

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 18, 2014
MAIN ASSEMBLY ROOM
4:00 P.M.

Board member – Present	Board membership
Chad Boetger	Downtown Resident
Brandon Pace	AIA Representative
Brian Pittman	Downtown Resident
Russ Watkins	Business/Development Representative
Anne Wallace	City of Knoxville
Marleen Davis	Urban Design Professional
Lorie Matthews	Historic Zoning Representative
Mark Heinz	Business/Development Representative
Mike Reynolds	Metropolitan Planning Commission (non- resident)
Board member – Absent	Board membership
Matt Synowicz	CBID Representative
Ex-officio & staff members	Department / Organization
Mark Donaldson	Metropolitan Planning Commission
Crista Cuccaro	City of Knoxville – Law Department
Dave Hill	Metropolitan Planning Commission
Dori Caron	Metropolitan Planning Commission
Rick Emmett	City of Knoxville – Downtown Coordinator
Melvin Wright	City of Knoxville – Plans Review and
Applicants & general public	Affiliation
Timothy Dunnavant	Architect/Applicant Representative
Craig Swaney	Phillips Partnership
John Thurman	McCarty Hilsaple McCarty
Rick Blackburn	Blackburn Development Group
Jon Clark	JHD, LLC
Ron Turner	Brighton Partners, LLC
Jenny Eversole	Downtown Resident / The Elliot
Carolyn Fairbank Biggs	Downtown Resident / The Elliot
Paul Bates	Downtown Resident / The Elliot
Karen Eberle	Downtown Resident / The Glencoe
Bruce Anderson	Downtown Resident / The Glencoe

The meeting was called to order by Chair Chad Boetger. It was established that there was a quorum. Mr. Boetger asked that the Board members and ex-officio members introduce themselves.

Action: A Motion was made by Mark Heinz and seconded by Russ Watkins to approve the March 19, 2014 Minutes. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificates of Appropriateness:

Certificate No. 6-A-14-DT

912 Henley Street – Lord Lindsey Garage (Anthony Cappiello, Jr.)
Pre-development – N/A

Description of Work

Construct a new one-story parking garage with a rooftop patio. The garage is intended to be used solely by those using the Lord Lindsey facility. The entrance will be gated and it is intended to be operated manually by an attendant during events.

Site Plan (SP-1):

The parking garage will have access to Henley Street and the rooftop patio will have at-grade access from the Lord Lindsey property. The garage will be setback from the property line 5'-8". The existing sidewalk is 8 feet wide and there will be low landscaping between the sidewalk and the parking structure. There is a walkway between the Hampton Inn and the parking garage from the public sidewalk to a stair toward the rear of the garage that leads to the rear yard of the Lord Lindsey. The walkway is accessible from the parking garage and will be illuminated by down light wall sconces (see sheet A-5). In addition, an underground pedestrian connection is proposed from the parking garage to the basement of the Lord Lindsey facility. The vehicular entrance to the garage will have a gate that will be operated manually by an attendant during events at the facility (see sheet A-4).

Note: The existing parking lot and the Lord Lindsey property are currently two separate parcels that are intended to be combined. The Lord Lindsey property is not within the D-1 (downtown design) overlay, it is in the H-1 (historic) overlay. Any portion of this proposal on the Lord Lindsey parcel is not subject to review by the Downtown Design Review Board. This mainly includes the underground connection and proposed walkway/landscaping between the garage and the Lord Lindsey facility.

Elevations (A-4 & A-5):

The structure has an art deco design and will be clad with brick, rockcast (precast concrete veneer), and concrete. With the exception of the 'right side elevation', all the exterior walls will be predominantly clad in brick above the finished grade. On the 'right side elevation', the block and concrete above grade and below the handrail pillars are proposed to be painted. On the 'left side elevation', the door opening will have a 6-foot tall metal fence with a 42-inch wide lockable gate.

The large ground floor wall openings will have decorative metal in-fill panels with anodized aluminum frames. The parapet handrails (for the rooftop patio) are anodized aluminum. On the front elevation, on the four pilasters there are concrete slant fins with flags mounted on top.

Patio (A-2):

The patio will be at the same elevation as the Lord Lindsey yard and will be accessible via walkways in the yard. The patio will have a sealed concrete deck, anodized aluminum handrails, and full cutoff light fixtures (see attach spec sheet) on 6-foot tall posts located on the pillars (not on the front elevation).

Sign (A-4):

One sign is proposed above the garage entrance. The letters will be made of anodized aluminum with standoff mounts and 'halo' backlighting.

Staff Comments

The parking garage is proposed on an existing surface parking lot that has access only to Henley Street and will be for the exclusive use of the Lord Lindsey facility. The structures to the south (Mary Boyce Temple House and adjacent one story structure) and east (Lord Lindsey's) are in the locally designated Historic (H-1) Overlay District, but are not listed on the National Register. The historic resources section of the guidelines address development adjacent to properties listed on the National Register, but not those that are solely designated locally historic. This is primarily because properties designated H-1 are not regulated by the Downtown Knoxville Design Guidelines and most H-1 designated property are also on the National Register; however, the criteria for reviewing development adjacent to National Register properties should be considered in this case.

Since this proposal is new construction, many of the guidelines are applicable. Listed below are some of those guidelines, with additional comments from staff shown in italics:

Section 1.A – Public Realm

3a: Create parking garages that do not contain blank walls. Allow for future commercial uses that may not be feasible at the time of construction.

- *The size of this parking garage does not allow for commercial space at sidewalk level; however, the rooftop is proposed to be a patio for the use of the Lord Lindsey facility.*

3b: Locate parking garages under structures, or provide for retail, residential or office uses that line the garage. Corner locations are preferable for commercial uses.

- *See the note for 3a.*

4a: Foster downtown beautification with landscaping and plantings, public art, and public open space.

- *Landscaping is proposed at the base of the structure along the Henley Street sidewalk.*

4c: Plant street trees where possible. Choose tree planting locations that will not significantly alter the setting of, or harm the materials of historic buildings.

- *This site is not conducive to street trees because of the limited sidewalk width and visibility issues.*

Section 1.B – Private Realm

1e: Avoid blank walls along street-facing elevations.

2a: Set buildings back five feet in order to provide wider sidewalk space when new construction in non-historic areas is to be more than half the length of the block.

- *Though the historic structure to the south is not setback from the sidewalk, the garage needs to be setback to allow more space for vehicles to pull out of the Henley Street driving lane while entering the garage and to allow for increased visibility of pedestrians on the sidewalk and vehicles on Henley Street when exiting.*

2b: Consider using landscape elements to define the sidewalk edge where a building is to be set back from the sidewalk.

- *Landscaping will be provided along Henley Street.*

3a: Use complimentary materials and elements, especially next to historic buildings.

Section 2.B.1 – Recommended Signs

1a: Wall signs on sign boards that are above a transom or first story and mounted flush to the building façade.

- *The proposed wall sign is on the sign board, above the garage entrance.*

Staff Recommendation

APPROVE Certificate 6-A-14-DT with the following conditions: 1) Rezoning approval by City Council, 2) Use on Review approval by MPC, and 3) The lighting for the rooftop patio shall direct light away from the adjacent residential properties.

Discussion: It was clarified that when the 2 parcels are combined the property will have 2 overlays as the Lord Lindsay will retain its current H-1 overlay. Project architect Tim Dunnivant noted the staff report was very thorough and precise and had no additional information to add. Mike Reynolds noted staff felt the proposed design and materials were appropriate for the location. Brian Pittman noted he thought it was a great project as well as a good solution for the space. He also noted however that the area has a serious vagrancy problem and requested the Applicant consider putting a gate on the Henley Street side of the space at the sidewalk along their proposed structure going to the rear of the property and the Hampton Inn. Mr. Dunnivant agreed that that would be a great idea and it was generally agreed a 6-foot gate would be ideal. The discussion progressed to the south elevation being painted block and concrete and not bricked as are the other elevations. Mr. Dunnivant noted he was currently unsure of what the final grade will be on that side. He noted they may be able to take the brick back about 8 feet from the front of the building.

It was suggested they take the brick back somewhat further as it would look better from the intersection at Hill Avenue. Mr. Dunnivant noted they would be open to it. After discussion it was clarified that handicapped accessible access will be available and the Applicant described that location and the handicapped route necessary to get to the Lord Lindsay. MPC has heard and approved their Use on Review and have also reviewed the entrance specifics with City Engineering. Marleen Davis stated from

an urban design standpoint the project will certainly be an improvement for the space removing a surface parking lot and enhancing the sidewalk experience. Mr. Dunnavant noted the rooftop level is intended to enlarge the Lord Lindsay outside space as its future use will be as a banquet facility. Ms. Davis suggested the Applicant consider anticipating the need for vertical elements for perhaps erecting tents on the rooftop portion as well as future green elements for drainage. Mr. Dunnavant agreed they will stain the concrete to tone down the light reflectivity on the upper level. There was some discussion surrounding the Art Deco design being appropriate and asked the Applicant to explore some simplifications where possible though it was clarified the Board did not have the authority to mandate overall design specifics. There was general consensus that the flag/banners were somewhat over the top and Mr. Dunnavant noted he would take the Board's comment back to the owner. They add movement and a festive nature but all agreed they added noise to an already noisy spot.

There was no one from the public wanting to address the Board on this project.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Russ Watkins to approve the application based on staff recommendations with the additional consideration of including a pedestrian gate at the north elevation and the use of brick on the south elevation on the first bay. The Applicant clarified that on the south elevation the remaining exposed concrete will be painted to match the brick. **The Motion carried unanimously.**

Certificate No. 6-B-14-DT

118 W Jackson Avenue – John H Daniel Renovation (John Thurman)
Pre-development – N/A

Description of Work

This project is to renovate four buildings that have previously been used as one combined manufacturing facility. The proposed uses include commercial storefronts along Jackson Avenue and residential dwellings.

Typical improvements (all elevations):

All of the existing windows in the buildings are proposed to be replaced. The existing original windows have either been modified or are in poor condition. The new multi-pane windows (typical on the 3-story buildings) will have the same pane configuration as the historic windows and will be made of metal. The new double-hung windows will be multi-pane and will be metal clad, as shown on Sheet A201.

Storefronts, 3-story buildings (Sheets A201, A320 and A322):

Remove the storefront infill and replace with new storefront systems. The four storefront bays to the left will be recessed 9-feet 6-inches from the exterior facade creating an arcade, with no partitioning walls in the recess (see Sheet A320 for enlarged plans). The storefront to the right will have a new steel and translucent glass canopy that will be installed over the storefront and will be illuminated from below (see Sheet A322 for enlarged plans). These storefronts will be aluminum in steel structural framing, with clear glass.

Storefronts, 5-story buildings (Sheets A201 and A321):

Restore the historic wood storefronts by removing the existing window system and wood infill, and install new windows and doors. The doors are proposed to be recessed further than the current configuration. There are existing concrete ramps outside each doorway on the sidewalk, which will be retained or recreated.

East Elevation (Sheet A202):

Remove existing window infill where indicated on the plan, and install new windows and lighting, as shown on the plan.

South Elevation (Sheet A203 and A205):

Remove existing fire escapes, HVAC units, and window infill. Install new windows, doors, and lighting, as shown on the plan. Two doorways that were formally used as access to the fire escapes will have a new

window door system with a painted guardrail. The HVAC units for the residential units will be located on roof.

West Elevation (Sheet A204):

The existing painted sign at the top left corner of the elevation will remain. Demolish portions of the existing masonry wall to create new window openings to match the existing window openings, as shown on the plan. Remove existing clay parapet tiles and replace with metal cap.

Rooftop, 3-story buildings:

Demolish the existing elevator penthouse, which is located toward the rear of the 118 W. Jackson building, and install a new, taller elevator penthouse closer to Jackson Avenue. The old penthouse was only about one story above the roofline and the new penthouse will be about three stories above the roofline. The new penthouse is proposed to be clad in EIFS stucco and it is undetermined if the penthouse will be visible from the sidewalk.

The large, low penthouse above 114 W. Jackson will have the following modifications: remove the existing stucco siding, skylights and windows; install EIFS stucco siding; infill portions of the skylight and window openings with EIFS stucco siding; install new skylights and windows in the new window openings. See sheets A201, A202, A203 and A205.

Rooftop, 5-story buildings:

Remove the rooftop structures, as shown on sheet A203.

Staff Comments

These buildings are split between two National Register Historic Districts and are contributing structures within these districts. The two 5-story buildings (circa 1894 and 1903) are in the Jackson Avenue Historic District Extension, and the two 3-story buildings (circa 1900 and 1925) are in the Southern Terminal and Warehouse District. These buildings have been combined internally for use as one facility by previous owners. As shown on Sheet A201, the renovation is split into two phases. Phase 1 is the shorter 3-story buildings, and phase 2 is the taller 5-story buildings (4-story plus a mezzanine).

The Historic Resources section of the guidelines is applicable to this proposal. Listed below are some of those guidelines, with additional comments from staff shown in italics:

Section 1.C – Historic Resources

1a: Preserve or restore historic roofline features, including parapet walls and cornices.

1b: Design rooftop additions to be complimentary to the historic building in terms of materials and color.

- *The elevator penthouse is clad with EIFS stucco. An existing rooftop penthouse is currently clad in stucco, but is also proposed to be clad in EIFS stucco.*

1d: Do not alter, obscure or destroy significant features of historic resources when constructing additions.

1e: Design rooftop additions so that they are not seen from adjoining streets and sidewalks.

- *It has not been determined if the elevator penthouse will be visible. It is possible that a small portion will be visible from the sidewalk.*

2a: Restore and maintain storefronts as they were originally.

- *The four storefronts on the 3-story building that have been infilled with block are not historic. The fifth storefront to be converted to the main entrance for the residences has a wooden storefront; however, the architect does not believe it is original. This storefront is proposed to be replaced with a new aluminum storefront.*

3a: Establish recessed entries, either rectangular or with slightly canted sides, which are appropriate in storefronts.

- *The storefronts in the 5-story building will be recessed with rectangular sides. In the 3-story building, the entire storefront system is recessed, with the exception of the main entrance to the residential units.*

3b: Allow for multiple entries on the first floor of the building, giving access to commercial space that may be divided into bays.

- *There are seven entrances to the first floor of the building (eight entrances including entrance for the upstairs residential units).*

3c: Provide access to upper stories through additional entries.

- *One of the first floor State Street entrances is for the upper story residential units.*
- 3d: Maintain original height and materials for doors that are consistent with the use of the building, such as residential, commercial, or banking purposes.
- *The scale of the doors in the new storefront systems appear appropriate for the structure. The doors in the historic storefronts will not change in scale. The material of the doors is not noted.*
- 4a: Repair rather than replace historic windows.
- *There are many windows that appear original but most have either been modified or are in poor condition. In order to have a cohesive appearance, the replacement of all the windows may be appropriate.*
- 4b: Replace windows if repairs are not possible with matching windows, including duplicating design, operation, material, glass size, muntin arrangements, profiles, and trim.
- *The replacement windows for the existing original windows duplicate the design.*
- 4c: Insert windows with the same pane configuration, materials and size as other buildings of the same general construction date, if no original windows are present.
- 5a: Repair masonry with stone or brick and mortar that match the original.
- *The masonry will be patched using bricks removed from these buildings to create new window openings.*
- 5b: Do not paint masonry that has never been painted.
- *There is only one wall brick wall proposed to be painted and it has been previously painted.*
- 6a: Do not sandblast, water blast, or use other abrasive or corrosive methods to clean or restore historic structures.
- 8a: Allow awnings in traditional shapes and materials.
- *There is only one canopy proposed, for the main residential entrance. It is not made of traditional shape or materials but the steel and glass design appears appropriate for the historic warehouse district. In addition, similar non-traditional canopies were installed on adjacent structures before the adoption of the Downtown Design Overlay District.*
- 9a: Use indirect lighting of the building façade where appropriate.
- *On the front façade, the lighting fixtures for the three and five-story buildings are different. The lighting is mounted between each storefront bay.*
- 11a: During rehabilitation of historic buildings, restore components to the original or an approximate design.

Staff Recommendation

APPROVE Certificate 6-B-14-DT with the following conditions: 1) Approval by City Engineering for all door and ramp encroachments into the right-of-way, 2) Any future signs for first floor tenants will require approval, and 3) Any improvements to parking areas (with the exception of restriping) must come into compliance with the guidelines.

Discussion: Brian Pittman recused himself.

Mike Reynolds noted this project is split up into 2 phases. The two three-story buildings are phase 1. The 5-story buildings are Phase 2. He noted the double hung windows proposed on the 5-story structure are multi-pane. Project architect John Thurman noted that staff's overview of the project was quite thorough. He reiterated that this will be a 2 phase project from an interior standpoint. They are planning on doing the entire exterior of the project as Phase 1. Part of the apartments and the easternmost buildings will be Phase 1 with the entry and the westernmost, taller building being Phase 2.

He also clarified that they are pursuing historic tax credits for this project. He further noted that several of the elevations, where for example, they have new window cuts and sizes, are preliminary until they discuss the project with Louis Jackson, Historic Preservation Specialist with Tennessee Historical Commission.

Mark Heinz noted that from his experience felt there would most likely be an issue with the existing steel windows in Phase 1 on Jackson Avenue and asked for clarification on those windows. Mr. Thurman noted they are exploring options presently but wanted to keep the thin profile and muntin patterns of the existing windows. He noted they would be responding to comments from the Board as well as the National Park Service. Mr. Heinz stated that since the Applicants are pursuing tax credits the National Park Service is really is a stopgap. Subsequently it is not the purview of this Board to make comments at

this time. Mr. Heinz further stated that should they choose not to pursue the historic tax credits and come back before the board, he would want to see significantly more detail on any proposed windows. There was consensus from the Board on Mr. Heinz's comment regarding more detail on the proposed windows. Concern was expressed about the doors opening onto the sidewalks, affecting recessing or not recessing, and would that be an issue with regards to code. Melvin Wright noted that is unclear where the property line is with regards to the doors and easement will depend on their exact location. Mr. Thurman noted that the property line has relief from the taller westernmost buildings and that they have recessed most of the fronts to keep them off the ROW. He also noted they have had multiple meetings with City Engineering and Plans Review and Inspections discussing access to the buildings as well as with Rick Emmett with regards to sidewalk improvements. One thought was to place planters on the sides of any outswing door to guide pedestrians out away from them.

Brandon Pace also noted his concern of the use of EIFS and that he would recommend changing it to true cementitious stucco. Mr. Thurman noted the EIFS was set off the facade 27 and 29 feet from the front. He noted the timeline for construction is currently slated for sometime in the fall. He also clarified that the pink south elevation sign will be removed and the fading historic sign on the west elevation will be kept. He noted the owner is working with KUB and the City who are all interested in relocating the power underground as part of the Jackson Avenue streetscape improvements. The intent is to bury at least the power in front of the building. Rick Emmett stated the City has hired CDM Smith to do the detail design for the project and that is in progress. He noted most of the survey work is done and there has been a public meeting on this as well. The City is working closely with the owner but the owner is a little ahead of the city. Mr. Emmett asked CDM Smith to develop a "phase within a phase" if you will, to complete their design work for this project's portion of the sidewalk to adjoin the project timeline. He did note the City did not currently have the funding for the project. After briefly consulting with his client, owner John Daniel, Mr. Thurman noted the project would not move forward without obtaining the historic tax credits.

Action: A Motion was made by Mark Heinz and seconded by Lorie Matthews to approve the application per staff recommendation with the condition that the approval is contingent on the Applicant receiving an approved Part 2 application from the National Park Service for this project.

Further Discussion: Mr. Heinz further noted that without an approved Part 2 application the Applicant would need to come back before the Board with more detail on the proposed windows. It was clarified that the parking improvements are not currently part of the project scope but any changes to the parking and/or addition of signs would be projects that would need to come before the Board.

Board Chair Chad Boetger called for a vote. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificate No. 6-C-14-DT

210 W Church Avenue – Residence Inn (Rick Blackburn)
Pre-development – 5/21/2014

Description of Work

The proposal is for a new 8-story hotel with 112 rooms and an attached 3-story parking garage with 112 spaces. The development will be on the half block between Church Avenue, State Street, and Cumberland Avenue. The property is currently vacant.

Site Plan:

The development will fill the entire half block, with the exception of an interior courtyard and the 5-foot front yard setback (as shown on the site plan). The hotel will encroach upon the 5-foot setback to install planters at the base of the State Street and Church Avenue corner of the building, and to create a 'breakfast balcony' along State Street, and for the metal canopies that extend from the façade along Cumberland Avenue. These encroachments are only for the basement and ground level of the hotel and garage.

The main pedestrian entrance to the hotel will be from Church Avenue, and there will be one vehicular parking entrance to the parking garage from Church Avenue and one from State Street. The Church

Avenue parking entrance has a 22-foot wide drive aisle, with two loading spaces and bicycle parking in the courtyard area.

The streetscape improvements include removing the existing curb-cuts around the property and installing new concrete sidewalks to match the existing sidewalks, new street lights to match those on Church Avenue, and street trees.

Hotel Elevations:

All of the windows will have aluminum frames and clear glass. The corner tower will have prefinished metal panels that extend the full height of the structure and square ribbed metal panels starting at level 2. The rest of the upper portion of the building will be a mix of brick, EIFS and decorative metal railings for the balconies.

The exterior of level 1 (ground floor) will be clad in precast concrete block and have composite wood accent trim, brick planters and prefinished metal canopies above the main entrance and parking entrance along Church Avenue. The State Street elevation will also have brick on the basement level. The wall behind the brick planters will have accent tile.

Parking Garage Elevations:

The base of the garage will be clad in brick with the upper portions skinned with panelized composite wood accent screens, 'green' screens that will have live vegetation, and prefinished metal canopies. The stair tower at the corner of State Street and Cumberland Avenue will be concrete.

Signage:

The large blade sign on the Church Avenue elevation will have halo-lit letters and is approximately 50 feet tall by 4.5 feet wide. There are two externally illuminated wall signs, one near the main entrance on Church Avenue and one to the right of the 'breakfast balcony' on State Street. Each wall sign is approximately 6 feet tall by 10 feet wide. The two parking entrances have non-illuminated signs atop the prefinished metal canopies.

Lighting:

On all three street facing elevations, the prefinished metal canopies have recessed can downlight fixtures. On the ground level of the hotel there are up/down wall sconces between the storefront windows. The corner tower will have LED strip lighting to illuminate the underside of the tower for the full height of the tower starting at level 2. The LED strip lighting will be on both Church Avenue and State Street elevations.

Staff Comments

The development is proposed on a vacant lot that encompasses one-half of an entire block, approximately .9 acres. The existing development surrounding the property includes: West – 1 to 3 story buildings facing Gay Street with the uses primarily consisting of retail, restaurants and office; South – 5 story parking structure for the adjoining 27-story First Tennessee Plaza Tower; East – surface parking lot; and North – two 3-story residential condo buildings, The Elliot and Keyhole Building, which are both contributing structures within the Gay Street Commercial (National Register) Historic District.

Since this proposal is new construction, many of the guidelines are applicable. Listed below are some of those guidelines, with additional comments from staff shown in italics:

Section 1.A – Public Realm

1d: Widen sidewalks to accommodate street trees and amenities with a minimum 5-foot clear pedestrian passage.

- *On the State Street sidewalk there is one instance of concern at the 'breakfast balcony' where the building extends to the property line and there is a tree well that constricts the sidewalk. The architect has shifted the street trees to relieve this constriction.*

1g: Consolidate curb-cuts and locate driveways near mid-block, when necessary; alley access should be provided for service and parking, if feasible.

- *There are several curb-cuts along the three street frontages and these will be reduced to two as shown on the plans.*

- 3a: Create parking garages that do not contain blank walls. Allow for future commercial uses that may not be feasible at the time of construction.
- *Being that the garage is being constructed to support with adjacent hotel, this should fulfill the recommendation to allow for commercial uses.*
- 3b: Locate parking garages under structures, or provide for retail, residential or office uses that line the garage. Corner locations are preferable for commercial uses.
- *See the note for 3a.*
- 4a: Foster downtown beautification with landscaping and plantings, public art, and public open space.
- *Landscaping is proposed at the base of the structure on the Church Avenue elevation and wrapping the corner of the building at the State Street intersection. The courtyard will be landscaped which will be visible from the alley and the buildings across the alley. The parking garage will also have 'green' screens that will have live vegetation to provide interest to the façade.*
- 4c: Plant street trees where possible. Choose tree planting locations that will not significantly alter the setting of, or harm the materials of historic buildings.
- *Street trees are shown on the Site Plan; however, the final location, species, number of trees will need to be coordinated with the city's Urban Forester.*

Section 1.B – Private Realm

- 1a: Maintain a pedestrian-scaled environment from block to block.
- *Pedestrian-scale is not explicitly defined but the intent paragraph for this section of the guidelines states that "the use of 'human-scale' design elements is necessary to accomplish (pedestrian-scale). Human-scale design elements are details and shapes that are sized to be proportional to the human body, such as, upper story setbacks, covered entries, and window size and placement". The proposed building does use landscaping, protruding architectural elements, signs and differing exterior materials to define the base, middle and top of the building to respond to this recommendation.*
- 1b: Foster air circulation and sunlight penetration around new buildings. Buildings may be designed with open space, as allowed under existing C-2 zoning; or buildings may be 'stepped back' on upper floors with lower floors meeting the sidewalk edge.
- *The C-2 zoning district does not restrict the height of buildings but does restrict lot coverage depending on the height of the building. This proposal is restricted to 95 percent lot coverage, which it does conform with. The guidelines provide the board the ability to approve a lot coverage above that if the upper floor are 'stepped back', but this is not a requirement.*
- 1c: Use building materials, cornice lines, signs, and awnings of a human scale in order to reduce the mass of buildings as experienced at the street level.
- *See notes for 1a and 1b.*
- 1d: Divide larger buildings into 'modules' that are similar in scale to traditional downtown buildings. Buildings should be designed with a recognizable base, middle, and top on all exposed elevations.
- *The design uses recesses and varying building materials to break the building into 'modules'.*
- 1e: Avoid blank walls along street-facing elevations.
- *This has been accomplished along all the elevations of the hotel and parking garage.*
- 2a: Set buildings back five feet in order to provide wider sidewalk space when new construction in non-historic areas is to be more than half the length of the block.
- *The original concept reviewed by the Downtown Design Review Board at a public workshop did not propose any portion of the building extend into the setback. Members of the board encouraged the development team to utilize some of the setback space to include landscaping at the base of the structure and to consider an outdoor balcony off the lobby/breakfast room along State Street. The State Street sidewalk will be constricted to some degree along the balcony but the minimum 5-foot clear passage will be maintained.*
- 2b: Consider using landscape elements to define the sidewalk edge where a building is to be set back from the sidewalk.
- *Landscaping will be provided along Church Avenue and the corner of the building at the intersection. Landscaping could be added along the parking structure on both State Street and Cumberland Avenue.*
- 3a: Use complimentary materials and elements, especially next to historic buildings.
- *The Gay Street Commercial Historic District does extend down Church Avenue and include The Elliot and Keyhole buildings, which were both primarily constructed as residential structures.*

These buildings have brick exterior with stone and wood accents. The proposed hotel will incorporate brick and precast concrete for the base of the building and window sills.

- 4d: Differentiate the architectural features of ground floors from upper floors with traditional considerations such as show-windows, transoms, friezes, and sign boards.
- *The lobby area will have larger windows a different exterior material than the upper stories.*
- 5b: Orient primary front entrances to the main street; secondary entrances should be clearly defined and oriented to streets or alleys, as appropriate.
- *The primary entrance faces Church Street, which is the main street.*
- 5d: Consider corner entrances at the end of blocks.
- *Because of the slope of the property, locating the entrance at the corner is not easy to accommodate.*
- 5e: All windows at the pedestrian level should be clear.
- *This has been incorporated.*
- 5f: Recess ground floor window frames and doors from the exterior building face to provide depth to the façade.
- *The main entrance is recessed, along with the large lobby windows.*
- 7c: Screen rooftop vents, heating/cooling units and related utilities with parapet walls or other screens. Consider sound-buffering of the units as part of the design.
- 7d: Locate utility connections and service boxes on secondary walls.
- *The 'transformer room' will face Church Street but it is entirely enclosed. The equipment will not be visible.*
- 7e: Reduce the visual impacts of trash storage and service areas by locating them at the rear of a building or off an alley, when possible.
- *The 'dumpster room' is accessed from the alley and will have an overhead door to conceal the dumpster.*

Section 2.B.1 – Recommended Signs

- 1a: Wall signs on sign boards that are above a transom or first story and mounted flush to the building façade.
- *The two proposed wall signs are below what would be considered the sign board. There will be in-ground light fixtures to uplight these wall signs. Since the signs are externally illuminated, the pedestrian experience should not be impacted negatively.*
- 1b: Projecting signs of modest size (9 square feet, maximum); a larger sign must be approved by the board.
- *The sign appears to be scaled appropriately for the structure. The halo-lit letters should keep the light trespass onto other properties to a minimum.*

Staff Recommendation

APPROVE Certificate 6-C-14-DT with the following condition: 1) Coordinate with the City Urban Forester on the final location, soil volume specification and species for the street trees.

Discussion: Mike Reynolds noted the final streetscape design is still in flux, particularly in regard to the street trees. In discussion it was noted the signage is somewhat large, particularly the blade sign proposed for Church Street, but it is halo-lit which should greatly reduce the amount light that shines out. He noted the board can approve signs larger than nine square feet and this is 50 feet tall by 4.5 feet wide. Project architect Craig Swaney noted the rooftop event space is still under consideration but yet ready to bring before the Board. Anne Wallace thanked him for taking the time to come before the Board in a workshop setting allowing members to ask questions and offer input early in the process. Additionally she noted multiple changes to the design subsequent to feedback from the Board at the workshop and felt the project was progressing nicely. Mr. Swaney noted there would be no EIFS used below 12 feet from grade for a better pedestrian experience and further noted it would be used at the recesses and at the very top of the building. He gave an overview of the design features of the building.

Paul Bates, here with individuals (as noted above) from the Elliott and Glencoe, began noting that Mr. Blackburn has already reached out to them for which they are very pleased and further noted he had offered to meet with the HOA. He noted they were seeking assurance with regards to the lighting and noise level, particularly the “transformer room” as they are literally right across the street. He asked for an explanation of halo lights as well. Mr. Swaney noted a transformer room is the termination of the utilities

from the street to the building, noting it may have to be moved to different location in the future as they move forward in the project development. He noted their intent is to keep it within the building. It was noted that modern transformers are much quieter and they would not place a guest room directly over it if it was going to be loud. It was also noted that there are open transformers all over the city that are not enclosed and they have not been an issue. The fire room is where the fire department would come, for example, to shut off an alarm. This is where these types of control panels would be located. He was asked by a resident if they could be switched. He did note that could be explored. It was clarified that the Board does not have purview over the interior of the building. Multiple examples of halo lit signs across the city were noted. It is not a direct light and a silhouette of the letter is what is actually seen. It illuminates the background of the letter. It was pointed out that new signage of the WATE building on Broadway is halo lit and offered as a good example. Mr. Swaney noted the halo lit light was chosen so as not be to glaring and bright. Anne Wallace clarified the dimensional requirements of the C-2 base zoning. Mike Reynolds clarified the Board's purview over signage and noted they can approve a size over 9 square feet, if appropriate. Bruce Anderson noted that an advantage here is that the building has not yet been built. He also noted the project developers had indeed reached out to the neighbors. He also noted his concern over the size of the blade sign and that the overall lighting will be bright. He did not have a problem with the hotel itself. Mr. Anderson stated he would like assurance that the lighting will not be overly bright. He also noted concern that the façade materials would fit into the neighborhood and surrounding buildings. He also noted noise was an overall concern. Mr. Anderson noted the developer has agreed to work with them to provide a high grade of landscaping. There was significant discussion between the neighbors, the developers and board members surrounding the proposed lighting, including its intended size, offering more details and visual examples in the city.

It was clarified that there was additional lighting on the building besides the blade sign as indicated in the work description. Brandon Pace noted his larger concern was the use of EIFS stating he did not feel it was appropriate for use downtown and noted he would want the developers to use true cementitious stucco. It was clarified by Mr. Swaney that the tower would house guest rooms with floor to ceiling glass windows with curtains and that the rooms would have typical hotel room lighting with lamps and shades. The only outdoor space on the tower is at the ground level. The guest room interiors will not be where much light will be generated. He also noted there would be a strip of lights facing the back panel along the one edge of the tower and across the top of it. Mr. Swaney clarified where there would be brick, concrete and EIFS on the exterior facade. Marleen Davis noted she thought from a design standpoint the overall project is well done, however she felt although the use of halo lighting was very clever the blade sign as proposed is too large. Mark Heinz thanked the development team for coming before the board and engaging the neighbors. He feels that this project will be a great asset to the block with good articulation in the design. He also thought the sign gives the building character.

Action: A Motion was made by Mark Heinz and seconded by Anne Wallace to approve the application as submitted per staff recommendation.

Further Discussion: It was clarified the developer would explore the cost of using cementitious stucco versus EIFS as well as review the size of the sign and review their findings with staff. It was clarified that if the developer does make the sign smaller staff could approve it if still appropriate. It was also clarified the Board does have purview over façade materials but the guidelines are not black and white especially with regards to area above the base of the structure.

Mark Heinz stated he did not feel the Board has the purview to mandate the use of cementitious stucco instead of EIFS. He noted the developer has agreed to research the use of stucco.

Board Chair Chad Boetger called for a vote. The Motion carried with Brandon Pace voting no.

Staff Report:

Mike Reynolds reviewed staff reports approved this month.

- 130 W Jackson Avenue (4-A-14-DT) – New hanging sign.
- 722 S Gay Street (5-A-14-DT) – Amendment to CoA 11-A-13-DT, to include the replacement of the glass and frame in the storefront.
- 401 W Summit Hill Drive (5-B-14-DT) – Exterior material changes for the Crowne Plaza.
- 312 S Gay Street (5-C-14-DT) – New window signs.

Other Business:

- Presentation of maintenance plans for Krutch Park. Recommendation/approval is not required.

Rick Emmett noted this is really a maintenance project and briefly reviewed the parameters. He noted maintenance has been an issue at this location and this project is to streamline that work. Submitting this project before the Board also allows the public another way to be aware of what is going on within the City.

- Nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair.

Mike Reynolds noted this is just to get names on the floor. There can be additional persons nominated at the next meeting. He also noted this was the last meeting for Chair Chad Boetger and Mark Synowicz who are both rotating off the Board. Chad was thanked for his hard work on the Board.

Chad Boetger nominated Russ Watkins for Chair.

Mark Heinz nominated Lorie Matthews for Chair.

Brandon Pace nominated Lorie Matthews for Vice-Chair.

Action: A Motion was made by Brandon Pace and seconded by Mark Heinz to adjourn. The Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

Tabled:

1. ***Certificate No. 10-A-13-DT***
531 Henley Street – Project: The Tennessean Hotel
2. ***Certificate No. 11-B-12-DT***
100 S Broadway – Project: 100 S Broadway
3. ***Amendments to the Downtown Design Overlay District, Downtown Knoxville Design Guidelines, and Administrative Rules and Procedures.***
Initiated by the Downtown Design Review Board.