

MINUTES
KNOXVILLE DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2015
SMALL ASSEMBLY ROOM
4:00 PM

Board member – Present	Board membership
Brian Pittman	Downtown Resident Representative
Chad Boetger	CBID Representative
Lorie Matthews	Historic Zoning Representative
Mark Heinz	Business Development Representative
Brandon Pace	AIA Representative
Anne Wallace	City of Knoxville Representative
Kristina Wright	Downtown Resident Representative
Mike Reynolds	MPC (non-voting)
Marleen Davis	Urban Design Representative
Board member – Absent	Board membership – Absent
Russ Watkins (Excused)	Business Development Representative
Ex-officio & staff members	Department / Organization
Crista Cuccaro	City of Knoxville – Law Department
Dori Caron	Metropolitan Planning Commission
Melvin Wright	City of Knoxville – Plans Review
Rick Emmett	City of Knoxville – Downtown Coordinator
Applicants & general	Affiliation
Robert Lundin	George Ewart, Architect
Derrick Gillett	C3 Studio, LLC
Joshua Pettler	C3 Studio, LLC
Kiffin Lashua	Little Diversified Architectural Consultants

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Lorie Matthews. It was established that there was a quorum. Ms. Matthews asked that Board members and ex-officio members introduce themselves.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Chad Boetger to approve the December 17, 2014 Minutes. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificates of Appropriateness

The applicant for the first agenda item (Certificate No. 12-A-14-DT) was not present at the beginning of the meeting and the board agreed to move the item later on the agenda to allow the applicant to arrive.

Certificate No. 12-B-14-DT

417 S. Gay Street – Kress Building (Greg Huddy)

Discussion: Mike Reynolds noted the revised storefront design, which comprises the majority of the proposed scope of work takes into account recent staff feedback. He highlighted that the original storefront glass area had a second level of glass as depicted in the photos however the Applicant is proposing that the storefront glass now go from the bulkhead to the upper transom. Architect Josh Pettler

clarified that the upper transom glass would be recreated with transparent glass, and would have an aluminum frame similar to the rest of the storefront, potentially with an opaque glazing applied to the glass as signage for a tenant. The opaque glazing would be separated by the vertical mullions. He also added that they want to find a very thin profile in terms of the reveal of the aluminum mullion so it has a more historic look. He noted they like the look of a darker, anodized finish for that storefront and their intention is to use an aluminum anodized storefront system. Mr. Pettler stated they could explore options that are narrower than 2 or 1 3/4 inches but is unsure if any exist. They could explore other options but cost and feasibility need to be considered as well. He agreed that any minimization of the width and profile of the aluminum bands in the transom would be ideal.

It was generally agreed that the transom area is more building specific than the street level storefront which can change over time. There was consensus that the Applicant needed to come back before the Board with more details on their proposal for the upper transom before the Board could consider approval.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Brian Pittman to approve the application as submitted per staff recommendation with the condition that details on the transom window be provided to staff for final approval.

Further Discussion: Brandon Pace noted concern that the design proposed in the center bay of the storefront below will not be achievable due to the limits of the glass and felt there would need to be another mullion or break in the glass because of its proposed width. Mr. Pettler stated he may be correct. There was discussion surrounding what widths of glass panes of this size could work and several options/examples of storefront systems that would be appropriate were discussed. Mr. Pettler clarified that they are in the design of element phase of the project and are currently coordinating with engineers and hope to have CD's [construction documents] within 4 or 5 weeks. It was clarified they need to have a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to obtaining a building permit.

Action: Anne Wallace amended her Motion to approve the application as submitted per staff recommendation with the condition that the design of the transom and storefront systems are not included in the approval and must come back before the Board for separate approval. The Amended Motion was seconded by Brian Pittman. The Amended Motion carried unanimously.

Certificate No. 1-A-14-DT

410 Locust Street – Walnut Parking Garage – Storage Building (Robert Lundin)

Discussion: Mike Reynolds noted this concerned the storage component of the Walnut Parking Garage along Locust St. He noted the Applicant is now proposing to remove what was previously approved on the ground floor level which was metal panels (originally approved from the parapet to the ground floor level) and instead have concrete with textured paint. He noted they are concerned about the potential damage, and its cost, from activity in the adjacent parking lot. He also noted the front façade has changed slightly in this rendering and described those changes which staff felt were in keeping with the original design and have already approved. Robert Lundin, representing George Ewart, Architect, was present and noted they are trying to eliminate costly repairs to the building at the request of the owner. Mike Reynolds clarified that the main wall of the building will be stained when the weather cooperates and further noted the Applicant will not receive a Certificate of Occupancy until it is stained per their approved plan.

There was substantial discussion and general consensus that a solid cement wall would not lend well to a good pedestrian experience and that the previously approved metal panels, though repetitious, reduced the overall scale and added texture. Several options for breaking up the monotony of a large cement wall

were discussed. The Applicant clarified it was a solid cement wall, not cement blocks. Mr. Lundin was encouraged to go back to the owner and explore materials that could be used to address the scale issue yet that would be more durable against potential future damage.

Action: A Motion was made by Brandon Pace to deny the application as submitted based on the need to consider an alternative to removal of the panels and painting the cement.

Mr. Pace withdrew his Motion.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace to postpone action on this application until the next Board meeting based on the starkness of the proposed removal of the panels and subsequent painting of the cement, and the Board's intent that the wall [at ground level on the south facing wall] needs to have some variation, allowing the Applicant to come back before the Board with an alternative option(s). The Motion was seconded by Chad Boetger. The Motion carried unanimously.

Certificate No. 12-A-14-DT

550 Main Street - Bank of America ATM (Bank of America)

Discussion: Mike Reynolds reviewed the proposal, with the Applicant seeking approval on Option A, and noted the Design Guidelines do not provide guidance on ATM's, or similar types of structures, and the Board is tasked with reviewing it with respects to its surrounds. It was clarified that the trees that would impact the lighting are pubic trees. Kiffin Lashua noted she was representing the architectural firm (Little) that is consulting with the Applicant (Bank of America). She stated they were flexible with regards to the overall lighting and were open to working with the Board on its final design and placement. She noted they have a specific minimum level of lighting they like to meet but are also open to working with the Board on that as well. Further she noted, the reason they chose to carve out the retaining wall was to meet ADA requirements.

Brian Pittman shared that he has worked in the building for 20 years and works for the firm that actually designed the building, and pursuant to that has pulled and studied the archived drawings. He noted he agreed that Option B would not work and liked the idea of an ATM at the street level, however the placement presented (Option A) is an extremely insensitive one, noting not only does it detract from the front of the building and its design, but does not lend well to Main Street, especially given how rare it is for a downtown to be as broad, low, green and comfortable as Main St. is. He further noted Option A presents as an intrusion.

Mr. Pittman proposed placement of the ATM structure on the Locust Street and attached to the building for the following reasons: the bank personnel could have direct access to the back of the unit, there is parking right there to accommodate ADA access, it is closer to the building wall, there is only one retaining wall to carve out, and it could be integrated into the existing window of the building. Mr. Pittman further noted he had spoken to the bank manager who very pleased with the idea of having an accessible ATM and liked the idea of having it placed adjacent to the building where they could service it easily as opposed to having it in a remote location (Option A) where they would have to pay someone else to service it. He inquired about whether the Applicant would consider this alternate placement and Ms. Lashua agreed to take it back to them for their review. Marleen Davis further added that from an urban design perspective Main St. is filled with historic buildings and this [Option A] would set an odd precedent as well as lessen the pedestrian experience. She was further concerned about the afterhours congestion it may create regardless of its placement. Mr. Pittman shared that the bank manager has stated they receive 5 complaints daily because members can only access their current ATM, which is inside the lobby, during business hours. There was also concern expressed that a front street placement would set a

precedent for other downtown banks as well. Further concern was noted that EIFS was an inappropriate material for this structure as it relates to the building as well as for the downtown, and material used should relate more to a natural (non-synthetic) material. Ms. Lashua stated they have done customized kiosks and could do so here. Melvin Wright clarified that EIFS is not an approved material within the downtown fire district. Anne Wallace noted there have been ATMs approved downtown as part of building frontages and if the Applicant were to consider doing that it would allow the Board to better consider the application.

Action: A Motion was made by Anne Wallace and seconded by Brandon Pace to postpone action on this item until the next Board meeting allowing the Applicant to review additional options with their client, further that the Applicant will need to be more specific regarding the materials they propose to use. The Motion carried unanimously.

Staff Report: There were no staff approvals to report this month.

Other Business:

- Crista Cuccaro noted that the City of Knoxville and the Metropolitan Planning Commission have been working on a Demolition Delay Ordinance as requested by City Council. It involves a 60 day delay for a demolition application of specific properties. Those properties are ones that are National Register [of Historic Places] or National Register eligible. Also, they are incorporating a statute that protects pre 1865 structures. She noted this was already required by law but they want to incorporate into the City Code to be clear. City Council is hosting a workshop on the Ordinance on February 12, 2015 at 5:30 P.M. in the Main Assembly room of the City/County building. Anyone is welcome to attend.

Tabled:

- *Certificate No. 11-B-12-DT*
100 S. Broadway – Project: 100 S. Broadway (old BP station)
- *Amendments to the Downtown Design Overlay District, Downtown Knoxville Design Guidelines, and Administrative Rules and Procedures.*
Initiated by the Downtown Design Review Board.

There was no further business.

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