

**MINUTES**  
Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission  
February 16, 2012

The duly advertised and regularly scheduled meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held February 16, 2012 at 5:30 p.m., at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Scott Noll called the meeting to order. Jenny Shugart called the roll.

**Attendance:**

The following Commission members were present: Mary Eastman, Jobeth Kavanaugh, Scott Noll, Kevin Osteen, Ryan Fiser, and Michael Prater

Absent: Thomas Palmer; Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff members present: Jenny Shugart, Stacy Morrison, Angela Wallace

Applicants present: Russell Golden; Beth Ann and Jay Green

Community members present: Brandi Hill, Architect for Greens

**OLD BUSINESS**

*There was no old business.*

Scott Noll explained the rules of procedure, swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission, and stated that the meeting was being recorded.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Case#12-HZ-00007**  
**508 Fortwood Place**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Russell Golden, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- Demolition of the existing secondary structure due to structural issues
- Removal of adjacent tree that is causing structural damage
- Rebuild and expand secondary structure (24' x 36').
- Materials to include:
  - Foundation: reinforced concrete footings; slab floor;
  - Walls: structural CMU or cast-in-place concrete walls with either a rubbed concrete or smooth stucco on the exterior;

- Roof: precast hollow core concrete panels with 3" topping slab & stamped concrete design or pre-engineered I-joists with composite decking on top;
- Garage Doors: two 10'x8' sectional overhead garage doors
- Replace existing wooden fence on top of concrete walls with new wooden fence similar in height and placement as the existing fence
- Stamped concrete for new driveway apron

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *Design Guidelines for Fort Wood Historic District*

**Criteria for Evaluation Demolition Proposals, p. 85** – 1. Whether or not the building contributes to the historical or architectural character and importance of the district and whether its removal will result in a more positive, appropriate visual effect on the district. 2. Whether or not the building or structure is of such old or uncommon design, texture, or scarce material that it could not be reproduced or could be reproduced only with great difficulty and expense. 3. Whether or not historic events occurred in the building or structure. 4. Whether or not a relocation of the building or structure or a portion thereof, would be to any extent practicable as a preferable alternative to demolition. 5. Whether or not the proposed demolition could potentially adversely affect other historic buildings located within the historic district. 6. The view of the structure or area from a public street or right-of-way, present and future, and the present character of the setting of the structure or area and its surrounding. 7. The age and character of the historic structure, and its condition. 8. The public purpose or interest in land or buildings to be protected. 9. The public necessity of the proposed demolition.

**Driveways and Offstreet Parking, p. 30** – 1. Offstreet parking should be from rear alleys when possible. 5. Define paved areas for parking generally should not be placed in the front yard of any properties or in highly visible side yards. 8. Insure that new paving materials are compatible with the character of the area. Color and texture should be carefully reviewed prior to installation.

**Garages, Outbuildings, and Site Features, p. 35** – 1. Retain existing historic garages, outbuildings and site features. 2. Design any new garages or outbuildings to be compatible with the style of the major buildings on the site, especially in materials and roof slope. 3. New garages or outbuildings generally should be located to the rear of the main house. In some cases they may be appropriately placed on the side where they can fit into the grade at street level. 4. The scale of new garages or outbuildings should not overpower the existing house or the size of the existing lot. 5. The design and location of any new site features should relate to the existing character of the property.

**Landscaping, p. 37** – 1. Retaining existing trees and plants that help define the character of the district. Replace diseased or dead plants and trees with appropriate species. 2. When constructing new buildings, identify and take care to protect significant trees and other plantings. 3. Criteria for determining the appropriateness of removing a mature tree [18" in diameter] is based on the following: The tree is damaging a historically significant structure such as a retaining wall, house or outbuilding; the tree is of a species that is invasive, a non-hardwood, or non-ornamental; the tree is diseased or has reached its maturity and requires replacement in the near future; the replacement of the tree will add to the character of the district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed demolition of the existing secondary structure is within the Guidelines because it does not contribute to the historical or architectural character and importance of the district. The new secondary structure is within the Guidelines in scale, design, and materials. The location is within the Guidelines due to the topography of the site. The removal of the existing tree is within the Guidelines.

Discussion

Russell Golden, the Applicant, addressed the Commission. Jenny Shugart received an e-mail from Gene Hyde stating that he felt the removal of the tree would not be a problem. The tree is covered with vines. The sidewalks would be stamped concrete (as is existing) and they will meet the guidelines. Fortwood Street does not have the octagonal tiles. The garage doors are only four panels wide not the five shown on the rendering. This has been to the BOZA and they have approved the project and recommended that this be approved here also. The garage will be a two car garage instead of one. The height of the garage will be about one foot higher than currently due to the size of modern day vehicles. The homeowner would put concrete or smooth stucco on the surface of the building around the garage doors. The fence will be the same all around the property and the height will be the same as it is now.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Michael Prater made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00007, 508 Fortwood Place, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are that the final plan for the fence, the final choice of the surface for the front of the garage around the garage doors and the final choice of garage doors be Staff approved.**

**Ryan Fiser seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**Case# 12-HZ-00008**  
**4110 St. Elmo Avenue**

Staff presented a PowerPoint presentation of the case which included a brief description of the proposed project, images, applicable guidelines and the staff recommendation:

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Jay and Beth Ann Green, have applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- Removal of back porch (east elevation)
- Construction of two dormers – one on west elevation and one on north elevation
- Removal of chimney on south elevation
- Construction of back addition (east elevation)
- Materials to include:

- Foundation (back addition): Brick Piers (to match existing brick) w/wood screening (Painted Lattice) between piers
- Siding: Fiber cement board lap siding w/ a 6" exposure (smooth finish)
- Window & Door Trim: 1" x 6" Wood or Fiber Cement Board
- Fascia: 1" x 4" Wood or Fiber Cement Board
- Soffit: Wood or Fiber Cement Board to follow slope of rafters
- Roof: 13:12 pitch; 3-tab fiberglass dimensional shingles to match existing; New gable dormer at front and left side; New hip roof at rear addition
- Windows: Wood or Aluminum-clad one-over-one double hung
- Door (back addition): Aluminum-clad full light
- Ceiling Heights: Main floor addition - 11'-4" (to match existing); Upper floor ceiling heights to follow slope of roof
- Rear Deck: pressure treated wood decking, steps, and supports, 2x2 wood spindles
- Front & Side Gables: 1" x 6" Wood or Fiber Cement Board lap siding w/ a 6" exposure (smooth finish)

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**Additions, p.28** – A. should be located at the rear of buildings, not on the front or readily visible areas of the sides of buildings. B. should be secondary (smaller and simpler) than the original building in scale, design, and placement. C. should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights, etc. D. should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period. E. should appear distinguishable from the historic building, not an exact copy of it. Additions should be contemporary in design but compatible with the original building. F. should be built in a manner that avoids extensive removal or loss of historic materials and which does not damage or destroy the main architectural features of the building. G. should keep the exterior walls of the original building alone and use existing door and window openings for connecting the addition to the building. H. should not be made through framing or glassing in the front porch or a prominent side porch.

**Chimneys, p. 36** – A. should not be removed or altered if original. B. should be repointed and cleaned according to masonry guidelines to match original materials, colors, shape, and brick pattern. If chimneys have been extensively repointed resulting in mismatched colors and textures, painting the chimney dark red or brown is appropriate.

**Demolitions, p. 39** – A. of any original feature or part of a historic building should be avoided. B. of a building which contributes to the historic or architectural significance of the St. Elmo Historic District should not occur, unless:

1. public safety and welfare requires the removal of the building or structure;
2. if a building has lost its architectural and historical value and its removal will improve the appearance of the neighborhood;
3. if a building does not contribute to the historical or architectural character and importance of the district and its removal will improve the appearance of the neighborhood; or
4. if the denial of the demolition will result in an economic hardship on the applicant as determined by Section VIII of the Ordinance.

C. of pre-1945 secondary buildings (garages, etc.) may be appropriate if substantially deteriorated (requiring 50% or more replacement of exterior siding, roof rafters, surface materials, and structural members).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed demolition of the back porch is within the Guidelines as this element does not appear to be original to the primary structure. The proposed new construction of the addition meets the Guidelines in terms of scale, design, location, and materials. Removal of original chimneys is discouraged within the Guidelines.

Discussion

Scott Noll asked if anyone from the audience wished to make comments on this case. Brandi Hill, the Architect for the homeowners, addressed the Commission.

They will be removing the existing chimney – hated to lose it, but it is blocking part of the area that will be renovated to add space.

Mary Eastman feels the dormer on the west elevation looks like it will really change the roof line and the look of the house. JoBeth Kavanaugh feels it really looks out of scale with the house, that it changes the look of the bungalow totally. It makes the house look top heavy. She also thinks tearing down the chimney is unacceptable.

Brandi Hill pointed out that they decided on the size of the dormer because they wanted to get more light in the house.

Mary Eastman asked if they could achieve the same square footage if you change and build out the back of the house. Brandi Hill stated that is not what the homeowners want. Scott Noll noted that there is a lot of vegetation on the north of the house which means you wouldn't notice the dormer on that side. It is the one on the west (front) of the house that would be a dramatic change. It was suggested that if the roof height was dropped, it would change the overall look from the front. The curb appeal of the house looks like it is out of balance for that bungalow.

Board members put together a proposed drawing of what they would suggest and asked the homeowners what they think about their revisions? JoBeth Kavanaugh feels that it is a question about the dormers, the changes in the roof line and the removal of the chimney.

Jay Green (homeowner) does not understand the items that are of concern. Brandi Hill feels the proposed changes could work if the homeowners are ok with it. Beth Ann Green doesn't understand why the front dormer is a problem when it is the same as the side and on other houses in the area. Scott Noll stated that what may work for one house, may not work for another – the guidelines are just that – guidelines.

Did you consider abandoning the attic and pushing out the back? NO. There is a lot of room in the attic.

Board wants the chimney to remain. Brandi Hill asked if it would be ok to demolish the chimney and rebuild it on the outside only. Homeowners have no problem with removing the interior part of the chimney, but leaving the outside part of the chimney.

Scott Noll asked if anyone else from the audience wished to make comments on this case. No one else came forward.

**Kevin Osteen made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00008, 4110 St. Elmo Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions in this case include the chimney staying (if only on the outside of the house – to be determined whether it will be removed and rebuilt or the interior portion being removed and the exterior portion remaining); The dormer on the west elevation be a smaller size; The dormer on the north elevation to be changed to be more in proportion with the rest of the elevation; a brow design used rather than a hip design; and that you will see no siding on the west elevation of the roof. The homeowners have the right to return to the Board if they decide the plan approved at this meeting is not acceptable to them at any point.**

**Michael Prater seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 3-2 vote.**

### ***Staff Approved Certificates of Appropriateness***

Steve Noll asked about three of the staff approved COAs.

**Mary Eastman made a motion to approve the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness. Ryan Fiser seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### ***Announcements***

Next Meeting Dates – March 15<sup>th</sup>, April 19th

Scott Noll may be moving out of state. A decision will not be finalized for a couple of months.

### ***Adjournment***

**JoBeth Kavanaugh made a motion to adjourn. Michael Prater seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:51 pm by Scott Noll.**

## **MINUTES**

### Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission March 15, 2012

The duly advertised and regularly scheduled meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held March 15, 2012 at 5:36 p.m., at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Scott Noll called the meeting to order. Stacy Morrison called the roll.

#### **Attendance:**

The following Commission members were present: Mary Eastman, JoBeth Kavanaugh, Scott Noll, Ryan Fiser, Kevin Osteen, and Michael Prater

Absent: Thomas Palmer, Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff members present: Stacy Morrison, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants present: Carol Kuhrt, Robert Gustafson, Beth Ann Green, Kim Honeycutt, Troy Bage

Community members present: Lorie Blalock w/Pratt & Assoc.; Delsby Dunlap; and Amanda Tarr

Scott Noll explained the rules of procedure, swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission, and stated that the meeting was being recorded.

Minutes from the February meeting were accepted. A motion to approve the Minutes was made by Michael, second by JoBeth and unanimously approved.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

*There was no old business.*

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### **Case#12-HZ-00013** **5521 St. Elmo Avenue**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Carol E. Kuhrt, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the installation of a new wooden shed in the back yard.

#### **APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**New Construction, pp. 61-64** – C. of secondary buildings such as garages, carports, and other outbuildings should be: 1. smaller in scale than the primary building; 2. simple in design but reflecting the general character of the primary building; 3. located as traditional for the street, near an alley or at the side of the dwelling, not close to or attached to the primary building; 4. compatible in design, shape, materials, and roof shape to the main building; 5. preferably of wood siding. However, if located along rear alleys or towards the rear of the lot, secondary buildings may have exterior siding materials such as masonite (preferred), aluminum, or vinyl. Along rear

alleys or rear lot lines, standard pre-fabricated buildings are also acceptable; 6. if readily visible from the street, secondary buildings should have an emphasis on historic designs and detailing. For garages wood paneled doors are more appropriate than paneled doors of vinyl, aluminum, or steel. Wood paneled overhead roll-up doors are widely available and are appropriate for new garages.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The installation of a wooden shed is within the Guidelines in scale, design, location and materials.

Discussion

Carol Kuhrt presented to the board that she wants to install a shed in the back of her property. The shed measures 12'x24'x30' and matches the picture submitted and is the second from left on the brochure – looks like a little house. The structure will be on a platform and will be painted white like the house.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

The building is essentially like the one in the next yard, just a little larger. The overall height of the building next door looks like it would be a little taller than the one being applied for. Michael asked if we want to put in the conditions a limit on the height

**Michael made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00013, 5521 St. Elmo Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. The condition in this case being that the shed is to be no larger than 12' x 24'**

**Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00014**  
**4109 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Robert Gustafson, has applied for a “Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)” for the following work:

- Demolition of the existing 18' x 8' room on the back of the primary structure
- Construction of a deck 18'x 8' where old deck was previously removed
- Removal of flat roof on back of primary structure and reconstruction with gable roof to match existing roof

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**Additions, p.28** – C. should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights, etc. D. should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period. E. should appear distinguishable from the historic building, not an exact copy of it. Additions should be contemporary in design but compatible with the original building. F. should be built in a manner that avoids extensive removal



or loss of historic materials and which does not damage or destroy the main architectural features of the building. G. should keep the exterior walls of the original building and use existing door and window openings for connecting the addition to the building. H. should not be made through framing or glassing in the front porch or a prominent side porch.

**Demolitions, p. 39** – A. of any original feature or part of a historic building should be avoided. B. of a building which contributes to the historic or architectural significance of the St. Elmo Historic District should not occur, unless:

1. public safety and welfare requires the removal of the building or structure;
2. if a building has lost its architectural and historical value and its removal will improve the appearance of the neighborhood;
3. if a building does not contribute to the historical or architectural character and importance of the district and its removal will improve the appearance of the neighborhood; or
4. if the denial of the demolition will result in an economic hardship on the applicant as determined by Section VIII of the Ordinance.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed renovation of the existing primary structure is within the Guidelines. The repair/rebuilding of the back room and deck and the removal of flat roof and reconstruction with gable roof to match existing roof are within the Guidelines in terms of materials, location, design and scale.

#### Discussion

Robert Gustafson addressed the board. Mr. Gustafson wants to tear the back side out and change the existing roof line, most of which is covered with mold. He wants to make the roof line flush with the existing roof. There will be a concrete pad under the porch. He will take the demolition back to the first set of windows. The owner wants to make the addition flush with the rest of the house. There is a gable across the front but not currently across the back. The walls will be in one line, no offsets. Roofing will be shingles.

It was asked how you are going to join the siding to the rest of the house. All the siding is gone now. The new siding will be 4" reveal cement with smooth finish. The deck will be all wood with 2"x2" spindles. It will be the same as the deck next door. The windows will be replaced with wood on wood double hung and will be lined up as shown in the elevation drawings. On the north elevation, the owner is thinking about putting shakes in the gables (using hardy board). Scott thinks it would be better to do the same shading on both sides. Mr. Gustafson would prefer to do only the one side, but will do both if the board requires. The door is a half light door. The door on the south elevation will be gone and there will be windows at that location. The back door will be French doors on the bottom and top with full light. Trim around the windows will be 1"x4" on three sides and 1"x6" on the bottom.

The chimney has been removed. Stacy met with them prior to this and there was a safety issue with the chimney and it had to come down.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Michael made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00014, 4109 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. The conditions are 1"x4" trim will be used on windows with 1"x6" trim on the bottom of the windows which will be wood clad windows. The stairs on deck are approved. The door will be a half light. The siding in the gable will be either cedar shake or hardy board. The siding will be same on both sides and continue all the way up.**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00019**  
**4110 St. Elmo Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Jay and Beth Ann Green, have applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for changes to previously approved COA for the construction of dormers.

- Materials to include:
  - Siding: Fiber cement board lap siding w/ a 6" exposure (smooth finish)
  - Front & Side Gables: 1" x 6" Wood or Fiber Cement Board lap siding w/a 6" exposure (smooth finish)

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**Additions, p.28** – A. should be located at the rear of buildings, not on the front or readily visible areas of the sides of buildings. B. should be secondary (smaller and simpler) than the original building in scale, design, and placement. C. should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights, etc. D. should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period. E. should appear distinguishable from the historic building, not an exact copy of it. Additions should be contemporary in design but compatible with the original building. F. should be built in a manner that avoids extensive removal or loss of historic materials and which does not damage or destroy the main architectural features of the building. G. should keep the exterior walls of the original building alone and use existing door and window openings for connecting the addition to the building. H. should not be made through framing or glassing in the front porch or a prominent side porch.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed new construction of the dormers meets the Guidelines in terms of scale, design, location, and materials.

**Discussion**

Beth Ann Green addressed the board. They wanted to reapply to show the perspective of the house with one of the suggestions for the dormers. Jenny and the Greens agreed that it needed the architectural elements that are shown on the drawing. Some houses in the area have a roofing triangle and siding. The hip that was talked about was at one of the neighbors houses. Mrs. Green feels they really need to have the gable on the dormer. The second picture shows

another option with the smaller windows. Either of these are examples are acceptable to the Greens but they feel the front dormer needs to be gabled. JoBeth feels the changes do help the look of the house. The front gable material is a diamond pattern. The side one makes the front one look better. They will be keeping the chimney and this helps the look also. This looks so much better. The owner's preference is the first set versus the second submittal. The side dormer is best with the siding exposed. The side dormer elongates the room. We need to decide which selection we like. The one on the screen is the preference with the window double hung.

Scott wanted to note that the last COA did not state the chimney not being taken down and the siding material.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Michael made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00019, 4110 St. Elmo Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are if the chimney is torn down another is to be put up in the same size, scale and in the same location. The first submittal, which is the first choice of the applicant, is approved with the double hung windows. The gable area of the dormer is to match the gable area on the front of the house.**

**Mary Eastman seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00021**  
**4418 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Will and Kim Honeycutt, have applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- Renovate attic adding master's suite
- Construction of four dormers – one on each elevation
- Construction of back and side addition
- Add entry on west end of addition

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**Additions, p.28** – C. should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights, etc. D. should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period. E. should appear distinguishable from the historic building, not an exact copy of it. Additions should be contemporary in design but compatible with the original building. F. should be built in a manner that avoids extensive removal or loss of historic materials and which does not damage or destroy the main architectural features of the building. G. should keep the exterior walls of the original building alone and use existing door and window openings for connecting the addition to the building. H. should not be made through framing or glassing in the front porch or a prominent side porch.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed new construction of the addition meets the Guidelines in terms of scale, design, location, and materials.

Discussion

Kevin recused himself since he is the contractor and he will be sworn in since he will be speaking to the board on this case.

Kim Honeycutt and Kevin Osteen addressed the board. Kim is looking for initial approval so she can start some preliminary work between now and April, then come back in April with further submission. Owners want to remove the back of the building and make an addition around the back and side to add a great room to the house. Kevin is trying to figure how to expand the house and use a retaining wall as well as at the back of the house. The addition will go into the bank. The current retaining wall is starting to collapse. During the process of the addition, they will add to the retaining wall and replace what is currently there.

They would also like to redo the attic adding more space. Owners want to add four dormers to the attic area to add light and balance out the look of the house.

The applicants want the basic footprint approved at this meeting for adding to the back and side of the house. Kevin wants a basic approval that the dormers will be okay to add. The chimney is going away but will be replaced. The existing dormer is a small one, and they want to open it up more and then add the other three. The existing one is about 4' and they would like to expand it to 6' or 7'. The height would go up but would still be lower than the roof. Owners want to know if this is doable before they hire an architect to do the drawings. Scott cautions that the Board needs to not get into too many specifics. Michael feels that the Board can approve for the applicant start excavating and start working on the footprint of the addition. Mary agrees with the four dormers but not sure about increasing the size. Kevin says the plan is in flux but can go ahead and start doing some of the work and then come back next month with more specifics about the dormers. You cannot see the addition point from the front of the house. No problem with the addition to the back and side. Kevin only wants a basic go ahead at this point. Owner wants to add about 6-8' on the back and 10-12' on the side. It could change a little depending on what is found when start digging.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

The Board tentatively approves four dormers, one on each side with no reference to size. Slab can be approved with a general size. The excavation is not within our scope. It is possible to do this job with the existing dormer size on the front and possibly slightly larger ones on the other three sides. JoBeth does not feel comfortable approving without more information on the dormers. Kevin will come back about the dormers.

**Michael made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00021, 4418 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are approval of the construction of the new dormers,**

but before construction begins on dormers or on the back, applicant will return to the Committee with more specifics. The chimney is to be replaced in same location with the same look. The addition is to be no more than 12' at back and no more than 8' on side.

Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.

**CASE # 12-HZ-00022**  
**825 Oak Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Troy Bage, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the Construction of new primary and secondary structures on an existing vacant lot.

Materials to include:

*Foundation* – stone veneer over concrete block

*Siding* – stucco

*Soffit* – decorative corbelling

*Roof* – clay tile; 3:12 to a 6:12 pitch on house; 6:12 pitch on garage

*Windows* – wood or clad-wood windows

*Doors* – wood or clad-wood doors

*Window & Door Trim* – wood

*Ceiling Heights* – 10' at first floor, 9' at second floor and basement

*Porches* – concrete floor; fiberglass or wood spindles/posts and columns

*Driveway and Walkways* – concrete or pavers

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *Design Guidelines for Fort Wood Historic District*

**Site Design (pp. 26-39) including Setback (p.28); Spacing (p. 27); Driveways and Off street Parking (p. 30-31); Yards and Alleys (p.32); Fences, Walls, and Walks (p. 33-34); Appurtenances (p. 36); Landscaping (p.37-38); Signs and Outdoor Lighting (p. 39)**

and

**New Construction and Additions (pp 60-70) including Massing and Building Footprint (p. 61); Complexity of Form (p. 62); Directional Expression (p. 63); Orientation (p. 64); Height and Width (p. 64); Scale (p. 65); Roof (p. 66); Openings: Doors & Windows (p. 67); Porches and Porticos (p. 68); Color (p. 68); Materials and Texture (p. 69); Architectural Details (p. 70);**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The new construction, while similar in style with historic structures within the district, is not too imitative. The proposed new construction meets the Guidelines in terms of mass, building footprint, complexity of form, directional expression, orientation, height, width, and scale. The setbacks appear to meet the Guidelines for both the front and side yards, as do the roof pitch and roof style. The materials for the foundation, trim, roof, porches, driveway, and walkways also meet the guidelines. The stucco siding is acceptable under the Guidelines. The windows and doors are within the guidelines, as are the details and trim for the building.

Discussion

Troy Barg addressed the board. JoBeth read the approval that was issued at the last presentation to the Board in October. Troy came to address the three items left open on the first COA. First the window, he did bring an example of the aluminum clad window. The windows will be white instead of the gray on the sample. The actual window will not have a divider in the center of the window pane. The arch is built in the window and the owner would prefer to have no grills. There will be a lot of elongated windows. The drawings submitted are not what the windows will actually look like. The top arch windows (the third level of windows) will be single light. The second row will be casement windows with a sash in the middle – one over one – a single divided by casements. The first row windows are divided – one over one. The center window over the turret is now a 4.5' x 3' rectangular window.

The applicant has submitted an example of the color and finish of the stucco stone. Troy brought samples and a drawing tonight. The new drawing has a change in the roof line but that is not being changed – this drawing is for the stone only. JoBeth does not recognize the stone the applicant is presenting. The drawing is not very clear. The applicant needs to bring exact samples to the Board at a future time.

The third item is the window over the arch and that is acceptable.

It is critical that we make a decision on the windows because they need to be ordered now. JoBeth there are a lot of different windows used in this house.

The covered porch windows will be the same as on the front of the house. There will be a no grid glass French door on the back porch on second floor. The windows on the back are double hung but are a different size than the front. The first floor porch uses the same windows, double hung with a single light French door. On the sides the windows are all double hung with no grills. The first floor transom at the kitchen is a non-working transom. It is about 14' long. On the first floor, one over ones and transoms are all single hung.

So the difference on the second floor on the front elevation is that they are double casements and the rest are one-over-one. Size above the porch would be same style on the stucco side over the first floor porch. The ones over the simulated balcony being different from the others are ok. The spot over the three windows on the front – it is a detail not a window. It should be a stucco detail or nothing there at all. It was agreed that there will be nothing there at all.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience.

Amanda Tart addressed the board. The three windows behind the simulated balcony will be divided windows. In the past there have been approvals at a Board meeting but the finished product was completely different than approved. Are there different roofing materials being used? No. It was asked if the aluminum clad windows are approved in Fort Wood. Ms. Tart also questioned the size of the house. The Board feels the size is appropriate.

There were no additional presentations.

Mary is still concerned that the window over the front porch is going to be too small in comparison with the others. The Board asked to make it rectangle and smaller. It is now 4.5' x 3'. It comes

up from the roof just a little. JoBeth concerned about the long transom in the kitchen. Feels it would look better being divided into 3 or 4 pieces. Mary agrees with JoBeth. It is 14 feet long. The applicant agrees to divide it into three separate windows.

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00022, 825 Oak Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are: the stucco and stucco color are approved as submitted. Decorative corbelling – Reduced to single corbels on East, West and North sides (design scale to be approved by the Commission at a later date). Stone veneer to be approved by Commission. All French doors (not front door) are single light glass. Windows in front upper area are horizontal 3'x4' rectangular windows. East elevation all double hung and one-over-one windows and long transom in kitchen is now three windows instead of one long window. Front elevation has all one-over-one double hung windows with the exception to the center. The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony casement for three windows approved as submitted. All transoms are single light.**

**Kevin seconded the motion. Motion carried with five for and one (Michael) opposed.**

Questions were raised about the material for the roof. In future submitted materials, make sure what they want approved be spelled out on the application and the drawings. JoBeth does not feel good with approving something that is different than the submitted drawings. They are keeping the corbels but are changing them from double to singles on the sides, reducing the number from 88 to 62 (12x12x3). Mary is confused that we are trying to approve something that is totally different from the drawings submitted. The roof was approved with clay tile and now they will not be using any clay tile. Mary feels this is a significant architectural change. It is a deal killer for the owner to use the clay tile. Kevin stated that there are some specialty architectural shingles that the owner might be able to be use. There is a synthetic clay tile but it is also very costly. This would probably also be a deal killer. It would help if the board had pictures of houses that had the shingle type roof and a sample of the material. Approval of the roof is essential to the start of construction. If the decision is not to use the architectural shingles, it could make the budget so that it will be prohibitive to be built.

**The Applicant is required to bring roofing samples as well as the samples of other items as requested in the above Motion to the next meeting along with corrected drawings.**

### ***Staff Approved Certificates of Appropriateness***

**Mary made a motion to approve the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness. JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### ***Announcements***

Next Meeting Dates – April 19<sup>th</sup>, May 17<sup>th</sup>

CHZC Minutes  
03/15/2012  
p. 10  
Approved

Mary will be out of town on April 19. April will be Scott's last meeting

***Adjournment***

**Michael made a motioned to adjourn. Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.** The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 pm by Scott Noll.



## **MINUTES**

### Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission

April 19, 2012

The duly advertised and regularly scheduled meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held April 19, 2012 at 5:36 p.m., at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Scott Noll called the meeting to order. Stacy Morrison called the roll.

#### **Attendance:**

The following Commission members were present: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Thomas Palmer, Scott Noll, Ryan Fiser, Kevin Osteen, and Michael Prater

Absent: Mary Eastman, Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff members present: Stacy Morrison, Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants present: Jan Carter (representing Kenneth Cooper), Michele Peterson, Sharman Sherfey, Clark McNutt, Kim Honeycutt, Troy Bage

Community members present: Lori Blalock, Deborah Dunlap

Scott Noll explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission. Minutes from the March meeting were accepted. A motion to approve the Minutes was made by Michael seconded by Ryan and unanimously approved.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

*There was no old business.*

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### **Case#12-HZ-00023**

##### **202 Eveningside Drive**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Kenneth Cooper, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- Replace several windows
- Repair brick wall under basement window
- Seal walls
- Replace roof
- Paint exterior walls
- Repair/replace damaged siding
- Construct new deck at rear

- Addition of full bath
- Replace damaged rear wooden fence areas

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *Ferger Place Historic District Design Guidelines*  
**Section 5 Alterations to Existing Buildings** (pp. 9-11)  
**Section 6 New Additions to Existing Buildings** (p. 12)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The applicant needs to identify which windows need repair. Windows that can be repaired should be repaired and not replaced. Applicant needs to identify the style and materials of new windows before they can be approved. The proposed deck and fence are within the Guidelines in scale, design, location and materials.

Discussion

Jan Carter presented for her father Kenneth Cooper. She clarified where the bathroom would go and where the patio would be. The fence to be replaced was damaged during the storms in April. She brought pictures of the new vinyl windows which he has already installed in the kitchen and dining room. Scott stated the Commission does not approve the vinyl windows Mr. Cooper has used. The Commission does not have enough information on this application to decide anything.

The brick wall of the basement and basement window was damaged during the storm. Mr. Cooper plans on using the same brick that was knocked out of the wall. The window will need to be replaced with the same type window as the existing window. The Commission suggested going to a salvage yard to get a window identical to the existing one. If they replace this with any window except an exact match, they will need to bring it back to the Committee for approval. Sealing the wall on the inside is not within our jurisdiction. Sarah has spoken with Mr. Cooper and his main issue is with water leaking in the basement. If he applies a sealer on the outside, it needs to be a clear sealer.

The roof has already been replaced with architectural shingles. It was not submitted for approval but it is acceptable.

The damaged siding needs to be replaced with similar material with the same reveal. Mr. Cooper wants to use Hardie board. JoBeth pointed out that the existing siding is a tapered board and Hardie does not make that. There is a custom made product you can get. Whatever is used has to match the existing siding. The Applicant needs to bring a sample of the product to be used.

Jan stated the proposed deck will be coming out by the kitchen door. There will be stairs down to a concrete pad. Jan believes Mr. Cooper has scrapped adding the patio. Jan is not sure he is going to do the addition at all. The Commission will not discuss the addition tonight because they do not have enough information.

The damaged fence will be replaced with the same material as what was there originally.

Scott asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

The windows are something the Commission needs to discuss. Two of the windows are in but there are four more windows he wants to replace. Jan asked about the windows that were already installed. They can be replaced with windows that look the same as the original windows and that are wood or vinyl clad with true muntins.

**Michael made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00023, 202 Eveningside Drive, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Ferger Place Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are as follows:**

- **Windows are to be replaced with wood or vinyl clad with true muntins.**
- **Brick wall will be repaired to match existing.**
- **Any sealing above ground will be clear and not alter the appearance of the wall.**
- **Siding to be done with Hardie Board or wood to match the existing shape and reveal.**
- **Roof is approved as done.**
- **Addition is denied.**
- **Construction of deck approved**

**Kevin seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00026**  
**4209 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Chris Peterson, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling
- Materials Proposed:
- Hardie Board
- Cedar (Michigan Pre-stain)
- Lap siding with 5 ¼" reveal – Hardie Board
- Roof – Architectural Shingle

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**New Construction, p.61** – New construction needs to be contemporary in design but compatible with adjacent buildings. New construction should be distinguishable from historic buildings while reinforcing roof forms, materials, window and door sizes and placement, porch size and location, as well as foundation heights. A design that may be appropriate along one block may not be appropriate along another block.

**Shape** – Variations of rectangular and square forms are most appropriate;

**Scale** – Restricted to 35 feet in height. One or two stories are appropriate for this area;

**Roof shape and pitch** – Roof slope ratio for new construction should be a minimum of 6:12 to a maximum of 12:12. Roof forms of gable and hipped variations are more appropriate;

**Orientation to the street** – All buildings should have at least a secondary entrance and some type of entry porch on the front of the building. Most buildings in St. Elmo have their

fronts oriented towards the street and this characteristic should be maintained by new construction;

**Location and proportion of porches, entrances, windows, and divisional bays** – Porches should have roof forms of gable or shed design and at least cover the entrance. Porches which extend partially or fully across the main façade are recommended. Porch columns and railings should be simple in design in square or round shapes. Columns should be a minimum of six inches and a maximum of ten inches square or in diameter. New windows should be rectangular sash whose proportions on the main façade should not exceed three-to-one in a height to width ratio or be any less than two-to-one in height-to-width (two-to-one proportions are preferred). No horizontal sash, casement, or awning type windows should be placed on the fronts of buildings. The use of plastic or “snap-in” muntins (window pane dividers) is discouraged;

**Foundation height** – Height of foundations should be a minimum of 1 foot six inches and a maximum of two feet above grade. No slab foundation or at-grade foundation should be utilized on the fronts or readily visible sides of buildings;

**Floor to ceiling heights** – Should not exceed ten feet or be less than eight feet;

**Porch height and depth** – Porch heights should be consistent with those of adjacent buildings. Porch depths should be a minimum of six feet;

**Materials and material color** –

- Foundations: Most foundations are of brick, poured concrete or concrete block. Poured concrete is more appropriate than concrete block. If concrete block is used, a stucco wash is recommended to provide a smooth surface. Split faced concrete block is also an acceptable foundation material.
- Frame Dwellings: If the new construction is of frame, the preferred exterior material is horizontal wood siding which is a minimum of four inches and a maximum of six inches in width. The use of Masonite is also acceptable as long as it meets these size recommendations. The use of grained pressboard or chipboard is less appropriate but is acceptable if it meets these size recommendations.
- Windows: Wood construction is preferred for windows, especially those on the fronts of buildings. However, the use of vinyl-clad or aluminum-clad windows is also acceptable as long as they follow proper proportions.

**Details and texture** – The width of window and door trim should be at least three and one-half inches. Roof eaves should have a minimum depth of eight inches. No imitative architectural features are appropriate for new construction

**Placement on the lot** – Front and side yard setbacks should respect the setbacks found along the block on which the building is sited. The minimum front yard setback under R-2 zoning is 25 feet. Requirements for side yard setbacks are a minimum of 10 feet. B. of primary buildings, while blending in with adjacent buildings, should not be too imitative of historic styles so that new buildings can be distinguished from historic buildings.

**Driveways & Paving, p. 43** – B. which are new, should be located at the rear with access from the alley. C. in the front or side yards should be of gravel (white or pea gravel), concrete (smooth), or concrete tracks (narrow strips). D. should have their parking areas located in the rear yard nearer the alley than the building and screened with hedges, shrubs, or fences where noticeable from the street. E. requiring new curb cuts to access driveways and parking lots should be kept to a minimum.

**Doors, p. 40** – D. of solid six-panel or flush wood or steel design should be used only for rear entrances or side entrances which are not readily visible from the street.

**Sidewalks & Walkways, p. 85** – C. that are newly introduced to the property should be smooth concrete in patterns, dimensions, colors, and placement like original or early sidewalks in the district.

**Windows, p. 100** – Windows should be maintained or repaired to match the original design. If windows are deteriorated beyond repair, the installation of new wood windows to match the original designs is best. Vinyl-clad windows or windows of anodized aluminum are also acceptable, but these are more appropriate at the rear or sides of dwellings which are not readily visible from the street. A. should be preserved in their original location, size, and design and with their original materials and numbers of panes. C. should be repaired rather than replace, but if replacement is necessary due to severe deterioration, the replacement should be in-kind to match the originals in material and design. E. should not have snap-on or flush muntins. These muntins are much thinner than the muntins on historic windows.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The materials, location, and design of the proposed structure are within the Guidelines. The scale of the proposed structure is not consistent with the surrounding historic houses, which are predominantly one to one and one-half stories.

#### Discussion

Chris and Michele Peterson addressed the Committee. The placement of the house is going to be fronting Tennessee. The only elevation drawing included is of the front. Scott, we need to see the elevations for the north, south and west, especially due to the slope of the lot. Michele is going to pour and backfill the lot to be level with Tennessee. Michele normally places the windows after she does the floor plan to enhance the view and privacy. Michele asked what difference does it make where the windows are? The Commission has to see what the outside is going to look like. Scott – I know you have done work in St. Elmo before so I don't understand why you are not familiar. Michele does not understand if she changes the placement or number of windows why that changes the historical view of the house. The Commission is here to interpret the guidelines. You cannot build a floor plan and then move windows around. If you don't follow what we have approved we will take it to the next level. Michele asked if she submits a picture does she have to do a drawing. If she takes pictures of the outside of another house would that be sufficient. We need to see exactly what you are planning to do – all four sides. JoBeth pointed out that the Commission also needs the measurements of everything. A new construction is different than a renovation or replacement. Kevin we need the same level of information we have from Case #31, not just four pictures. If you want to take four pictures and come in with a list of detail materials and elevation information then we can discuss this. SDL windows are not approved. Can I apply muntins to the outside? No. We need to know the placement and measurements of the windows. The elevation is very important. The material and the placement are both important to our decisions. It does not have to be an architectural drawing; just a graph paper drawing is fine as long as it is to scale. We need to have a site plan with setbacks, the materials and placement of the driveway. Does this mean I will be postponed until May? Yes. Setbacks and sidewalks are something that needs to go through the Zoning office.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Kevin made a motion to defer Case# 12-HZ-00026, 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant**

to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. This case needs to come back to the Commission with accurate site plans, elevations and a materials list.

Michael seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.

**CASE # 12-HZ-00027**  
**4109 Alabama Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Steve and Sharman Sherfey, have applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling
- Materials:
- Hardie Board Siding
- Roof – Architectural Shingles
- Windows – Either Vinyl or Vinyl-Clad one-over-one double hung

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**New Construction, p.61** – New construction needs to be contemporary in design but compatible with adjacent buildings. New construction should be distinguishable from historic buildings while reinforcing roof forms, materials, window and door sizes and placement, porch size and location, as well as foundation heights. A design that may be appropriate along one block may not be appropriate along another block.

**Shape** – Variations of rectangular and square forms are most appropriate;

**Scale** – Restricted to 35 feet in height. One or two stories are appropriate for this area;

**Roof shape and pitch** – Roof slope ratio for new construction should be a minimum of 6:12 to a maximum of 12:12. Roof forms of gable and hipped variations are more appropriate;

**Orientation to the street** – All buildings should have at least a secondary entrance and some type of entry porch on the front of the building. Most buildings in St. Elmo have their fronts oriented towards the street and this characteristic should be maintained by new construction;

**Location and proportion of porches, entrances, windows, and divisional bays** – Porches should have roof forms of gable or shed design and at least cover the entrance. Porches which extend partially or fully across the main façade are recommended. Porch columns and railings should be simple in design in square or round shapes. Columns should be a minimum of six inches and a maximum of ten inches square or in diameter. New windows should be rectangular sash whose proportions on the main façade should not exceed three-to-one in a height to width ratio or be any less than two-to-one in height-to-width (two-to-one proportions are preferred). No horizontal sash, casement, or awning type windows should be placed on the fronts of buildings. The use of plastic or "snap-in" muntins (window pane dividers) is discouraged;

**Foundation height** – Height of foundations should be a minimum of 1 foot six inches and a maximum of two feet above grade. No slab foundation or at-grade foundation should be utilized on the fronts or readily visible sides of buildings;

**Floor to ceiling heights** – Should not exceed ten feet or be less than eight feet;

***Porch height and depth*** – Porch heights should be consistent with those of adjacent buildings. Porch depths should be a minimum of six feet;

***Materials and material color*** –

- Foundations: Most foundations are of brick, poured concrete or concrete block. Poured concrete is more appropriate than concrete block. If concrete block is used, a stucco wash is recommended to provide a smooth surface. Split faced concrete block is also an acceptable foundation material.
- Frame Dwellings: If the new construction is of frame, the preferred exterior material is horizontal wood siding which is a minimum of four inches and a maximum of six inches in width. The use of Masonite is also acceptable as long as it meets these size recommendations. The use of grained pressboard or chipboard is less appropriate but is acceptable if it meets these size recommendations.
- Windows: Wood construction is preferred for windows, especially those on the fronts of buildings. However, the use of vinyl-clad or aluminum-clad windows is also acceptable as long as they follow proper proportions.

***Details and texture*** – The width of window and door trim should be at least three and one-half inches. Roof eaves should have a minimum depth of eight inches. No imitative architectural features are appropriate for new construction

***Placement on the lot*** – Front and side yard setbacks should respect the setbacks found along the block on which the building is sited. The minimum front yard setback under R-2 zoning is 25 feet. Requirements for side yard setbacks are a minimum of 10 feet. B. of primary buildings, while blending in with adjacent buildings, should not be too imitative of historic styles so that new buildings can be distinguished from historic buildings.

**Driveways & Paving, p. 43** – B. which are new, should be located at the rear with access from the alley. C. in the front or side yards should be of gravel (white or pea gravel), concrete (smooth), or concrete tracks (narrow strips). D. should have their parking areas located in the rear yard nearer the alley than the building and screened with hedges, shrubs, or fences where noticeable from the street. E. requiring new curb cuts to access driveways and parking lots should be kept to a minimum.

**Doors, p. 40** – D. of solid six-panel or flush wood or steel design should be used only for rear entrances or side entrances which are not readily visible from the street.

**Sidewalks & Walkways, p. 85** – C. that are newly introduced to the property should be smooth concrete in patterns, dimensions, colors, and placement like original or early sidewalks in the district.

**Windows, p. 100** – Windows should be maintained or repaired to match the original design. If windows are deteriorated beyond repair, the installation of new wood windows to match the original designs is best. Vinyl-clad windows or windows of anodized aluminum are also acceptable, but these are more appropriate at the rear or sides of dwellings which are not readily visible from the street. A. should be preserved in their original location, size, and design and with their original materials and numbers of panes. C. should be repaired rather than replace, but if replacement is necessary due to severe deterioration, the replacement should be in-kind to match the originals in material and design. E. should not have snap-on or flush muntins. These muntins are much thinner than the muntins on historic windows.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed new construction meets the Guidelines in terms of scale, design, and materials. The proposed structure must have a minimum front yard setback of 25 feet.

## Discussion

Sharman addressed the Committee. John Barshar manages the property and was also present. The house was heavily damaged during the April storms and had to be torn down. Applicant wants to build the house back using the same footprint. Found a house plan (without the garage) of what they want. The back of the house plan is more modern and we would take that off and make the plan simpler. The drive way would be to the back in accordance with the guidelines. The footprint of the current house is a 20' setback but we can move it back if need be. Scott stated this plan is not typical of what we see for this neighborhood. He liked the original picture but the drawing submitted tonight is a little different. What you have presented is not going to work. The picture is a family home but the original was a 2 story bungalow. Kevin would like to see something with more detail of what you plan to do before we move on. What is here does not fit the area but it may if we had more detail. We would have to deny this submission. If you want to stay in the footprint we don't have a problem with that. The Applicant is in the ballpark with the footprint and basic plan, but we need more information on the elevation and on the drawings.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**JoBeth made a motion to defer Case# 12-HZ-00027, 4109 Alabama Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines.**

**Michael seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### **CASE # 12-HZ-00028** **1614 W. 52<sup>nd</sup> Street**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Clark McNutt, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- Remove old non-historic porch
- Replace porch with newly constructed bedroom
- Repair front retaining wall
- Replace back stoop with 8'x8' deck

#### **APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**Sidewalks & Walkways, p. 85–C.** that are newly introduced to the property should be smooth concrete in patterns, dimensions, colors and placement like original or early sidewalks in the district.

**Additions, p.28 – C.** should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights, etc. **D.** should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period. **E.** should appear distinguishable from the historic building, not an exact copy of it. Additions should be contemporary in design but compatible with the original building. **F.** should be built in a manner that avoids extensive removal



or loss of historic materials and which does not damage or destroy the main architectural features of the building. G. should keep the exterior walls of the original building and use existing door and window openings for connecting the addition to the building. H. should not be made through framing or glassing in the front porch or a prominent side porch.

**Demolitions, p. 39** – A. of any original feature or part of a historic building should be avoided. B. of a building which contributes to the historic or architectural significance of the St. Elmo Historic District should not occur, unless:

1. public safety and welfare requires the removal of the building or structure;
2. if a building has lost its architectural and historical value and its removal will improve the appearance of the neighborhood;
3. if a building does not contribute to the historical or architectural character and importance of the district and its removal will improve the appearance of the neighborhood; or
4. if the denial of the demolition will result in an economic hardship on the applicant as determined by Section VIII of the Ordinance.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed new construction meets the Guidelines in terms of scale, design, location, and materials. All materials used for the proposed replacement of the historic retaining wall must be of similar type, style, scale, and color present throughout the neighborhood. The addition of a rear bedroom must be smaller in mass and scale, should be constructed with materials that complement the historic structure, while appearing distinguishable from the historic structure. The addition cannot extend further than the sides of the house and cannot be visible from the street. The addition cannot block or interfere with the use of the exterior kitchen door.

#### Discussion

Clark McNutt addressed the Commission. There are structural issues with the porch. There is a false wall next to the bathroom. It was an interior wall even though it was an outside porch originally. I want to square off the house with adding a new foundation and the bedroom. Looking at the construction cost, the plan may change. We are rewiring the house currently. Now we are planning on adding a bedroom only – 12'x13' where the porch is. There is hard board and we are planning on pulling that out and the contractor says he can replace it with same type as existing. The foundation is painted block and brick. The bedroom is going to go exactly where the porch is and then go out about 18" more making it cantilever over the original foundation. Originally thought about extending the foundation, but have decided against that. We are going to try to match the roofline. Scott we really need some drawings to see the final plan. We have a submitted drawing but you have changed what you want to do. The elevation will be the same as the submitted drawing. If I can cantilever 18" over the existing foundation I will do a 10'x13' bedroom. Conceptually, no problem. Kevin does not think structurally the foundation wall would carry the cantilever. The Commission cannot approve this without accurate drawings. Without the cantilever, the bedroom will be only 8'x13'. Scott does not feel we can approve this application with the changes you are proposing. We need elevation and site drawings.

The retaining wall. Next week will be taking the rock up but doubt if they can be reused. I want to try to restack it but if I can't, I want to put groundcover and let it take over. Scott would like to see it restacked. The wall goes all the way to the next house but only about half of it needs to be repaired. The guidelines do not cover removing and not replacing. Thomas, the building

inspector may not let you get away with putting ground cover only. Michael would like to see CMU up to the ok part and stucco all of it to property line.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Michael made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00028, 1614 W. 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are the demolition of the back porch denied, construction of bedroom denied, deck is denied. The rock wall is approved to remove and replace with restacking the existing stone or replace with CMU and stucco up to the property line.**

**Kevin seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00030**  
**4418 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Will and Kim Honeycutt, have applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the following work:

- Renovate attic adding master's suite
- Construction of back and side addition
- Add entry on west end of addition

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines*

**Additions, p.28** – C. should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights, etc. D. should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period. E. should appear distinguishable from the historic building, not an exact copy of it. Additions should be contemporary in design but compatible with the original building. F. should be built in a manner that avoids extensive removal or loss of historic materials and which does not damage or destroy the main architectural features of the building. G. should keep the exterior walls of the original building alone and use existing door and window openings for connecting the addition to the building. H. should not be made through framing or glassing in the front porch or a prominent side porch.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed new construction of the addition meets some of the Guidelines in terms of scale, design, location, and materials. The window design on the front façade of the proposed addition needs to resemble the historic window design and placement on the existing structure. There also should be no more than two windows of the same scale and design on the proposed front façade. The windows and entrance on the south façade of the proposed addition should be repositioned to line up with the windows on the existing structure to create a more uniform design. All window placements on the east façade should also lineup to continue the uniformity.

Note: There are no representations of dormers or the existing chimney on the drawings.

## Discussion

Kevin recused himself and he was sworn in since he will be speaking to the Commission on this case. Thomas also recused himself from this case.

Stacy we did receive a revised design today with some major differences, and provided that to the Commission. Kim Honeycutt addressed the Commission. Last month wanted to renovate the attic. As we looked more into it, we decided it was not feasible. It was suggested at the meeting last month that we go off the back of the structure. The retaining wall in the back needs to be replaced anyway and are looking at using that area for the new foundation. We want to rip off the existing addition and go 15' from there which goes to the holly tree and where the retaining wall is. All the windows, siding and roof would match the existing structure. You cannot see the addition from the street at all. The addition would not be easily visible from the side street (Seneca). There is no chimney in the back at present. We would like to add one at a later time. Applicant wants to use wood or Hardie that matches existing. The retaining wall material will be poured concrete. The window will be full light and will be wood clad one-over-one.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00030, 4418 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines.**

**Michael seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

Kevin and Thomas rejoined the Commission.

## **CASE # 12-HZ-00031** **825 Oak Street**

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Troy Bage, has applied for a "Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" for the Construction of new primary and secondary structures on an existing vacant lot.

Materials to include:

*Foundation* – stone veneer over concrete block

*Siding* – stucco

*Soffit* – decorative corbelling

*Roof* – architectural shingles

*Windows* – wood or clad-wood windows

*Doors* – wood or clad-wood doors

*Window & Door Trim* – wood

*Ceiling Heights* – 10' at first floor, 9' at second floor and basement

*Porches* – concrete floor; fiberglass or wood spindles/posts and columns

*Driveway and Walkways* – concrete or pavers

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:** *Design Guidelines for Fort Wood Historic District*

**Site Design (pp. 26-39) including Setback (p.28); Spacing (p. 27); Driveways and Off street Parking (p. 30-31); Yards and Alleys (p.32); Fences, Walls, and Walks (p. 33-34); Appurtenances (p. 36); Landscaping (p. 37-38); Signs and Outdoor Lighting (p. 39)**

and

**New Construction and Additions (pp 60-70) including Massing and Building Footprint (p. 61); Complexity of Form (p.62); Directional Expression (p.63); Orientation (p. 64); Height and Width (p.64); Scale (p.65); Roof (p.66); Openings: Doors & Windows (p.67); Porches and Porticos (p.68); Color (p. 68); Materials and Texture (p.69); Architectural Details (p. 70);**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The new construction, while similar in style with historic structures in the district, is not too imitative. The proposed new construction meets the Guidelines in terms of mass, building footprint, complexity of form, directional expression, orientation, height, width, and scale. The setbacks appear to meet the Guidelines for both the front and side yards, as do the roof pitch and roof style. The materials for the foundation, trim, roof, porches, driveway, and walkways also meet the guidelines. The stucco siding is acceptable under the Guidelines. The windows and doors are within the guidelines, as are the details and trim for the building.

Discussion

Troy Bage and Lori Blalock addressed the Commission. Think we have our drawings in order and believe it has improved the overall structure. The window over the front door is different. We have changed the window back to the arch because we like it better. The first floor windows are casements. The top floor windows are one-over-ones double hung. Windows underneath the overhang are one-over-ones. The corbels are going to be as drawn. The doors over the porch are full light French doors. The drawing is showing a tile roof on the garage, but it will match the house roof. Windows on the back, top floor are what we talked about and first floor are one-over-ones and the transom window has been split. The foundation will be multi-color cultured stone with stucco. JoBeth concerned about the multi-colored stone does not feel it looks like Fort Wood. The houses in Fort Wood have limestone or brick. Kevin likes the dimension and the style but not the color. Lori there is a limestone color in the stucco. Commission wants to see the same color stone. Applicant is agreeable to that. Roof will be single shingle. If asphalt shingle is what you can afford this sample is acceptable. Kevin thinks this is a fair compromise.

Scott Noll asked for any discussion from the audience.

Debbie Dunlap presented from the neighborhood. The size of the house is overwhelming. It will be the largest house on the street. When you come down Oak Street it will be hugely visible. Since this house is so visible, feel it should be done correctly with the style. When the house does not have the tile roof, it really changes the whole look. Troy stated the house is 4000 sq ft and there are multiple houses on the street that are that size or larger.

No one else to speak.

Michael stated the Applicants have worked with us and they have done what we have asked. I like the idea of the rock being the same. JoBeth – this is going to be a quality home but you are getting the last lot in Fort Wood and people are concerned. JoBeth wants the new construction to

compliment not detract. The house is busy and bold. Feels it will look like a suburban house in a historic neighborhood. Scott wants to make sure that the current plans are what goes in the files.

**Kevin made a motion to approve Case# 12-HZ-00031, 825 Oak Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are roof as submitted house and garage to match in color and style. The rock base to be one color**

**Michael seconded the motion. All in favor, 3 for and 2 against. The motion carries.**

### ***Staff Approved Certificates of Appropriateness***

**Michael made a motion to approve the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

A staff approval was done for Case 12-HZ-00029 and Kevin questions whether it should have come before the Commission. Will be discussed.

### ***OTHER BUSINESS***

Welcome to Sarah Kurtz. Sarah informed the Commission of her background and qualifications. She is open to any recommendations from the Commission to make things flow easier. JoBeth has some people that are out of compliance in the districts and wanted to be assured that Sarah would be combing the areas. Sarah wants to get with the city attorneys and go through the guidelines and update as needed.

The Commission suggested: It would be helpful to have page numbers on the slides in the power point; wants the materials lists included in the staff reports; would be helpful that the members of the Board focus on the current conversations and not have side conversations; members please speak up when asked for approvals. The Commission will make a list of projects that have deviated from what we have approved and give to Sarah to follow up.

### ***Announcements***

Next Meeting Dates – May 17<sup>th</sup>, June 21<sup>st</sup>

The Commission needs to appoint a new chair. Stacey stated that chair election is generally done by staff taking nominations from the Board and then the Board holds an election. We will check on this and take care of it at the next meeting. Scott will be missed.

### ***Adjournment***

**Kevin made a motion to adjourn. JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 pm by Scott Noll.**

**MINUTES**  
Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission  
May 17, 2012

The duly advertised and regularly scheduled meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held May 17, 2012 at 5:38 p.m., at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

**Attendance:**

The following Commission members were present: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Stuart Wood and Michael Prater

Absent: Ryan Fiser, Kevin Osteen, Mary Eastman, and Thomas Palmer

Staff members present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants present: None,

Community members present: None

Michael Prater announced there was not a quorum of the Board members present, therefore, the meeting would be recessed until Tuesday, May 22, 2012 at 5:30. Sarah Kurtz will contact all applicants and inform them of the change.

JoBeth made a motion to recess the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting until May 22<sup>nd</sup> due to the fact that there was not a quorum present. The motion was seconded by Stuart. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***

**JoBeth made a motion to adjourn. Stuart seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 pm by Michael.

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

May 22, 2012

The duly advertised and special called meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held May 22, 2012 at 5:35 p.m. (after being recessed at the regular scheduled meeting on May 17 due to there being no quorum of the Board present) at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Thomas Palmer, Mary Eastman, Kevin Osteen, and Michael Prater

Members Absent: Stuart Wood (active duty), and Ryan Fiser

Staff Members Present: Stacy Morrison, Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Michele Peterson, Steven and Sharman Sherfey, Carrie Meadows, Corey DeVaughn, and Anne McNutt.

Community Members Present: Mike Croxell

In accordance with the By-laws, the election of a new Chair and Vice-Chair need to be held. A nomination for Chair was made for Michael Prater and seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor. A nomination for Vice-Chair was made for Kevin Osteen and seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor.

Michael Prater explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

Kevin made a motion to approve the Minutes from the April meeting. The motion was seconded by Thomas. The motion was unanimously approved. Thomas made a motion to approve the Minutes from the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. The motion was seconded by Kevin. The motion was unanimously approved.

***OLD BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00026: 4209 Tennessee Avenue** (Deferred from April Meeting)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Chris and Michele Peterson, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness (“COA”) for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

## Discussion

Michele Peterson addressed the Committee. I tried to submit what you asked for at the last meeting. Thomas doesn't object to the size of the structure, there are houses that size a few streets over. Michael questions the rear elevation board and batten siding and using three different types of siding. Applicant is treating the basement as a crawl space and that is why there is no door to it. Michele stated that is the way Kevin's house is and that is what she patterned this house after. Michele asked if three or more materials on a structure have been approved before. Michael doesn't know and it really doesn't matter. Thomas feels there is just too much of the board and batten being used and may be better to install more windows to break it up. The lack of a window to the right of the front door makes the structure looks heavy. There is no window to the right of the door because there is a stairwell there. JoBeth is not bothered by the materials but am about the large expansions without a break. There is a mistake on the drawing with the windows, they are the same around. The material for the foundation is poured concrete. Brick veneer for the chimney.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

Mary feels the board and batten on the back overwhelms the house. Thomas and JoBeth would be happy with just poured foundation. Maybe pour the foundation walls and stucco or brick around the foundation. You could do block up to the first floor and stucco or scratch coat. Thomas, you can get a small window to the right of the door and balance the front façade out. Put one of the smaller windows like on the cedar at the porch on the right of the door. Getting two windows in the quadrant would help. Line up the top of the windows in the cedar with the rest of the window tops across the rest of the front of the house. Are you going to have the rafters exposed? Thomas suggests using tresses or rafter tails. Michael on the back, what are you showing for the windows? That is French doors – 6 of them. The windows across the top on the rear elevation should be vertical windows instead of horizontal. You will need to make sure the windows meet the ADA egress requirements from the bedrooms. There does need to be a door entering the crawl space. If the chimney matches the foundation material it would be nice to keep the chimney rather than delete it. The front porch does not have any railing just post at the corners. The porch columns are a 3"x3" or 4"x4". The Commission would like to see 6"x6" there. Triple columns with trim needs to be specified.

## **Motion:**

**Thomas Palmer made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00026, 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are: windows above front porch to have matching head heights to rest of windows. Add small window to the right of the front door as well as to the right hand quadrant of the façade with the stairs. The columns are to be triple with paint grade trim. The eave will have rafter tails squared off that is to be staff approved. The knee wall is to be capped all the way around. The windows that are side by side on the rear upper floor are to be broken apart. The foundation will be of block with scratch coat and paint with a crawl space full height door added. The chimney will be of matching material to the foundation or the owner has the option to delete the chimney. No foundation windows on the sides of the house.**



**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00027 - 4109 Alabama Avenue** (Deferred from April Meeting)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Steve and Sharman Sherfey, have applied for a COA for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

Discussion

Steven Sherfey addressed the Committee. The slope of the roof on the porch is 4x12 and the house is 9x12. I didn't show the soffit but there will be a soffit. The house is essentially the same as the other house we did, Hardie board siding, architectural shingles. The house that my great-grandfather built is what we want to build. The windows will be the same size all the way around. The front door will have two sidelights. The decorative window on the front will be something like the one on the original house with the same decorative window on both sides. Planning on a 2' overhang but forgot to show on the drawings. The garage is not attached, it is set behind the house. The porch will use 8" round columns on the front and 6" on the back. We are planning to keep the porch low enough so we don't have to use railings. There is 11' between the house and garage. The same materials will be used on the garage as on the house. You could do a covered walkway between the two. You could have a roof, a floor and a railing but it could not be a solid enclosed building. Kevin questioned Sarah's statement on the garage not being attached to the house. The guidelines were read by Sarah. It says it "should" not "shall". That means it could be an enclosed breezeway. Kevin felt the roof lines are a little troubling concerning water runoff. The Commission showed a couple of options to the roof lines and the breezeway to control the water runoff. The windows are vinyl clad, one over one double hung; wood front door with transom; and a carriage style door on the garage. The foundation height on the garage is whatever the rule is for termite prevention. The house will have a crawl space. The finished floor height will be 18" off the ground. There will be 2 or 3 steps from the garage to the house. When the architect drawings are done, have them reviewed by Sarah before building.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Kevin made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00027, 4109 Alabama Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are windows in the house are to be wood one over one vinyl clad, the garage is to be pushed back on the lot and attached to the house via a 4-5' breezeway, the house will have a brick veneer or stucco foundation, lights and gables are to match the drawings 8" round columns on the front, columns on rear are 6" square, the fascia and soffit are to have a 2" overhang.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

## ***NEW BUSINESS***

### **CASE # 12-HZ-00033 - 1504 W. 49<sup>th</sup> Street**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, John McDonald and Carrie Meadows, have applied for a COA for the following work:

- Screening in front porch
- Installing two ceiling fans on front porch

*This case will be heard in conjunction with*

### **CASE # 12-HZ-00036 - 1504 W. 49<sup>th</sup> Street**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, John McDonald and Carrie Meadows, have applied for a COA for the following work:

- Replace roof with architectural shingles
- Add gutters, downspouts and water barrels

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

#### **Discussion**

The applicant, John McDonald, addressed the Commission. The applicant wants to add some 2"x4" to support the screen and then paint it white to match the existing railing. There is a 10' space between the post now and can't find 10' wide screen. They will extend the railing out to meet the door. The screen will be behind the spindles then a 2" decorative strip on the outside of the screen to cover the 2"x4". Kevin feels you should use panels instead of running the screen. Use a 4'x4' to match what you have and build a casing to hold your panels and that would keep you from replacing the entire screen if you have problems with weather damage. The framed panels are nice but they are higher in cost. How are you going to put the ceiling fans and have them not be seen? The ceiling of the porch is 12" higher than the roof line you see from the street so they would not be seen from the street.

Carrie Meadows entered the discussion and was sworn in.

Either the way the applicants have presented is acceptable. The Commission suggested painting the trim a different color so they are almost transparent.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Kevin made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00033, 1504 W. 49<sup>th</sup> Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. The screen must be translucent and installed behind the porch railing. The ceiling fans are approved as long as they are installed so they are not seen from the street.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00036, 1504 W. 49<sup>th</sup> Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. No conditions**

**Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00038 - 0 Lynnwood Avenue (Parcel #167J F 012)**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Angelia Adams and Corey DeVaughn, have applied for a COA for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling
- Detached garage

*Since this case is the same property and the same building, this presentation is in conjunction with:*

**CASE # 12-HZ-00039 - 0 Lynnwood Avenue (Parcel 167J F 012.01)**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Angelia Adams and Corey DeVaughn, have applied for a COA for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling
- Detached garage

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

**Discussion**

The applicant, Corey DeVaughn, addressed the Commission. Corey asked if he should do two different styles of house on the two lots instead of the proposed same house on both lots. Yes the Board would prefer different houses. This house will be Case # 12-HZ-00039.

Corey has one change – wants to do the Hardie board but not the cedar siding. Wants to have a living space above the garage and put windows on the front and the back sides of the garage. Kevin, there are some code restrictions about living conditions over the garage that you will have to see about but this Board does not address that. No transoms over anything. The window will not be glass blocks, it will be a single glass picture window. The front porch will not be connected to the ground. There will be a brick foundation and a concrete poured porch. There will be no railing around the porch. There will be about 4-5 stairs to the door. Is the porch floor the same level as the house floor? Yes. The front steps will be brick. The lot is a sloped lot with the front at 36” and the rear at 48”. The stairs coming off the back deck will be more than 3 treads as shown on the drawing. The deck will be higher than that, probably about 4-5’. Will build up the foundation on the garage to make sure the roof line is lower than the main structure. This Committee will specify that this is a one story garage and to get it different you will have to go to permitting. The driveway will be strips. Thomas stated there is no defining beam at the roof line. There will be. The post will be square with decorative trim. All wood siding is Hardie board; roof is architectural shingles; door is plain upper glass. The top of the garage will have two

windows on the front and on the back or a square vent. The revised drawings will go to Sarah for final staff approval as long as in line with what is discussed here. All the windows will have the same height and are 305.

Mary has a problem with this application. The drawings are generic and the elevations are not consistent with the lot. The Board would like to see much more information on the proposed building. When we are talking about new construction, this is not sufficient material.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**JoBeth made a motion to deny Case # 12-HZ-00038, 0 Lynnwood Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00039, 0 Lynnwood Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are windows are 3'x5' wood, window on right facade is not glass block but will match other windows; the window heights are consistent on top edge and no transoms, they will be one-over-one; the garage is to be of one story in height and the upper space can be either 2 one-over-ones or square vent. The columns are 4"x4" square, the same as 5007 Tennessee Avenue. There needs to be a beam at the top of all columns. The front door will be wood with top light. There will be a belly beam on all sides. The trim accepted as listed on materials list. They will have a 4" reveal. The porch will have a brick foundation with concrete floor. The driveway will imitate the one at 1211 W 46<sup>th</sup> Street with strips; final drawings will be submitted and staff approved by Sarah.**

**Thomas seconded the motion. Four in favor and one opposed, the motion was carried.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00040 - 1614 W. 52<sup>nd</sup> Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Clark McNutt, has applied for a COA for the following work:

- Remove old non-historic porch
- Replace porch with newly constructed bedroom
- Replace back stoop with 8'x8' deck

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

### Discussion

Anne McNutt (for Clark McNutt) addressed the Commission. Applicant brought the elevations and additional information the Board requested at the last viewing. They are keeping the same roof line as existing and carrying it out. The bathroom stays. The new bedroom will be where the porch is now and extending out an additional 4' on the east and south sides. The foundation will be block and stucco to match the existing house. The deck will be laid over the existing stoop. The deck will be 6'x12' with 36" railing. Thomas concerned about the roof line at the back of the addition. Afraid the ceiling height will be only 7'. Michael also concerned about the slope over the addition. We think you will have structural issues with water runoff at the back corner of the house and a room with a 7' ceiling. The structural issues are not something we can speak to. The bump out is ok, but have issues with the roof line. Michael feels visually it looks like it is going too far out and not proportionate with the rest of the house. Anne, the addition will blend in with the rest of the house. JoBeth it is the shape of the roof that we are concerned about. JoBeth it is on the back of the house and they are making improvements. Let's give them some options and let them choose. Caution them to be careful with the roof material. It has to be a membrane roof.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Kevin made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00040, 1614 W. 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are addition work on the rear and side of property is approved as submitted, siding materials are approved. The shed roof is approved as submitted. A roofing membrane is required over the roof. The spindles on the deck are to match requirements.**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### Staff Approved Certificates of Appropriateness

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

No

### ***OTHER BUSINESS***

GENERAL NOTES: If the applicant is going to refer to other properties in the area – let's have pictures of those properties available to us. We need to see more detail on these projects, especially new constructions. Small changes at meeting are fine. Major things, such as the slope, should not be done here at this meeting. Michael feels the application should be deferred if they start making changes. We can help to a point but after that defer until they have better information.

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** June 21<sup>st</sup> and July 19<sup>th</sup>

**Kevin made a motioned to adjourn. Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 pm.**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Prater, Chairman

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

June 21, 2012

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held June 21, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Thomas Palmer, Kevin Osteen, Ryan Fiser, Mary Eastman and Michael Prater

Members Absent: Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Kevin Osteen representing Kim & Will Honeycutt; Brandon Carter.

Community Members Present: None

Michael Prater explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

Thomas made a motion to approve the Minutes from the May meeting. The motion was seconded by Kevin. The motion was unanimously approved.

***OLD BUSINESS***

None

***NEW BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00047 – 4418 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Kim & Will Honeycutt & Kevin Osteen, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alteration
  - Addition of Two-Story Porch
  - Changes to Preapproved Drawings

Kevin and Thomas recused themselves from the Board for the hearing of this case.

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

### Discussion

The applicant, Kevin Osteen, addressed the Commission. The proposed changes to a previously approved COA are acceptable according to the guidelines. The owner is trying to reduce cost by not bumping out the side. The footprint will be the same, just changes to a two story porch. The windows and door put on the side will match the windows and doors already approved and used on the rest of the structure.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00047, 4418 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions.**

**Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### **CASE # 12-HZ-00048 – 641 Battery Place**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Brandon Carter of Summit Property Restoration, LLC, representing owner Henry Lukin, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alteration
  - Replace Slate Roof with Copper
  - Replace Copper Gutters

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

### Discussion

The applicant, Brandon Carter of Summit Property Restoration, LLC, addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable by the guidelines. The roof was severely damaged by a hail storm and the owner does not want to replace with slate due to the damage. The copper is a more durable and pliable material. Brandon presented a sample of the copper. He also passed around photos of another home owned by Mr. Lukin with a copper roof. Within a month or two the copper will turn black and then will eventually turn to a green patina. The gutters will also be copper. Currently the entire home is slate. Board has not seen a lot of copper used around the area. This particular house was built in 2006.

The garage doors will be replaced with the same as what is currently being used.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Mary made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00048, 641 Battery Place, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Battery**



**Place Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions**

**Kevin seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00049 – 4712 Florida Avenue**

This case was withdrawn by applicant prior to the meeting.

**Staff Approved Certificates of Appropriateness**

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

No

**JoBeth made a motion to accept the staff approved COAs. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***OTHER BUSINESS***

None

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** July 19 and August 16

**Thomas made a motion to adjourn. Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 5:51pm.**

---

Michael Prater, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

July 19, 2012

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held July 19, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: Thomas Palmer, Kevin Osteen, Ryan Fiser, Mary Eastman and Michael Prater

Members Absent: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Andrew Fahsholtz, Dani T'Kanda, Jennifer Ware, Troy Bage

Community Members Present: Lorie Blalocke, Jeff Bestoy

Michael Prater explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

Mary made a motion to approve the Minutes from the June meeting. The motion was seconded by Thomas. The motion was unanimously approved.

***OLD BUSINESS***

None

***NEW BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00055 – 525 Battery Place**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Andrew Fahsholtz, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

**Discussion**

The applicant, Andrew Fahsholtz, addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines. Project started 2 or 3 years ago, fell through with that contractor and we picked it up this year. He did not know that permission had to be gotten for doing the work. As the project evolved, things changed and we saw more damage than expected. Renovation includes

installation of five (5) windows and replacement of two (2) windows on Unit 8. Windows are energy efficient and match other windows in the building. The new stucco will match existing building. Michael asked what the actual differences are. The glass at the door is a replacement in the same location. The exterior door below is rotten and a new door will be put there. The existing door is a one light door and we are putting a solid door. There was no handrail and we are putting one to bring it up to code. Windows 2, 3, 4 and 5 are new windows. Are there railings on any other units? There is not a consistent theme on the building. There is only one other deck on that side of the building and it is sitting on grade. There are 2 decks on the top of the building and they are of synthetic materials. The ultimate goal on this building is to bring it up to date, starting with this unit. At one point they were going to expand the building to add additional square footage but they never did that. Are there any other decks expanding out? Yes. Is the 2 window larger than the others and why do they not line up? The bedrooms do not line up and so to center in the bedroom, they are not lined up on the exterior. The 2 window is larger than the others. The block around the ground at the bottom door will be stuccoed to match the rest of the exterior. Railing looks good but does not match the rest of the building. When we pulled the permit, they did not inform us that it was a historic area and that we needed anything else.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

The railings are within the guidelines. The steel to hold up the deck is what exists for all the decks.

**Kevin made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00055, 525 Battery Place, #8, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Battery Place Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are the block wall facing the river on the rear of building is to be stuccoed.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

#### **CASE # 12-HZ-00056 – 4518 Tennessee Avenue**

##### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Dani T’Kanda, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- New Construction
  - Portable Storage Shed

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

##### **Discussion**

The applicant, Dani T’Kanda, and Jeff Bestoy addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines. Shed to be 10’x12’x8’1.5”, height was not specified. The chain link fence is to be extended 25’. There will be two sheds. The existing one is a little smaller than the proposed building. The roof pitch is a little lower. Michael asked if could match the roof pitch of the existing building. Yes. The shed will be portable and built on site. There will be no power ran to the building. There are no limits on the number of storage sheds on a property. The existing shed is a prefab shed. What would you think about matching the existing shed more than trying to match the house? The Board would prefer the new shed to match the existing shed on the pitch of the roof, the

roofing material and possibly even the siding. If this is going to be a permanent shed, Thomas would rather it match the house. The new shed is to be set off the ground so it would not be the same height as the existing shed. If you did one building to house two sides divided, it would make the shed larger than appropriate. Owner has a problem with one shed to be shared due to confidential issues. The plan is for the existing shed to be for tenants of the house (renters) and the larger shed for the owner's belongings. There is nothing in the guidelines against having more than one shed but the Board is looking at this as setting precedence.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Mary made a motion to deny Case # 12-HZ-00056, 4518 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions**

**Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion carried with four votes to approve and one against.**

#### **CASE # 12-HZ-00057 – 4712 Florida Avenue**

##### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Jennifer Ware, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Rehabilitation & Exterior Building Alterations
  - Front & Rear Porches

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

##### **Discussion**

The applicant, Jennifer Ware, addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines. Sarah has suggested that at least on the front the round spindles be used but owner would like to use the round spindles on the back porches due to cost. Michael asked the owner what she thought about what Sarah stated about the 36" vs. the 42" baluster. The owner agrees to the 36". Owner agrees to use the round spindles in the front and the square in the back. The existing railing will be removed, it was a temporary measure. The lattice will also be replaced with similar wood lattice. The railings at the back porches are not required for code due to the height of the porch. There are only two steps from the ground to the porch. The Board feels you may not like the look without the railing.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Thomas made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00057, 4712 Florida Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are that the railing height is approved at 36" and the railing spindles in the front are to be turned Victorian style spindles and the spindles in the back can be the round or square. The lattice is to be wood.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00058 – 825 Oak Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Troy Bage, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- New Construction
  - Change to previously approved plans
- Removal of Hackberry Trees

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

**Discussion**

The applicant, Troy Bage and Lori Blalock, addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines. Owner wants to move the garage back and that places it in the drip line of two trees. Sarah has letters from neighbors that they are okay with the removal of the trees. Gene Hyde, the City Forrester, is okay with the removal of the trees, feeling one of them is possibly a safety issue and should be removed. The hackberry trees are not a favored tree. Michael asked if anything is changing about the garage. The only thing is the foundation will not be as high as originally thought.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Mary made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00058, 825 Oak Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions**

**Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.**

***STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS***

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

No

**Kevin made a motion to accept the staff approved COAs. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***OTHER BUSINESS***

Review and discuss updates/changes to CHZC Bylaws and Ordinances. Let us know if you have any questions or concerns. We are hoping to get these approved by September.

Michael would like to move Old Business after the New Business. Accepted

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** August 16 and September 20

**Mary made a motioned to adjourn. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 pm.**

---

Michael Prater, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

August 16, 2012

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held August 16, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: Thomas Palmer, Ryan Fiser, Mary Eastman and Michael Prater

Members Absent: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Stuart Wood (active duty), Kevin Osteen

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Dani T'Kanda, Jeff Besley, Stuart Gaines, Ryan Coulter

Community Members Present: None

Michael Prater explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

*Since we don't have a quorum, the Board decided to go ahead and hear the presentation of the cases, but will recess the meeting and hold the motions and voting at a future time. If there is a need for additional information from the applicants at that time, they will be contacted.*

***NEW BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00066 – 841 Fortwood Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Stuart Gaines and Anthony Shaw, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

**Discussion**

The applicant, Stuart Gaines, addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines. Staff would prefer the siding to match the main structure more than the existing siding on the garage structure. The applicant will enclose the HVAC equipment with a wood fence to make it less noticeable. Michael asked if the existing windows are entry level double hung wood. They were installed by the previous owner. Thomas – the belly band under the windows – is it only on one side? Yes, it does not continue all the way around. The owner is willing take it all the way around if that is

what the Board requests. The Board would like to see it taken all the way around so it would match the main house. There are about 10-20 tiles needing replaced. All trim would be white to match existing. The 15-light door would go on the ends as entrances to the apartments. The three panel half-light door will go on the front of the garage, matching the main house door. The Board feels the entire building should be painted (the former owner had started painting). The Board would like to see the paint color closer to the color of the main building. The opening in the garage at the back will be a small window to a laundry room. The small openings on the rear of the apartments, the owner would prefer to make them higher transom windows. They are in the shower stalls so that would provide a little more privacy. There will be three different size windows on the back of the apartment part (there are currently three different sizes there). Thomas concerned about shrinking the small windows to transoms, that they will have a more modern look. The HVAC unit will be centered on the rear wall with a gray painted wood fence around it.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Motion and voting to be held at a later meeting.**

**CASE # 12-HZ-00067 – 4518 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Dani T’Kanda, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- New Construction
  - Addition to Portable Storage Shed

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

Discussion

The applicants, Dani T’Kanda, and Jeff Besley addressed the Commission. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines. Addition is 12’x8’ which will make the final unit 18’x8’. All materials will match existing. The fence will be moved back 25’ to accommodate the addition.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Motion and voting to be held at a later meeting.**

***OLD BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00026 – 4209 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Chris and Michele Peterson, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness (“COA”) for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling

This case was originally heard in May of 2012. The following motion was made and approved:



**Thomas Palmer made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00026, 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are: windows above front porch to have matching head heights to rest of windows. Add small window to the right of the front door as well as to the right hand quadrant of the façade with the stairs. The columns are to be triple with paint grade trim. The eave will have rafter tails squared off that is to be staff approved. The knee wall is to be capped all the way around. The windows that are side by side on the rear upper floor are to be broken apart. The foundation will be of block with scratch coat and paint with a crawl space full height door added. The chimney will be of matching material to the foundation or the owner has the option to delete the chimney. No foundation windows on the sides of the house.**

Follow up drawings were requested from Ms. Peterson but never submitted. Michele has since sold the property and will not be building. It is, therefore, recommended by staff that this project be denied.

**Motion and voting to be held at a later meeting.**

***STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS***

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness? No

**Motion and voting to be held at a later meeting.**

***OTHER BUSINESS***

Updates/changes to CHZC Bylaws and Ordinances.

Staff made a proposal to change the date of the December meeting from December 20 to December 13, and change the deadline for submittals date from December 6<sup>th</sup> to November 29 due to the holidays.

**Motion and voting to be held at a later meeting.**

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** September 20 and October 18

**A follow up meeting will be held on Monday, August 20, 2012 at 5:30.**

**Michael adjourned the meeting.**

---

Michael Prater, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

August 20, 2012

The recessed meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held August 20, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1B. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: Thomas Palmer, Ryan Fiser, Kevin Osteen, Mary Eastman and Michael Prater

Members Absent: JoBeth Kavanaugh, Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: None

Community Members Present: None

Michael Prater announced that the meeting was being recorded.

Since we did not have a quorum at the regularly scheduled meeting on August 16, the Board decided to go ahead and hear the presentations at that time and reconvene on August 20 to hear the motions and voting.

Thomas made a motion to approve the Minutes from the July meeting. Ryan seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

***NEW BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00066 – 841 Fortwood Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Stuart Gaines and Anthony Shaw, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation

**Thomas made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00066 – 841 Fortwood Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are the belly band that is existing on one side be continued all around the structure; all windows be one over one double hung wood windows; the HVAC equipment is approved provided that a wood fencing screen is provided in a color to match the existing stone; the entire structure that is painted currently be repainted, trim to be white, the main field to be a color that is taken**

from the existing house, one of the darker two tones of the brick on the main house, preferable one of the gray tones, and that color to be staff approved after staff shows the choices to the Board; the two bathroom windows to be one over one windows.

Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.

**CASE # 12-HZ-00067 – 4518 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Dani T’Kanda, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- New Construction
  - Addition to Portable Storage Shed

Kevin questioned putting the building on a slab vs. skid for structural stability. You would not be able to see the slab from the street or neighbors.

**Kevin made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00067, 4518 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions**

Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.

***OLD BUSINESS***

**CASE # 12-HZ-00026 – 4209 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Chris and Michele Peterson, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness (“COA”) for the following work:

- New construction, single family dwelling

This case was originally heard in May of 2012. The following motion was made and approved:

**Thomas Palmer made a motion to approve Case # 12-HZ-00026, 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Guidelines. Approval is subject to any and all conditions. Conditions are: windows above front porch to have matching head heights to rest of windows. Add small window to the right of the front door as well as to the right hand quadrant of the façade with the stairs. The columns are to be triple with paint grade trim. The eave will have rafter tails squared off that is to be staff approved. The knee wall is to be capped all the way around. The windows that are side by side on the rear upper floor are to be broken apart. The foundation will be of block with scratch coat and paint with a**

**crawl space full height door added. The chimney will be of matching material to the foundation or the owner has the option to delete the chimney. No foundation windows on the sides of the house.**

Follow up drawings were requested from Ms. Peterson but were never submitted. It is, therefore, recommended by staff that this project be denied.

**Ryan made a motion to deny Case # 12-HZ-00026, 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions.**

**Kevin seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### ***STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS***

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

No

**Thomas made a motion to accept the staff approved COAs. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### ***OTHER BUSINESS***

Updates/Changes to CHZC Bylaws and Ordinances. Major change would be adding a \$25 fee for staff approval and \$50 for presenting cases before the Board. Kevin and Mary are opposed to the addition of fees. This is the only Board that does not charge fees. Members feel that if we add a fee it is going to destroy any feeling of good will and cooperation that has been established. The \$25 is not enough to cause this kind of problem. Thomas and Kevin suggested that a fee be added to the permit for historic areas instead of being charged at the front end. Mary questions if the other boards charge a fee shouldn't we do the same. Maybe this is something the city should mandate – not this Board.

**Mary made a motion to go forward with the changes to the Bylaws and Ordinances without the addition of fees. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

Staff made a proposal to change the date of the December meeting from December 20 to December 13, and change the deadline for submittals date from December 6<sup>th</sup> to November 29 due to the holidays.

**Kevin made a motion to approve the change of the December meeting date to December 13 and the deadline for submittals to November 29. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** September 20 and October 18

**Kevin made a motioned to adjourn. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.**

---

Michael Prater, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

September 20, 2012

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held September 20, 2012 at 5:32 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: Thomas Palmer, Kevin Osteen, JoBeth Kavanaugh, Mary Eastman, William Shealy and Michael Prater

Members Absent: Ryan Fiser, Stuart Wood (active duty)

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Walter Harrison, Brian Roack, Arlen Morgan, Anthony Shaw, Robert Gustafson, Lynn Smith, Jonathan Clark, Al Jayne, Matt McGee

Community Members Present: None

Michael Prater explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

**Thomas made a motion to approve the Minutes from the August meetings. The motion was seconded by JoBeth and was unanimously approved.**

***NEW BUSINESS***

**CASE #12-HZ-00069 – 4500 Alabama Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Walter Harrison, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Site Improvements/Changes
  - Retaining Wall

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. The work was started before an application was submitted and staff issued a stop work notice until it could be presented to the Board. The wall will measure 5 foot 10 inches and is pursuant to the City Code. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines.

**Discussion**

The applicant, Walter Harrison, addressed the Commission. We have owned this house 25 years and did not know I had to come here to get approval. We wanted to put a fence across the back of the property and there are 22 trees across the lot. We started taking the trees down and then the wall started

crumbling. The inspector and engineers are fine with the placement. Applicant will have to add the geo grid to the wall and it will need to go 8 blocks high. Presently the wall is 6 high. Applicant is planning on putting a fence up after the wall is complete.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Mary made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00069, 4500 Alabama Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions.**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### **CASE #12-HZ-00073 – 841 Fort Wood Street**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Stuart Gaines and owner Anthony Shaw, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. We will be talking primarily about the back building and the railing. The contractor has a hardy board that will match the existing siding. The applicant returned due to the fact that the Board did not deny closing the window in the bathroom. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines.

#### Discussion

The applicant, Anthony Shaw, addressed the Commission. The Board agreed to a smaller window as long as it was a one-over-one. There is not a one-over-one the size of the proposed window, therefore, applicant proposes closing up the windows. The applicant would prefer a smaller fixed square or rectangle window to closing it up. The contractor is confident that the hardy board he has found would match the existing siding for closing the window or making them smaller.

The building inspector said the spacing is too wide between the rails and is shorter than code allows. He also felt the railing is not in good shape and is unstable. Sarah spoke to the inspector and he is concerned because this is rental property. The existing railing is between 29 and 30 inches high and code requires 36 inches. The applicant is proposing a wooden railing. The Board feels 36 inches is too high and that the wood railing will not match the integrity of the building. The Board would prefer wrought iron or aluminum. The Board would like the applicant to talk to the inspector and see if he could raise the railing and secure what is there. In the event that fails, return to the Board next month with some material options.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Thomas made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00073, 841 Fort Wood Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions: Approve the change to the bathroom windows to be square in proportion and reduced in size to no less than the vertical dimension being equal to the current horizontal dimension. The area closed in to make the window square to be filled in with siding to match the existing siding. We defer the railing portion for a month so applicant can present material options.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### **CASE #12-HZ-00074 – 4303 Tennessee Avenue**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Jamie Malone with Hullco Exteriors and Arlen Morgan, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. We are discussing the windows on the top floor of the left façade of structure. The proposed project is possibly acceptable according to the guidelines.

#### **Discussion**

The applicants, Arlen Morgan and Brian Roack from Hullco, addressed the Commission. The existing windows are drafty and hard to open and close. We propose to remove the existing window sashes and install an insert replacement window made of vinyl with the same configuration as existing. Then we would repair any damaged wood and clad the existing and repaired wood with a PVC coating. The appearance would be exactly the same but would be greatly more efficient. Brian presented a sample of the replacement proposed. This is what is used for historical structures. There is damage to the wood and sashes at almost every window. The owner is concerned about future deterioration. Has any repair been done previous to this? The owner has replaced a pane in one window. The Board feels more inspection needs to be done to determine the extent of the damage to the existing windows. The Board never has approved full vinyl windows and very few times vinyl clad. Vinyl windows would be very noticeable on a house with original wood windows. The jam depth is 3 inches deep and we can float the replacement to match the existing jam depth. The Board's main concern is using the full vinyl. Is any of the trim rotten? The vertical trim is not rotted, the sashes is where it gets tricky. Although this particular product may be of a better quality, there are other brands that are not of this quality and the Board cannot recommend or endorse particular products.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**JoBeth made a motion to deny Case #12-HZ-00074, 4303 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines.**



**Kevin seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #12-HZ-00075 – 4209 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Robert Gustafson, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- New Construction
  - Primary Structure

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. New construction to be a one and a half story structure facing the street. The drawings are not acceptable and staff recommends this project be deferred for more exact drawings with dimensions.

Discussion

The applicant, Robert Gustafson, addressed the Commission. The applicant got the plans at the library. For the most part, I would like to mimic the drawings but they would not be exact. The applicant got inspiration from pictures but has a contractor that will do the project and make more explicit drawings. The submitted drawings do not give us enough information to make a ruling. We would have to see elevations of all sides of the house. The slope of the property does not match the drawings, so that is a concern with approving breaking ground.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**William made a motion to defer Case #12-HZ-00075, 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines.**

**Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #12-HZ-00076 – 1501 W. 48<sup>th</sup> Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Jonathan Clark for owner, Lynn Smith, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Fence

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. East side yard 3 foot picket fence is acceptable. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines.

Discussion

The applicant, Jonathan Clark for owner, Lynn Smith, addressed the Commission. Kevin asked how far into the yard will the fence sit on Virginia Avenue (north) side? It will come off the gable and tie into the existing back corner of the stoop.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Thomas made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00076, 1501 W. 48<sup>th</sup> Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions**

**Kevin seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.**

### **CASE #12-HZ-00078 – 941 McCallie Avenue**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Al Jayne, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Rehabilitation
  - Exterior Building Alterations
  - Site Improvements
  - Retaining Wall
- Demolition
  - Part of Primary Structure

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. The demolition will be of the two top levels and the front porch (added on). Queen Anne features are acceptable. Trim materials and corbels need to be decided on. The proposed project is acceptable according to the guidelines.

#### **Discussion**

The applicant, Al Jayne, addressed the Commission. The house needs a tremendous amount of work. It is obvious that what was originally built is not close to what is there now. We want to make this a single dwelling, possibly with an office. It would be difficult to get a consistent look with brick and that is why applicant wants to use stucco. We would like to get going with the roofing because it is leaking badly. I would like to take the part on the back off because it was an add-on, but the architect left it on these drawings. Applicant is not planning to occupy the basement, just use for utility purposes, but does not want to put glass there. The gazebo and breezeway looks too much like new construction. Applicant is agreeable to just wrapping the porch with no breezeway and gazebo, or bringing the gazebo in to the side of the house instead of being separated with the breezeway.

Today applicant would like to get approval for the removal of the top floor, roof and the front portion so he can close it in. Sarah has talked with the inspector and he feels they need to seal it off. Thomas – need to add a beam element around the roof of the porch and at the top floor (applicant will make that consistent throughout); the foundation on both sides of the front porch will be limestone. Michael feels we need to approve plans 1, 3, 4 and 5 and then defer the rest of the proposal so applicant can go ahead and close in. The Board would like to see material differentiation.

Matt McGee addressed the Board. There is an artistic rendition that we had prior to this drawing showing a different layout with the gazebo. He will e-mail it to Sarah and she will forward it on to the Board members.

Michael asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Thomas made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00078, 941 McCallie Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. We approve staff report Items 1, 3, 4 and 5 with the one exception - the gazebo portion on the southwest corner being deleted or re-designed and presented at a later time. The rest of the submittal is deferred until the October or November meeting of the CHZC.**

**William seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.**

### ***OLD BUSINESS***

None

### ***STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS***

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

No

**Mary made a motion to accept the staff approved COAs. William seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### ***OTHER BUSINESS***

New Member – William Shealy

Meeting Dates for 2013

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** October 18 and November 15

**JoBeth made a motion to adjourn. William seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.**

---

Michael Prater, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**  
**OCTOBER 18, 2012**

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held October 18, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: Ryan Fiser, JoBeth Kavanaugh, Kevin Osteen, Thomas Palmer, Michael Prater

Members Absent: Mary Eastman, William Shealy, Stuart Wood

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz and Dottie Burns

Applicants Present: Robert Gustafson, Lee Courtney, Bob and Dody Campbell, and Paul Teruya

Community Members Present: Samuel Ramirez, Raymond Tillard, Doug Hightshue, James Johnson, and Yeedo Hoshino

Michael Prater explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Dottie Burns swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

***OLD BUSINESS:***

**Case #12-HZ-00075: 4209 Tennessee Avenue**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: New Construction: Single-family dwelling.

The applicant is Robert Gustafson. He has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction. The proposed shape, scale, orientation and placement on lot, height, roof shape and pitch, fascia and soffit, gutters and downspouts and windows are acceptable and the proposed doors/entrances, foundation, exterior materials, front porch and rear deck and driveway are acceptable.

Samuel Ramirez addressed the Board. He said this was a single family dwelling that was going to be for sale. He said there would be no chimney.

Ms. Kavanaugh said the metal door was not acceptable and asked for a wooden door. She said the spindles and metal door were her concerns. Mr. Ramirez said he could go with a wood door. He said he would put in a small front gable. He said the rafters were going to be covered by bead board and would not show. Mr. Palmer asked if the gables were going to be open and Mr. Ramirez said yes and would measure 4 x 6. The spindles are to be 2 x 2, exposed rafter tails, front (wood trim) are to be 4 x 6.

**Ryan Fiser made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00075 – 4209 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions.**

**Conditions are: exposed rafter tails, change door to a wooden white door, porch (wood trim) to be 4 x 6 wood, spindles on front and back porches to be 4 x 6.**

**Stuart Wood seconded. All in favor, the motion carried unanimously.**

***NEW BUSINESS:***

**Case #12-HZ-00086: 5301 Tennessee Avenue**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Exterior building alterations and installation of a rear deck and parking area. The applicant is Lee Courtney. Mr. Courtney has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work: exterior building alterations, rehabilitation, restoration, new construction and deck.

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. The proposal is to replace a historic window on the 53<sup>rd</sup> Street façade with a transom. The transom window material is to be wood, 10 x 12 in length is possibly acceptable. The proposal to replace middle window on rear façade with a door leading onto a 12 x 6 deck is possibly acceptable. The door material is to be wood with some light. The proposal to enclose old stoop and add a vinyl clad wood window on rear façade is possibly acceptable. The proposal to install wood handrails on front porch to code is acceptable. The proposal to install a new wood deck on the rear is acceptable which should measure 12 x 6 and 6' off of the ground. The proposal to enclose extra basement openings on rear façade with brick is possibly acceptable. The proposal to lay a gravel parking area in rear / side is acceptable.

Lee Courtney addressed the Board. Mr. Courtney said they want to make the plexy glass a transom window. It will stay where it is but will be smaller in width and will go further to the right.

Raymond Tillard addressed the Board. Mr. Tillard said in order to get a 5' shower line, you can only get a certain amount of transom window length. He said it will be more of a horizontal window that will measure 12" or 13" high and 2' wide.

Discussion

Ms. Kavanaugh asked if the door was part of this request. Mr. Courtney said it was the back door. Mr. Palmer asked if they were going to match the siding and Mr. Courtney said they were going to match what is there now. They were going to replace the window pane in the kitchen. Ms. Kavanaugh asked how they would enclose the foundation. Mr. Courtney said they would re-brick and paint the brick. They would take off the ply board, bond it and tie it in properly. Mr. Wood asked if they could salvage the windows. Mr. Courtney said they were in bad condition but the windows were going to be identical. All the windows will be replaced. Mr. Tillard said the windows would be double insulated glass, wood windows, wood clad. Mr. Wood said the windows would have to be staff approved. Mr. Palmer asked what the new back door would be made of and Mr. Courtney said wood with some glass. Mr. Prater asked about the railing on the back and if that was the design they were going to stick with. Mr. Courtney said not necessarily, just the spindles. Mr. Wood asked if the deck was going to be a few inches down from the door and Mr. Courtney said yes. He said top rails would be 2 x 4 or 2 x 6. Mr. Courtney said they are not enclosing the front porch. The back crawl space would be a wood door. Mr. Courtney said they did not know about the driveway and parking area. Mr. Palmer said they would

defer that portion so as not to hold them up. Mr. Courtney asked if the windows can be full view or do they have to be divided as shown in the picture. The Board preferred to keep them the way they were. Mr. Palmer asked if they were re-roofing. Mr. Courtney said yes they are fixing that valley and it was a 3/12 pitch and they would just replace that area with matching shingles. They would match the rafter tails and soffit. Mr. Courtney said they would just as soon paint the brick the way the brick is now. The porch would be the last thing.

**Thomas Palmer motioned to approve case 12-HZ-00086 – 5301 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: site plan is deferred to November, applicant to provide detailed site plan, porch design, and detailed drawings as to the back deck with stairs, front porch will not have railing and pickets as shown in application. Although all codes must be met with drop off with planters, all exterior doors will be staff approved wood with glass, windows with transom 1' tall match existing. Width, match all existing siding, all windows to be replaced and staff approved, match existing 2/2 existing pattern, true divided light wooden profile, all repaired rafter conditions to match existing house. Openings at the crawl space will be brick to match existing. Size and match with existing running bond, new door at the crawl space will be new and siding on the new enclosed stoop to match existing as well.**

**JoBeth seconded. All in favor, the motion carried.**

#### **Case #12-HZ-00087: 5401 Ansley Drive**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Window replacement and front façade replacement

The applicants, Bob and Dody Campbell have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work: exterior building alterations, windows and siding. The proposal to replace all windows on the main floor of structure due to age and deterioration is possibly acceptable. The proposal to replace all windows with aluminum is not acceptable.

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

Bob Campbell and Doug Hightshue addressed the Board. Mr. Hightshue said they want to take the brick façade down. They want to replace all damaged. The existing windows are aluminum windows and they want to replace with vinyl windows to make it more insulating and give it a better look. He said 3 of those houses have vinyl windows as well and the look is attractive. There is nothing on the block that really matches the historic house. Mr. Hightshue said it is more replacing the vinyl clad to get a better look and get the R value.

#### **Discussion:**

Ms. Kavanaugh said it looked like they had an exterior profile. Mr. Palmer said they do not mind the vinyl clad. Mr. Palmer said it is less about look but more about longevity. The proposal said it was for a vinyl window, not aluminum. Mr. Hightshue said that would have to be a solid pane in the front. The windows on the left are single light, double hung. This is all the windows in the house. They will keep the same size of the windows. They don't want to mess with the siding. They will have the concrete

looking shingles all around. They said it would look like imitation cedar shake. Mr. Palmer asked if there would be a paint scheme but Mr. Hightshue said it would stay gray. Mr. Osteen said the house was on a back road and not on a main road even though he was not for vinyl windows and can lean towards approval because they are making a number of improvements to the house. This is a 1950's house and the windows are appropriate for the period. They were not replacing doors.

**Stuart Wood motioned to approve Case #12-HZ-00087 – 5401 Ansley Drive, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: replacement of all exterior windows with vinyl. Design will be identical to current windows except large picture window, removing brick and shutters, repair and replace underneath. Horizontal trim is to be required under front gable, first and second courses of existing siding, strong suggestion to paint siding below that existing piece of trim, and to paint the part below that with darker.**

**JoBeth Kavanaugh seconded.**

Mr. Hightshue said he misunderstood the windows, large picture on the center with 2 1/1 windows on the side.

**Stuart Wood moved to amend to specify that the front picture window will be replaced by a picture window with 2 1/1 windows in keeping with the windows.**

**Ryan seconded. All in favor motion carried.**

#### **Case #12-HZ-00088: 4303 Alabama Avenue**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: New construction: Single-family dwelling  
The applicant is RTB Holdings LLC and Paul Teruya.

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

Paul Teruya addressed the Board. He said they are high energy efficient buildings. They are going to mirror the image what is on this plan. It will be a better layout for the garage to be flipped on the other side. It will be a pine front door, half light. They usually do metal on the rear.

#### **Discussion:**

Ms. Kavanaugh asked if this was going to be a half light with a transom over it. Mr. Teruya said there was an old retaining wall there on the rear which they would keep. He said they do have a deeded access from the rear. They will clean up the alley. The driveway has some elevation toward the rear. The windows are 5 x 2. Ms. Kavanaugh said she was okay with the transoms. Mr. Osteen said he was not sure about the front side matching the elevation, not being appropriate for the neighborhood the way it is designed. He said he can live with the back but the front is not for St. Elmo. Mr. Wood said a lot of it comes from the pitch of the roof. He said something like a 10/12 would be better. Instead of a shed roof coming off the edge and increasing the pitch, adding a vent or detailed gable would be better. He

said the house would look taller by breaking it up. Mr. Palmer said it was a nice looking house but the proportions are bothering them. He said to look at a hipp roof and match the proportions to the rest of the windows in the house. Two roof pitch changes and three window changes would make a difference. Kevin said a 12/12 would be great. It should give a lot of attic space by adding a vent and gable and lowering the pitch would make the windows longer. Soffits are 12" hardy soffit, fascia details gutter material is aluminum 6" gutters. Mr. Wood said he liked exposed rafter tails. Open rafter tails with fascia boarding is okay. He would prefer to box it in but is okay with what the Board decides. Mr. Fiser asked about the pitch of the house and the pitch of the garage.

James Johnson addressed the Board. He said that piece of property is a little bigger than a tennis court, it is 47' wide. He felt it was inappropriate to put a big house between little houses. He hoped they could get a survey of the property before it is approved. He said all the codes would be violated if the Board allowed this. Mr. Palmer said by code the house will have to meet all the setbacks and they would need to get a survey. This Board approves the design of the house. The code issues will be down the road and this Board does not have jurisdiction over that.

Yeedo Hoshino addressed the Board. She said her house looks right to the back of this property. She has some of the same concerns about property lines. The look of the driveway and the back of the garage are some of her concerns. Ms. Kavanaugh said this is for new construction and is not supposed to look like an old house. Mr. Wood said the guidelines are less stringent on the back of the house rather than the front. Ms. Hoshino said she has seen the design but was just wondering if there was anything about the design of the garage, like doors, etc. Ms. Kurtz said the City would have to address the driveway. There is no alley or drive shown. Ms. Hoshino said it is supposed to be a shared driveway.

Mr. Teruya said he would be happy to meet with the neighbors and discuss the deed. They plan to put down gravel in an alley. Ms. Kurtz said an alley is a public ROW.

Mr. Osteen said the house is built and placed as submitted, exposed rafter tails, alley will be addressed some place else, change roof pitch to 12/12 on entire house, hipp roof over the porch and lower the roof to enable the windows to be resized to match existing. The layout is going to be built mirror image with front door on the left, pad on back is to be concrete pad, gutters 6' alum, break the fascia across the front gable, add a vent or gable.

**Kevin Osteen motioned to approve Case #12-HZ-00088 – 4303 Alabama Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: soffit is denied, exposed rafter tails, change the pitch 12/12 entire house, porch to hipp with lower ridge, windows will change to match the windows on the side elevations, the front gable will change and the vent or window to be staff approved, and the door on the side elevation is deleted, the walkthrough door is deleted, the parking pad in back to be concrete, gutters are to be 6" aluminum.**

**JoBeth Kavanaugh seconded. All in favor, the motion was approved.**

**Mr. Osteen amended this motion for any other future drawings to be staff approved to include a break in the front gable trim to give some separation, eliminate the front fascia and provide a trim detail.**



**JoBeth Kavanaugh seconded. All in favor, the motion was approved.**

**Case #12-HZ-00089: 121 Ochs Hwy.**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Site Improvements: Repair/removal of retaining walls and patio area

**Stuart Wood recuses himself from this case.**

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. The applicants, Stuart and Kimberly Wood, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work: site improvements/changes and retaining wall.

Stuart Wood addressed the Board. Mr. Wood said the winds knocked down a lot of trees. The retaining walls were damaged because of the trees falling across them. Mr. Wood would like to remove all the earth, salvage all the stone out of the wall and then remove a bit of terraced area to widen the fire pit and put an 8' wall to lengthen. The depth of this is about 12-13'. There is a little patio just behind the house. The wall will be brought back. A section will be repaired. The upper wall will be 8' and then another wall will be 3' and then there will be rounded terraces that will step down. It will be a nicer version of what is there now. The stone that is salvaged should be sufficient to repair the wall. The parking area could be squared off, extend the retaining wall. Face it with new or salvaged brick and maybe cap it with stone. He wants to match the existing stone. He said they need a staircase to build up to the wall that will run up the stone to get to the second level. They want to build a detached garage and there was a carport there but trees knocked it down. They want to build it in the same footprint in what was there. Stuart said they would go with stone or concrete paver with symmetrical pattern or they will go with brick. They may do some sort of stamped concrete. They want to go from where this new area starts to the rock. The height of the wall is about 8'. They want the wall to be about a foot high with a low fence. Michael said he could come back with patio material.

Mr. Palmer said it might tie it in together by using the stone at 3' to break up the vertical to give you the stone consistency, use brick.

**Discussion:**

Excavate the rock, remove the dirt to come back to us, do brickwork and terrace the land.

**JoBeth Kavanaugh motioned to approve Case # 12-HZ-00089 – 121 Ochs Hwy, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: removal and movement of any rock and brick on site, any exaction and actual terracing to be done as submitted, a staircase can be built at the foot of the huge rock, as long as it is rock and brick, any other materials will come back thru for the patio, this is for the retaining walls that have been submitted.**

**Kevin Osteen seconded. All in favor, the motion was approved.**

*Staff Approved COA's:*

*Other Business:*

Announcements: Next meeting dates November 15, December 13

The meeting was adjourned.

---

Michael Prater, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

November 15, 2012

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held November 15, 2012 at 5:37 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Kevin called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll. Due to the absence of Chairman Michael Prater, Vice Chairman Kevin Osteen will be conducting the meeting.

Members Present: Kevin Osteen, JoBeth Kavanaugh, Mary Eastman, William Shealy, and Ryan Fiser

Members Absent: Michael Prater, Stuart Wood and Thomas Palmer

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Al Jayne, Matt McGee, Matthew Parks, Stuart Bickley, Jennifer Ware, John Santoro of Tristor Development, LLC, and Matthew & Catherine Martin

Community Members Present: None

Kevin explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

**Mary made a motion to approve the Minutes from the October meeting. The motion was seconded by William and unanimously approved.**

***OLD BUSINESS***

**CASE #12-HZ-00078 – 941 McCallie Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Al Jayne, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Rehabilitation
  - Exterior Building Alterations
  - Site Improvements
  - Retaining Wall
- Demolition
  - Part of Primary Structure

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. The demolition will be of the two top levels and the front porch (added on).

## Discussion

The applicant, Al Jayne, addressed the Commission. We had the materials on site to shore up the walls and seal off the area after the demolition. The building was in very bad condition. It was not a brick veneer; it was bearing on the brick wall. As we were tearing off the top floors, the second floor started bowing and falling in. You would just touch it and the bricks would come down. We decided to go ahead with tearing down the second floor and hoped that the first floor was something that could be salvaged. When we got to the first floor, we found it was just as bad as the second floor. We felt for safety's sake we needed to go ahead and take it down. We have kept all the brick and other materials on site that we could salvage. We took pictures and feel we can put it back as it was originally. We think there is enough brick there to do at least the first floor back. There is one back corner that is still standing at this time. Staff did have the inspectors go out and they feel it would have had to come down but feel they should have stopped and called someone on Saturday.

Mary – I wished there had been some delay in taking the entire building down. Al – I am sorry but I just did not think about stopping. I felt we had to have something solid. JoBeth – It doesn't surprise me that it was not structurally sound. It just feels like a slap in the face to us that you didn't stop and come to us. We would not have had a problem going along with the building inspector's determination. Al – We are willing to do whatever we can to rectify the situation. JoBeth – Did you get a clear picture of what had been the original structure? Al – We feel like we did. We really looked over the building and took a lot of pictures. JoBeth – At this point it is important for you to tell us what was originally there and what changes you want to make to that plan for the new building. I think we will need this information before we can move forward. Al – I would like a little more time to validate our plan and get permission to go ahead and take down the remaining standing wall and clean up down to the foundation (limestone). We also would like to have the foundation checked by the inspector so we know if we will be able to build on the foundation or if there is anything we will have to do. JoBeth – We need to get the site safe and at least cleaned up. We just want to make sure that any salvageable materials stay on site.

Kevin asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**JoBeth made a motion to defer Case #12-HZ-00078, 941 McCallie Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: Resubmit more detailed drawings, elevations, and materials list and how that relates to what was originally there; all demolition may proceed down to the limestone silt as long as any salvageable materials are kept on site; all other areas to be protected and remain untouched until further review; secure the site for safety and esthetics.**

**William seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**JoBeth moves to amend the above motion to request that if there are any changes to the foundation requested from the engineer's inspection, that those changes have to come before the Board before proceeding; and the deferral is for thirty (30) days.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

## ***NEW BUSINESS***

### **CASE #12-HZ-00090 – 4312 St. Elmo Avenue**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Victoria & Robyn Garner, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation, Restoration

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

#### **Discussion**

Matthew Parks, architect, addressed the Commission. The Chattanooga Neighborhood Enterprise hires my firm to inspect homes for applicants for loans. We inspect them, assess their needs, prepare a specification for work and that is submitted for bidding. The contractor then does the work.

JoBeth – Encapsulate, is that in vinyl? Matthew – It is a sealant, part of the lead abatement process. Another option would be to scrap the lead paint, then paint and seal it. There were three windows on the back found to have lead-based paint. William – The sealant sounds like a good method since it preserves the existing wood. Sarah – The owners were unable to be here but they did state that they did not feel any of the windows were bad enough to be replaced. Kevin – This system sounds good. My only concern is if the sealant is too thick (it is 10 mil), that the windows will not work properly. We need to provide for that possibility.

William – How does the pitch of the front porch roof work? Matthew – It is sloping toward the house and there is a leaking problem. I proposed a 3/12 slope. That is about as low as we go in order to shed water. William – I feel this new roof design is taking away from the integrity of the house. Kevin – Has anyone inspected the beam or the viability of the pitch of the roof? Matthew – No they have not. Mary – If you are the architect on this project, why didn't you inspect that beam on the front porch? Matthew – The scope of our work is strictly writing the scope of work for what the owner wants. The owner said she wanted a roof replacement and that is what I looked at. JoBeth – Maybe we need to look at the roofing material that is used. Kevin – What we have to decide is if we are going to let them add a new roof or require them to fix the damage that has caused the roof to sag. William – We would like to see the roof done as it was originally. Matthew – Could I submit that to Sarah instead of waiting for another month? JoBeth – Yes, but I would want to see it if there were any modification to what is existing.

Kevin asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**William made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00090, 4312 St. Elmo Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: Item 1 (roof) – we require reconstruction of the original roof and new drawings to be resubmitted to Sarah unless there are changes to the original design and those will need to**

**come before the Board. Items 3 and 4 - we specify that the windows be encapsulated instead of replaced.**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE #12-HZ-00093 – 4502 Alabama Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Stuart Bickley, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Rehabilitation & Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rear Porch Enlargement
  - Replace Rear Window with an Entrance

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

Discussion

The applicant, Stuart Bickley, addressed the Commission. The back door that we would use to replace the window would match the existing door onto the deck. It is also similar to the doors coming out of the basement. My plan is to enlarge the deck that is there. It is not easily visible from the street.

JoBeth – The edge of the deck needs to be stepped in from the edge of the house. Stuart – I agree. That may not be completely clear on the drawing. I'm flexible on the size of the spindles to be used.

Kevin asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Mary made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00093, 4502 Alabama Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: The deck spindles will be 1x4" and removal of the existing window being replaced with a 15 light full glass door is approved and the deck is to be stepped back on both ends by at least one foot (both sides to be the same distance).**

**William seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE #12-HZ-00094 – 5303 Alabama Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Tristor Development, LLC, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation, Restoration

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

### Discussion

The applicant, John Santoro, Tristor Development, LLC, addressed the Commission. The back of the house is totally deteriorated. The interior wall is completely destroyed. I want to take the entire back wall down, rebuild the interior back wall and then put the exterior wall back in using the same exterior siding on the build back. On the side of the house we want to put French doors that will lead out to the empty lot on that side of the house. We want to put a covering over the back deck.

Kevin – You think you can salvage enough of the siding off the back of the house to reuse? John – Yes I do. William – If you find that you do not have enough siding, will you be able to find matching siding? John - I believe so. The back porch can either totally go away or I can just cover it. I know I will have to put a rubber roof on it. William – I question the French door on the side. Mary – My question is are you incorporating the two lots into one? John – No it will remain two parcels. Mary – then what happens when you decide to sell the house but not the lot beside it or vice versa? John – I don't plan on doing that. JoBeth – It's a small cottage to have three doors. Kevin – I have a fear that you are not going to have enough salvageable siding to put on the rebuilt back wall.

Kevin asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Ryan made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00094, 5303 Alabama Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: with the exception of the putting in a door on the side of the house; any replacement of siding along the back of the house will be in kind with the rest of the house.**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### **CASE #12-HZ-00095 – 4712 Florida Avenue**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Jennifer Ware, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Restoration
- Site Improvements
  - Retaining Wall

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

### Discussion

The applicant, Jennifer Ware, addressed the Commission. Some of the top blocks on the wall have come loose. Also some of the steps have come loose. The contractor suggested stucco for the wall, I am open to any suggestions you have.

JoBeth – It sounds like just general repairs. Kevin – I think stucco is a great idea.

Kevin asked for any discussion from the audience. There was none.

**Mary made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00095, 4712 Florida Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: Wall to be repaired and re-stuccoed with a smooth finish and natural color.**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

### **CASE #12-HZ-00096 – 863 Oak Street**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicants, Matthew & Catherine Martin, have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Rear Enclosure/Addition
  - Convert rear porch into an enclosed breakfast room on 1<sup>st</sup> floor
  - Add a bedroom on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
  - Add a utility room on basement level
- Rear Deck Addition with Patio beneath
- Rear Walkway

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

#### Discussion

The applicant, Matthew Martin, addressed the Commission. We have lived in this house about 15 years. The drive for this is to get another bedroom. We feel like our plans are consistent with the guidelines.

JoBeth – It does look like an addition but it does not overpower the house at all. You may want to come back with the awning. Matthew – that awning is the same shingle, the gutter we were going to use was regular aluminum and paint it green. JoBeth – I'm talking about the awning on the back. Matthew – yeah. The brick sample is for the two piers. We are going to have to excavate about 2 feet to get the patio high enough to have head room under there. The pavers will be the floor. William – Should be French doors be a single light? All the other windows and doors are single lights. It's not a deal breaker. JoBeth – I would prefer the multi-light – I think the single light door is more contemporary.

Kevin asked for any discussion from the audience. Debbie Dunlap - There is no opposition in the neighborhood.

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00096, 863 Oak Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. No conditions.**



**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS***

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

**Mary made a motion to accept the staff approved COAs. William seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***OTHER BUSINESS***

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** December 13, January 17

**Ryan made a motion to adjourn. JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 pm.**

---

Kevin Osteen, Vice Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary

**MINUTES**  
**CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

December 13, 2012

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held December 13, 2012 at 5:31 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, conference room 1A. Michael Prater called the meeting to order. Sarah Kurtz called the roll.

Members Present: Michael Prater, Kevin Osteen, JoBeth Kavanaugh, William Shealy, Thomas Palmer, Mary Eastman, Stuart Wood and Ryan Fiser

Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Sarah Kurtz, Angela S. Wallace

Applicants Present: Matt McGee, Lea Courtney, and Doug Dalrymple

Community Members Present: None

Michael explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting was being recorded. Angela S. Wallace swore in all those who would be addressing the Commission.

**Kevin made a motion to approve the Minutes from the November meeting. The motion was seconded by Thomas and unanimously approved.**

***OLD BUSINESS***

**CASE #12-HZ-00078 – 941 McCallie Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Al Jayne, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Rehabilitation
  - Exterior Building Alterations
  - Site Improvements
  - Retaining Wall
- Demolition
  - Part of Primary Structure

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

Discussion

The applicant, Matt McGee (representing Al Jayne), addressed the Commission. The foundation report was submitted and distributed. We finished removing the back wall. We saved the brick and lintel. We

got the structural engineer's report and it was good, we can build on it but suggested we build a beam and a few other little points. I talked with Al and we will make the bond beam look like the sill on top of the foundation that is there. We plan to move forward with what the engineer suggested in the report if the Board approves. We are still working on the new drawings. We have to put a cap on the foundation in order to build on it and other small items like filling in cracks and clean up. We want to continue cleaning the brick and cleaning up the area. The limestone cap was left in place where it was but part of it was not there. The sandstone sill would be replaced with a solid concrete structure with I-beam to meet the code requirements. We hope the drawings will be ready by the January meeting.

Community Comments: None

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00078, 941 McCallie Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the Fort Wood Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: To continue restoration of the building foundation as specified by the structural engineer; and the cap to be no smaller than existing and color to match the sandstone.**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

#### **CASE #12-HZ-00086 – 5301 Tennessee Avenue**

##### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Lea Courtney, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Rehabilitation, Restoration
- New Construction
  - Deck

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report. Propose to lay a parking area in the rear. Rear elevation updated to show new window.

##### Discussion

The applicant, Lea Courtney, addressed the Commission. We already talked about the placement of the window. This presentation is to update the elevation drawing and approve the parking area. JoBeth – this was the only piece left on this project to be approved? Yes. The window does not go to the edge of the house as shown but actually is off the edge at least 1-2 feet. The deck ending will be between the window and edge of the house.

Community Comments: None

**JoBeth made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00086, 5301 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: Place the window as stated in the testimony in front of the Commission.**

**William seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***NEW BUSINESS***

**CASE #12-HZ-00103 – 4614 Tennessee Avenue**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Andrew Dodson, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- Exterior Building Alterations
  - Replacing Windows

Sarah talked with the applicant about repairing instead of replacing the windows. After researching the options, they will determine whether they need to come before the Commission.

**Thomas made a motion to defer Case #12-HZ-00103, 4614 Tennessee Avenue, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are: None**

**Mary seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

**CASE #12-HZ-00104 – 1319 W. 45<sup>th</sup> Street**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant, Doug Dalrymple, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

- New Construction
  - Primary Structure

Sarah presented the staff report. A PowerPoint presentation accompanied the staff report.

**Discussion**

Doug Dalrymple addressed the Commission. The previous owner of the lot (R-1) went through RPA to establish the setbacks. We choose this plan because it looks similar to others in the area. We do have some flexibility.

JoBeth – I like the house, it imitates the area. The roof will be architectural shingles. Stuart – Moving the staircase and/or front door. Would you prefer moving the door and/or stairs to the porch? Doug – I would prefer to move the stairs. Doug is open to making the windows more uniform. JoBeth –I would rather leave the steps alone and let it be offset. Thomas – I like the house. I think the steps are fine either way. I question the French door as the front door. The shutters also bug me. Doug – I am agreeable with the shutters going away and the front door changing to a solid single door with half-light. An option being considered is using brick on the piers and lattice between. We can change the chimney

material to brick also. There is on street parking. At this point there will be no property parking or driveway. The fencing could be standard vertical picket. The crawl space will probably be 30 inches. Stuart – The chimney would be as shown? Doug – Yes. Stuart – I think a cap more consistent with the older style rather than the metal cap. Doug – That is acceptable. Michael – I think the left elevation is fine. The only thing is that all the windows be the same size with the fascia the same. William and Ryan – Concerned about the vertical board and batting siding. Sarah – The guidelines specifies “horizontal” siding but do not mention vertical. Doug – I would like to use the vertical siding if possible. There are other houses in St. Elmo that have vertical board and batting. Stuart – I think if you remove all the items, you change the entire look of the house. It becomes a bungalow. What about a shake look or combination of materials on the side elevations, maybe with a waistline? Michael and William – I would like to see drawings showing all the changes we have talked about. It could completely change the look of the house. Would you want to do shakes and horizontal siding? Doug – Shakes in the gables would be good. Kevin – When are you planning on starting? Doug – The first of the year. Kevin – Can we specify the foundation of the house and general plan and let him resubmit the materials and trim? I would like to see something that doesn’t look like everything else.

Community Comments: None

JoBeth – Consensus is that the steps need to be in line – either in the center or to the side – owner’s decision. Sarah – I would like to receive revised drawings including all the changes you have talked about. Mary – The horizontal band – I think will look strange on the left side. There is no defined spot for it to be. If it has to be horizontal siding, I don’t think the band is necessary. William – My last home had a horizontal band but the materials above and below the band were the same. Thomas – Let’s not make a decision but defer with choices to be made by owner and then resubmitted to us.

**William made a motion to approve Case #12-HZ-00104, 1319 W. 45<sup>th</sup> Street, as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10-15e and pursuant to the St. Elmo Historic District Design Review Guidelines, subject to any and all approved conditions. Conditions are:**

- Foundation and chimney to be brick with a different cap on the chimney**
- The lattice and foundation needs to be specified in the resubmittal**
- The front door and porch stairs to align with owner choosing the location**
- Front door to be single door with sidelights**
- Porch pickets to be vertical 2 x 2 spacing to meet code**
- Eliminate shutters**
- All trim to be 4 inch minimum on windows and doors**
- Roofing to be revised on resubmitted drawings**
- Roofing to be architectural shingles, drawings to be revised and resubmitted**
- Lap siding recommended, drawings to be revised and resubmitted**
- Front windows to be consistent in size**

**JoBeth seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS***

Are there any questions about any of the staff approved Certificates of Appropriateness?

**Stuart made a motion to accept the staff approved COAs. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved.**

***OTHER BUSINESS***

Mary leaving – this is her last meeting.  
Stuart will not be here in January

***NEXT MEETING DATES:*** January 17, 2013, February 21, 2013

**JoBeth made a motion to adjourn. Thomas seconded the motion. All in favor, the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 pm.**

---

Michael Palmer, Chairman

---

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary