



CHATTANOOGA HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

January 16th, 2025

The duly advertised meeting of the Chattanooga Historic Zoning Commission was held on January 16th, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. in conference room 1A of the Development Resource Center Building.

Chairman Skip Pond called the meeting to order at 9:29 A.M.

Roll Call: Admin Support Shelby Ogle called the roll.

Member Attendance:

- ☒ Clif McCormick
- ☒ Piper Stromatt
- ☒ Brandon Panganiban
- ☒ Todd Morgan
- ☒ John Cavett
- ☒ John Brennan
- ☒ Nathan Bird
- ☒ Matt McDonald
- ☒ Skip Pond

Staff Attendance:

- ☒ Presenter: Cassie Cline
- ☒ Admin: Shelby Ogle
- ☐ Admin: Karen Murphy Cannon
- ☒ City Attorney: Andrew Trundle
- ☒ City Attorney: Chris McKnight

Skip Pond welcomes new member John Cavett!

Swearing In: Admin Support Shelby Ogle swore in people addressing the Committee.

Rules and Regulations: Chairman Skip Pond explained the rules and procedures, order of business, and announced the meeting is being recorded.

Approve Minutes: Chairman Skip Pond presented the December 19th, 2024 Meeting Minutes to be voted on. No amendments need to be made. *John Brennan* motioned to **APPROVE** the December minutes. *Clif McCormick* seconded the motion.

All in favor. The motion carries 8-0.

Introducing the new Assistant Director of Land Use Services: Darien Gilkenson!

Staff Review Cases: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the Staff Review cases to the Commission.

- **HZ-24-125:** 4120 St. Elmo Ave.: Porch Floor In-kind Replacement
 - **HZ-24-127:** 4214 St. Elmo Ave.: Rear Deck
 - **HZ-25-1:** 4907 Beulah Ave.: Fence
-

OLD BUSINESS

- HZ-24-11: 850 Oak St.: Rear Opening

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

4.7 Masonry, Page 43

Applicant Presentation: Applicant Michael Bridges presented to the Commission that he is the owner of the property and they came before the Commission last year and were looking to get permission to replace the windows, but was informed that the existing windows were not beyond repair. He stated that the restoration of the windows was going great. He then spoke on the archways and presented that they were closed in at some point previously. He stated that all the brickwork was in place for the arches and they planned to open them back up. He presented that the stairs that are currently there are rickety and unsafe and they want to replace them with something similar in appearance, but safer. He then spoke on the door replacement request and said that the doors are not historic to the home and need to be replaced/updated.

Community Response: No Community Comments.

Discussion: The Commission began their discussion by asking the Applicant if there was brick on the inside wall that can be exposed when the archways are open and he stated that there was brick there, they just have not dug it out yet. They then asked the Applicant about the materials of the stairwells and he stated that it was going to be utilitarian. They then asked the Applicant about the door replacements and whether Staff would be willing to approve the doors.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- *Matt McDonald* made a motion to **APPROVE** case #: HZ-24-11: 850 Oak St. with the following condition:
 - Staff to review the doors for replacement.

Nathan Bird seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 9-0.

- HZ-24-104: 838 Vine St.: Front Porch

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

4.2 Entrances and Porches, Page 37

Applicant Presentation: Applicant Keith McCallie presented to the Commission that the porch isn't the original porch and they are trying to rebuild the porch back close to the original and are trying to find a

brick that matches. She stated that they want to rebuild the knee wall and have a nice historic porch. She then spoke on the thin brick and stated that it is from the same manufacturer as the full brick, but has a 4 month lead time. Austin Starkey, who is the homeowner, presented that he and his wife are longtime Chattanooga residents and that this house and project start the rest of their lives. He stated that they had another home and when they were looking for temporary housing for renovations on their home, they found the house in the proposal and decided to make it their home.

Community Response: No Community Comments.

Discussion: The Commission started their discussion by stating that several members were present on site to see the mock up in person showcasing the thin brick on the columns. The Commission then asked the Applicant a few more questions about the brick and the options.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- *Clif McCormick* made a motion to **APPROVE** case #: HZ-24-104: 838 Vine St., with the following condition:
 - Option 1 from the Applicant's presentation: "Rebuild the brick knee wall and re clad the existing foundation walls at the porch with full size brick, re clad the columns with thin brick to match the full size in size and color, new wood columns which have already been approved by the CHZC."

Todd Morgan seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 9-0.

- HZ-24-118: 4309 Michigan Ave.: New Construction

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

6.22 New Construction, Page 52

Applicant Presentation: Applicant Michael Bridges stated that another representative presented the case last month and was unable to be there. He stated that they took into account the concerns that the Commission had about the scale of the home. He stated that they pushed the home back and they have pushed the porch back as well and the primary main wall is 4 feet back from the first presentation and they focused a lot more on reducing the scale of the home. He stated that the developer did agree to a reduction in the square footage of the home and they changed the pitch of the roof to improve the appearance of the home from the road. He stated that they gave it some more shadow lines to give it a more historic presence.

Community Response: The following was emailed opposition that was presented to the Commission:

"Cassie,

Thanks for sending the agenda for the January 2025 Historic Zoning Commission Agenda. I have the following comments:

Thanks.

CASE HZ-24-118 4309 MICHIGAN AVENUE

I am opposed to the proposed new construction design for 4309 Michigan Avenue. As I stated previously in my comments for the December 2014 meeting, the site is the site of the foundation and one retaining wall of a bungalow that sat on the site for many years and served as the servants' quarters for the large A. M.

Johnson home just north of West 43rd Street. This wall is shown in the site photographs and should be retained as it is likely well over 140 years old. I also have the following comments, some of which are also shown in the Staff Report for the site.

1. The proposed dwelling is 2-story. The immediately surrounding area in the 4300 block of Michigan Avenue contains a mix of 1-story and 1.5 story houses. This proposed dwelling, even with modifications from the December 2024 proposal, is still out of scale with the neighborhood. It simply does not fit the site.
2. The roof pitch is shown as a combination of 6:12 and 8:12. Doesn't the St. Elmo Guideline call for 6:12 pitch only?
3. The setback has been changed but still does not fit the neighborhood.
4. Wood is preferred for the windows according to the Historic Zoning Guidelines. This design shows aluminum-clad windows.
5. The revised plans show a width of 51 feet for this dwelling. The lot is only 63.5 feet wide; other houses are smaller than 51 feet, this making this design out of scale with the house next door at 4303 and the one across the street at 4304. The lots in this area of St. Elmo are small and designs should reflect that size and scale and not attempt to impose a design that is out of scale with houses that have stood on the street for many years. I know personally that the house at 4303 has stood at least 97 years and any adjacent houses should complement, not infringe on, this home.

Thanks,

Tim McDonald
Sunnyside Avenue"

Discussion: The Commission began their discussion by stating that the new design is an improvement from the last one. They stated that the roof lines and the size are much more compatible with the street. The Commission then asked the Applicant some more questions about the design of the proposed home.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- *Brandon Panganiban* made a motion to **APPROVE** case #: HZ-24-118: 4309 Michigan Ave.
Nathan Bird seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 8-1.

NEW BUSINESS

- **HZ-24-120: 4812 Alabama Ave.: Exterior Rehabilitation + Addition**

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

6.1 Additions, Page 33
6.6 Decks, Page 38
6.33 Siding, Page 70
6.41 Windows, Page 74

Applicant Presentation: Applicant Daryl Smith began his presentation by stating that there is no new parking proposed for this project. He stated that there would be a new window within the addition and that they want to remove the windows in the rear of the house and use them both in the new addition and on the

porch. He stated that they need to replace the front door and they would find one that is appropriate for the front of the house. He spoke on the baluster dimensions and stated that they would be within the guideline requirements of square and 2 inches. He presented that there is pretty significant dry wall damage on the interior of the home and that is why they are proposing to replace the windows instead of repair.

Community Response: No Community Comments.

Discussion: The Commission started their discussion by stating that the Commission would rely on Staff's visit for the windows for replacement. The Commission asked if there was a window replacement presented for review and the Applicant stated that they are aluminum clad that has been approved for historic cases previously. The Commission expressed concerns about not having a front door to review and it was stated that Staff normally approves those. The Applicant stated that they normally look for something that is historic in nature, but matches the neighborhood. The Commission then asked if there was a distinction between the addition and the rest of the house and the Applicant stated that the addition will be set back a little so there will be a distinction.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- Brandon Panganiban made a motion to **APPROVE** case #: HZ-24-120: 4812 Alabama Ave..
Nathan Bird seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 9-0.

- **HZ-24-126: 4507 Tennessee Ave.: Correction Notice (Rear Deck, Porch, Siding, Windows/Doors)**

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

6.6 Decks, Page 38

6.33 Siding, Page 70

Applicant Presentation: Applicant Denise Shaw presented to the Commission that there was some misinformation floating around that additions at the rear of the house do not need approval from the Commission and the contractor for this project was given that incorrect information. She stated that the footprint of the rear porch is the same as the previous porch and that the only change is really the location of the stairs. She stated that the rail design comes from a neighboring porch and they wanted to match them for consistency. She presented that the exterior was really rotted and did not have the historic siding and the deck boards were slanted the wrong way and contributed to the rotting of the siding. She said that one of the doors was replaced with a window. She said that the siding on the rest of the house except for one wall was replaced due to how rotted it was and they are requesting to be able to replace that siding as well. She stated that the contractor was trying to find the original siding profile.

Community Response: No Community Comments.

Discussion: The Commission began their discussion by asking what happened to the old doors and the contractor stated that they were rotted and they were a 15 panel standard door. He said that the jam was also extremely rotted and they asked what material the new window was and he stated that it was a vinyl window. The Commission discussed the window materials and stated that it needed to be approved. The Commission asked for clarification on the back door and the contractor stated that it was a fiberglass door that has $\frac{3}{4}$ light and is not a full door. The Commission then asked the contractor questions about the siding and the deterioration of the old siding. They then talked about the siding that was used and is proposed to replace the one wall to match. The contractor stated that they have not been able to find the right size

siding to be historically accurate. He stated that there are windows that would need to be repaired due to the water leaking in through the siding.

Piper Stromatt left the meeting at 10:25 am.

He stated that on the front facade of the house, the siding under the porch roof is nonhistoric, but the rest of the siding on the front is in good condition. They want to replace the sides of the home with the new siding and leave the front as is. The Commission then asked questions about the rear porch balusters and the design of the porch and the guideline requirements. The Commission then discussed the front porch flooring and that it was supposed to be tongue and groove and the contractor stated that they are willing to put any flooring that the Commission approves.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- *Nathan Bird* made a motion to **APPROVE** case #: HZ-24-126: 4507 Tennessee Ave. with the following conditions:
 - Vinyl window to be replaced, subject to staff review.
 - LP singing approved for west and south elevations. The north elevation is to be repaired in kind.
 - South elevation windows to be repaired in kind.
 - Existing railing may remain on the rear porch. (This is not intended to set a precedent.)
 - The front porch shall be exterior rated tongue in groove.
 - Miscellaneous trim may be repaired or replaced in kind.

Matt McDonald seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 8-0.

- HZ-24-128: 4705 St. Elmo Ave.: New Dormer + Parking

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

6.1 Additions, Page 33

6.9 Driveways + Paving, Page 41

Applicant Presentation: Applicant Matthew Lewis presented to the Commission that they are proposing a couple different things and right now the siding is asbestos siding. He then stated that he stripped off some of the asbestos siding and found some ornate details, which he believes leads him to believe that there is existing siding and details underneath the other asbestos siding. He stated that there are multiple types/styles of windows within the home, but the windows at the front facade are original to the home. He then presented that they want to put a drive way back where he believes there was one existing. He stated that there is no good way to access the back of the property at this time.

Community Response: No community comments.

Discussion: The Commission began their discussion by asking if the driveway was part of the application and the Applicant stated that he would like the material to be pea gravel in appearance. The Commission then asked how accessible the alleyway is to the house, to which the Applicant stated that it is not accessible from the alleyway and so access has to go through the church parking lot or a driveway off the road needs to be added. The Commission then expressed concern about the neighborhood not being properly notified about a driveway being proposed and suggested deferring due to that. The Commission then asked some questions about the addition. They also asked if he was planning to replace the asbestos

siding around the entire home and he stated yes. The Commission then touched on the roof line, but since it was at the back of the house they stated that it is not as concerning for the historic look of the home, because it is not visible from the street. The Commission stated to the Applicant that they would like to see the full scope of work for the project, before approving the entire plan.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- *John Brennan* made a motion to **APPROVE** the addition/dormer request of the case and **DEFER** the driveway/parking request to the February 2025 meeting for case #: HZ-24-128: 4705 St. Elmo Ave.

Nathan Bird seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 8-0.

- HZ-24-129: 5510 Post Ave.: Demolition of Primary Dwelling

Staff Presentation: Historic Preservation Planner Cassie Cline presented the report to the Commission.

Relevant Guidelines Covered:

6.7 Demolition, Page 39

Applicant Presentation: Applicants Isaac and Rebecca Kirk presented to the Commission that they began their project on this home with the idea of remodeling it. They spent a lot of time and effort cleaning the home out and preparing for renovations. They presented that a tree then fell on the home and the damage caused by that incident caused the project to fall outside of their budget to make repairs. They stated that they would like to demolish the structure and rebuild it.

Community Response: There was emailed opposition that has been presented to the Commission.

"Good afternoon,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed demolition of 5510 Post Ave (Case # HZ-24-129). This is a beautiful historic home that is absolutely contributing to the historic character of our neighborhood, and it would be a loss to demolish it. It's clearly been neglected over the years, and I'm sure there is much work needed, but that should not justify destroying it. Please save this historic home.

Sincerely,

Audrey Hebbeler

1319 W. 45th St."

Discussion: The Commission began their discussion by asking the Applicant about insurance and they stated that they did pursue it before the tree fell on it and it could not be reasonably insured. The Commission then asked the Applicants several questions about the history of modifications that had been made to the home as well as about any other damaging events that have occurred. The Applicants stated that there was evidence of a fire in the past and that it appears that an addition was added and the tree exposed an existing wall from that. The Commission stated that they believe that the home is not damaged beyond repair in its current state.

Commission Motion and Vote:

- *Nathan Bird* made a motion to **DENY** case #: HZ-24-129: 5510 Post Ave.

Clif McCormick seconded the motion.

All in favor.

The motion carries 8-0.

Other Business

Next Meeting Date: February 20th, 2025 (Application deadline is January 17th, 2025 at 4pm).

Historic Guidelines Update: The City Attorney has the final draft and is reviewing the guidelines from a legal standpoint, then it goes to the community for review.

Community Comment: Denise Shaw came before the Board and stated that emailed community comments used to be read into the record during the meeting and that it would be beneficial to the applicants and design teams to hear or see the opposition. The Board and Staff then discussed options for being able to get the information out to the public.

Nathan Bird motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Clif McCormick seconded the motion.

All in favor.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m..



Skip Pond, Chairman

2/20/2025

Date



Admin Assistant

2/20/25

Date