and Recycling Screening (City of Knoxville)
Pre-development – N/A

Description of Work

Install louvered panels to enclose trash and recycling collection sites in three locations on the public right-of-way. The louvered panels are 4 feet tall and the same as those installed at the State Street garage collection site installed last year. The panels will be bolted to the road or sidewalk. There will not be any other site preparation required. See the attached panel detail and images.

130 South Central Street location: Trash and recycling bins are currently located in a parallel parking stall along Central Street in the Old City, adjacent to a surface parking lot and near the Central Street and Willow Avenue intersection. The louvered panels will enclose the entire parking space.

200 South Gay Street location: Trash and recycling bins are currently located in a commercial loading zone in the 200 block, near the intersection of Gay Street and Vine Avenue. The louvered panel enclosure will be 9 feet deep by 24 feet long, as shown on the attachments.

420 Union Avenue location: Trash and recycling bins are currently located on the sidewalk along a fence, adjacent to a recessed parking lot. The fence and right-of-way step back 5 feet where the trash is located (see attachments). The louvered panels will be located on the two sides that are not currently fenced

Staff Comments

The City provides trash and recycling collection in the Central Business District and establishes sites for the storage of trash and recycling bins. In some areas of downtown it is not convenient and/or feasible to have the collection areas off a road or sidewalk. The collection sites need to be close to businesses and accessible to trash collectors. In order to make these accommodations some collection sites are in highly visible locations, which is why the city is interested in providing screening. The collection sites are located so as to not require site preparation and the louvered panels will be anchored with screws to the asphalt/concrete. If the collection site is moved or not required in the future, the panels can be removed leaving the site unaltered from its original use. Two of the proposed locations are in on-street parking or commercial loading stalls. These locations are in prominent locations where parking and commercial loading is limited. Alternative locations on side streets or other publicly owned land should be considered.

Staff Recommendation

RECOMMEND Certificate 3-A-13-DT as submitted for the screening of the three trash and recycling collection sites using the louvered panels. In addition, the City should create a comprehensive trash and recycling collection strategy that eventually moves the collection sites off the roadways and sidewalks.

Discussion: Rick Emmett, Downtown Coordinator for the City of Knoxville, noted these garbage cans have been out there for a while. He further noted pursuant to the Staff Recommendation, that the City has been working towards centralized garbage collection areas. Mr. Emmett noted he meets with each property owner's group downtown to try and determine places to put the cans if the City does not have property itself to do so. The existing screens have worked well. The City had sought alternative options via bid but did not have any responses so they pursued additional screening with the original vendor that installed the screens at the State Street Garage. He noted there would be openings to access the collection areas but they would not have an actual gate(s). He clarified that the height of the screen wall could be adjusted to most practically allow access to those using them for garbage as well as screening the cans, and could explore where best to attach them, on the street or sidewalk. He noted he would address that at each proposed site. Mr. Emmett noted that the City does have a comprehensive plan as noted in the Staff Recommendation but what they can do comes down to budget.

Action: A Motion was made by Matt Synowicz and seconded by Bob Alcorn to approve the Staff Recommendation to recommend the Application as submitted. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificate No. 3-B-13-DT

207 W Church St – The Elliott (Benchmark Development, LLC)

Pre-development – N/A

Description of Work

This proposal will revise the following Certificate of Appropriateness: 2-A-13-DT, 3-B-09-DT and 8-D-08- DT.

Main level (sheet 2.2): Install hand railings for both main level entry stairs on the sides and the middle. The side hand railings have already been installed (see attached images).

Basement level, facing Church/State sidewalks (sheet 2.1): In the right bay (nearest to the intersection), replace the basement doorway with a window (Note: the doorway has already been replaced with a window and the sill is made of brick which does not match the marble sills on the rest of the building). In the middle bay, replace the basement doorway with a window and fill the window well to the sidewalk level. Remove the two double hung windows and fill all three window openings with glass block. In the left bay, replace the left most double hung window with a transom window and fill the window well to the sidewalk level. Add a decorative guard rail to the existing middle window well. On the State Street elevation, replace three existing windows with glass block. The two windows near the middle of the façade are in a bathrooms, the other is adjacent to the rear of the building and is a mechanical room.

Basement level, facing path/courtyard (sheet 2.1): Fill windows and window wells as noted on plan. Replace windows with glass block as noted on plan.

Staff Comments

This building is in the National Register Gay Street Commercial Historic District, which means the Historic Resources section of the guidelines applies. Section 1.C.4b,c (page 26) state, "Replace windows if repairs are not possible with matching windows, including duplicating design, operation, material, glass size, muntin arrangements, profiles, and trim" and "In windows with the same pane configuration, materials and size as other buildings of the same general construction date, if no original windows are present". The windows in the building have been replaced with one-over-one double hung windows, which are similar to the configuration in the same general construction date.

Glass block is proposed in basement windows on both street facing elevations. Glass block was not typical residential application for windows in the era of this building so it should not be used. The glass block is

proposed in these locations for security and to limit visibility into a common storage room, bathroom and a mechanical room.

The historic window sills are made of pink marble and it is difficult to find matching materials. Sills on brick buildings of this era were typically brick or stone. When matching the stone is not possible, cast concrete that matches the design and dimensions of the stone is an appropriate alternative.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVE Certificate 3-B-13-DT as submitted with the following conditions: 1) All replacement windows shall be double hung windows that match the existing windows in the building, with the exception of the one proposed transom window. Security bars that match the existing on basement windows are appropriate for all basement windows, and opaque window glass is acceptable for the storage, bathroom and mechanical rooms that were proposed with glass block, 2) Replacement window sills shall be made of stone or cast concrete that matches the dimensions of the original sills, including the previously installed brick sill, 3) In the former door location in middle bay, replace missing brick around the window to match existing construction and install a new stone band above the window to match existing, and 4) Install metal hand railings to meet the requirements of the building and fire codes that match those that were previously installed.

Discussion: Mike Reynolds noted there had been modifications to the application since the Agenda was posted and recommended we proceed through submitted materials to review and clarify the proposed scope of work. He noted one change was the cast concrete window sill which the Applicant used to replace the previously installed brick sill (as described in the Description of Work). Also, the side street elevation shows previously approved window bars and the recommendation notes that on basement windows, security bars that match the existing ones are appropriate for all basement windows. He noted, also on the side street elevation, the recently installed glass block windows (not approved), is where the staff recommendation is to have double hung windows. Mr. Reynolds noted the front elevation middle bay facing Church Street is where staff recommends also using double hung windows and not the requested glass block. As opposed to the security bars, the Applicant is requesting approval to use a wired glass. On the rear elevation, he pointed out the previously approved and installed glass block windows which are not in conflict with the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation. Also on the side street elevation, Mr. Reynolds described the vent for the mechanical room, where the Applicant had originally asked for a glass block window, however, is now seeking approval for a white metal vent that fills the majority of the window opening (necessary to meet code). Further, to the left of the vent, the Applicant is requesting approval for a glass block window as well, where a double hung window was originally proposed. He noted that the request for glass block is because the main water line for the building “snakes” behind this opening. Camden Turner, Benchmark Development, LLC state they could also fill in the window opening with brick to match the rest of the building. Moving on to the stairs noted on the front elevation, the railings has been installed prior to approval in 2009, Mr. Reynolds noted the previous approval had the railing coming down the center. It did not necessarily approve side railings but in discussions with the fire marshal and building codes staff, side railings are preferred and he further noted that they suggested the hand rail wrap around to the front door as there is no real landing on this stoop. Mr. Reynolds noted that due to shifting, there will need to be repair done to the stairs with stone most closely matching what is currently there. Lastly, he noted the window well fencing installed prior to approval on the front elevation. Mr. Turner noted they had replicated what was there with wrought iron.

In review of the staff recommendation: Mr. Reynolds noted the general plan is to replace the door to the basement in the middle bay on the Church Street elevation with a window, filling in the window well to sidewalk level, and are proposing to install glass block or a double hung windows with security (wired) glass. The window with the new concrete sill, which was formally a door, was also not approved in the original Certificate of Appropriateness and needs to be part of this approval, and staff does not see an issue with this remaining a window. Further, staff recommendation is for all windows to be installed be double hung windows. For the middle bay in the front elevation, Mr. Reynolds noted staff supports an opaque glass and/or the security glass. Staff recommendation supports following the recommendation of the fire marshal/building codes office with regards to the handrail and further noted the Historic Preservation staff would support that as well. It was clarified that the Applicant feels the door in the middle bay that they want to convert to a window, was in fact, originally a window. Mr. Reynolds staff recommendation is to allow the door to become a window, for the stairs to be filled to sidewalk level and to install a sill of cast concrete or stone. Continuing, just above the middle bay opening, staff is recommending the Applicant replace the stone band using formed concrete, and to fill in the brick above the stone band. Mr. Turner noted they cannot find pink marble to match what is currently on the building.

The Applicant noted that this project involved two buildings with a shared private alley and will have 13 units. He noted they really wanted to stay away from metal bars on the basement windows because they can detract from the look of the building. He noted the glass block on the side street elevation has a bathroom behind it. The security bars on this side were unavoidable as there is residential space behind them. He noted they would like to keep the glass block where it is currently installed. Mr. Turner felt that glass block were originally used in cellars and felt this was their exact intention with their use here, and such would meet the Standards for Rehabilitation. He noted that is what they are trying to accomplish on the front elevation with use of glass block in the window openings in the storage areas (middle bay on Church Street elevation). Mr. Reynolds clarified that if wired glass was used it would be in the double hung windows. It was further clarified that use of the wired glass was presented as an option after the staff recommendation was released in the Agenda package.

Noting further requested clarification, Mr. Reynolds stated there had been three previous approvals for the building; 2008, 2009 and last month. The 2008 approval was a staff approval and was for taking everything on the building to its original look, basically fixing what was there. The 2009 after the fact approval included changing the front porches by replacing rotted out columns and adding exterior lights. Last month's approval involved the left main entryway on the Church Street elevation. It was noted glass block was not typically used in buildings of this type in this period.

Ms. Henry clarified with Mr. Turner that he was in Agreement with staff recommendations with the exception of the use of the double hung windows. Mr. Turner further clarified that they basically want to 1) keep the glass block where it has been installed prior to approval and 2) use it where they have requested approval for additional installation of them.

It was clarified that the Applicant is requesting glass block on all three windows of just the middle bay on the Church Street elevation for security and light in the common storage area. It was further clarified that the windows on the two outer bays are standard double hung windows, with the exception of one transom window.

Craig Belitz, Benchmark Development, LLC, spoke with regards to the glass block windows and stated they have just tried to offer light as well as privacy and security. On the State Street elevation it was further clarified they were looking for approval (after the fact) for the two glass block windows as they are bathrooms. Discussion ensued with regards to maintaining a consistent look across the building's facades.

Ms. Henry reviewed the staff recommendation which includes four conditions for approval; it was also noted again that there has been changes to the application since the recommendation was released. Subsequently Mr. Reynolds reviewed what needs to be addressed: The metal vent that was installed in the mechanical room, the next window opening down which is located in front of the water line (using brick or glass block), and whether or not allow glass block or move to approve double hung windows. Consensus was to split the Motions by street elevation:

Action: A Motion was made by Bob Alcorn, with respect to the State Street elevation, to approve the for the metal vent as installed (basement window closest to alley), glass block in the next window (second basement window from the alley) as well as the two bathroom windows and that the remaining windows be left as they are with the previously approved double hung (or casement) windows and security bars. The Motion was seconded by Matt Synowicz. The Motion carried unanimously.

Clarification ensued regarding the front façade. Mr. Reynolds noted the approval involves, starting from the front right (Unit 103) the following: the middle window, that was originally a door, involves the installed window with cast concrete sill; in the middle bay, fill the window well to the sidewalk level and to install glass block in all three windows; and in the bay to the far left, fill in the window well of the furthest left window and install a transom window (currently a double hung window with a window well) and a railing around the middle window well; and also the wrap around hand rails on the right entranceway. Discussion ensued about possible glass options for double hung windows that would offer security without the wire.

Action: A Motion was made by Mark Heinz, with respect to the Church Street elevation, to approve per staff recommendation with the following clarifications: double hung windows in the middle bay basement windows and to replace the water table sill with concrete in lieu of marble, to allow the Applicant to work with the fire marshal going forward on the handrails, to have no security bars on the front façade windows, and to allow installation of the transom window to the far left corner using clear glass. The Motion was seconded by Bob Alcorn. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificate No. 3-C-13-DT

510 S Gay St – Regal Sign Relocation (City of Knoxville)

Pre-development – N/A

Description of Work

Relocate the Regal Riviera Cinema sign from the roof structure that was removed over the escalators. The sign will be wall mounted on the north elevation of the cinema (above the new pedestrian bridge), as shown on the attached plan.

Staff Recommendation

RECOMMEND Certificate 3-C-13-DT as submitted for the relocation of the Regal sign to the north elevation of the cinema.

Discussion: Nathan Honeycutt, McCarthy Holsaple McCarthy Architects, noted that the two lower canopies over the escalator are being removed as part of the pedestrian bridge and that Regal had asked for the existing sign be relocated to the side of the buildings in order to maintain a visual presence for that area. There is already existing lighting on that side of the building that will provide power for the sign. Mr. Honeycutt noted they will simply be extending the conduit and flush mounting the sign to the side of the building. The sign will be internally illuminated. Some discussion ensued surrounding other potential

options for relocation. Jeff Galyon, PBA stated they had explored other options, however, this location was specifically requested by Regal.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Mark Heinz to approve Staff Recommendation to approve the application as submitted. The Motion carried unanimously.

Staff Report: There were no Staff Reports.

Other Business: There was no further business.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Mark Heinz to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned.