

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

August 8, 2019

Members Present

George Davis
Courtney Nicholas
John Ranson
R.J. Lackey

Members Absent

Peyton Keesee

Staff

Lisa Jones
Ken Gillie
Ryan Dodson
Bryce Johnson

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 315 Lynn Street to paint the exterior brick black and replace the red metal roof with a black membrane roof.*

Present on behalf of this request was Jason Wilson, owner of 315 Lynn Street. Mr. Wilson stated unfortunately we have already painted the exterior black. As far as the roof goes it is the original roof, and it is constantly leaking and the tenants are complaining. We cannot go back with that material anymore so the most effective way is to do a membrane roof and we have contracted Donald Sheets to replace. The back part of this roof was done about 3 or 4 years ago.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so your not asking to do the lower part of the metal red, just the upper?

Mr. Wilson stated yes, the lower was done already in a white by the previous owners.

Mr. Ranson stated so a roof that you are talking about replacing is it a low slope roof or what is the pitch of the roof?

Mr. Wilson stated this roof is low.

Mr. Ranson stated I think it is a quarter but I'm not sure. Therefore, it would be a flat roof.

Mr. Wilson stated yes and for years, they have been putting band-aids on it.

Mr. Davis stated are we going to like the black paint on the front?

Mr. Wilson stated depends upon your taste and I think it looks a lot better than it did before.

Mr. Ranson stated are we talking about the roof or the paint?

Mr. Davis stated we have to talk about them both even though he has already done it.

Mr. Ranson stated so what you are saying is that you are asking us forgiveness.

Mr. Wilson stated yes because we did not know that we had to ask for permission.

Mr. Lackey stated what was the reason for not going back with a red metal roof?

Mr. Wilson stated the material was somewhat outdated and people do not really use that kind of material for newer roofs and for cost efficiency.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion painting the facade black does meet the guidelines as presented and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mrs. Nicholas seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Lackey stated everything is cheaper and I hate that, which is why I did not want that as the answer. Unfortunately, part of these guidelines are more expensive every time. If we are not going to follow them because of cost then we should just disband the committee and be done with it. There is no reason to keep coming up here, and that is my opinion and I hate that it is the same thing with every window that you are going to replace because the original ones are more expensive to replace; that is why tax credits are in place. I have a real heartburn for this one.

Mr. Wilson stated all the other roofs around there have been done in the same stuff that we are asking for regardless of cost or availability.

Mr. Davis stated can this roof be seen from anywhere in the area?

Mr. Wilson stated it is five stories high.

Mr. Davis stated in my opinion if the roof is being done in the same material that it is in the adjoining buildings I personally do not have a problem with it. I know exactly what he is going through.

Mrs. Nicholas stated are there adjacent buildings taller?

Mr. Davis stated I would not think so.

Mr. Ranson made a motion that the request does not comply with the guidelines as presented. Mrs. Nicholas seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

Mr. Ranson made a motion due to the fact that the roof is not visible of public way that this would be considered a minor discrepancy and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was approved by a 3-1 vote.

2. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 109 Bridge Street, Unit 700 for an addition of a deck and roof structure to the second story of the Riverside Mill building (above Cotton) and additional building mounted signage for wayfinding.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Mark Herman, Manager of River District Development LLC. We are working diligently to expand to the upstairs above Cotton. We have gone through DHR and National Parks Service with the design that I believe that you have copies of that sign was approved by them. The projector light was just a temporary effort of trying to get a way of finding where to go because we have a real problem with people not knowing where to go. We knew it would not be a long-term solution because once we built this it would be irrelevant and we would have to come up with something different. The idea is that we are building an extension so there will be a deck above the deck at Cotton with a Canopy above that would allow you to see the River. We are pretty much, at where construction is ready to commence and we just need your approval.

Mrs. Nicholas stated the current deck would no longer be exposed as it is now because it will be under the new one from above?

Mr. Herman stated correct, the next deck will extend slightly from this deck to allow some water coverage to drop off onto awnings. The canopy will be to allow some protection from weather. The idea is to keep it open if possible.

Mrs. Nicholas stated would people be able to come and go from one restaurant to the next through the fire escape steps?

Mr. Herman stated so fire escapes by code will have to be all connected. They are not intended to be a circulation method but it won't be opposed by any stretch. It will mainly serve as an exit and I think the current fire exit on the deck is used frequently for people to get into the restaurant. It is not a problem but I think it will be less likely as that develops, and to go two floors up, people will be less likely to do so.

Mr. Lackey stated I am a little confused. Are you getting rid of the Cotton lighted projection?

Mr. Herman stated so the Cotton lighted projection, we were a little bit surprised that it was such a big deal. That was meant to be temporary until we completed the upstairs. It was not meant to be a permanent solution. We thought it was an answer to avoid issues with DHR, which is a project that you know. It was never intended to be a long-term solution and it has proven to be less helpful than we thought frankly.

Mr. Lackey stated this has nothing to do with what you are proposing right now. I do not remember Ann Dickerson saying it was a temporary sign. We spent two meetings talking about this thing.

Mr. Davis stated if she had said at the first meeting, we probably would not have gone to the trouble of tabling it.

Mr. Herman stated I just want to make sure there is no misconception, there is no sign up there now, because of all the difficulty getting people to know where we are and we are limited on the street. We are trying to accomplish that so at least when people drive into the parking lot they can see and be more aware of it. That has not been to DHR yet, only the building. We would like to put this to DHR also but we were coming to you first for the sign. There are two possibilities one is to do a ghost sign painted directly on the brick and the other is to put a mounted sign. I do not know which DHR prefers or if they would want either one. Really, we would like to opportunity to do it either way, and present it to DHR that way if that makes sense.

Mr. Ranson stated I will give you my opinion I think either one is appropriate.

Mrs. Nicholas stated is that the reason that staff is recommending steel or paint?

Mr. Johnson stated we made that recommendation under the impression that one was already painted there but it is not. So, our recommendation was to stick with the guidelines and keep the two consistent with one another.

Mr. Lackey stated so with it not being painted you do not care?

Mr. Johnson stated no.

Mr. David closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that both components meets the guidelines and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued, specify that with the conditions that the additional deck and reconstruct shall not visually interfere with the projecting Cotton sign unless that sign is removed and that the additional signage either be painted or steel pending DHR's preference. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

3. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 530 Craghead Street, Unit 200 to amend a previously issued COA and allow installation of a solid panel, such as sheet metal (stainless steel or aluminum) or FRP (fiberglass reinforced panel) on the inside of the raised fence and gate, to shield the smoker from view.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Butch Dalton, who stated he was a project manager for Rick Barker Properties. Mr. Dalton stated I am back because I have much more information than I did when I appeared before you before. You have a sketch in front of you of what the gate and fence would look like. We have contracted with Seeder's Fence Company, who was originally contracted by IDA to build a fence that is on the properties now. The smoker is 78 inches tall and it sits on a 7-inch slab. This fence and gate would be built 85 inches tall and the smoker extends out from the building the same distance as the posts that are currently there now. They would take out the two poles and put in a larger post construct a 48 by 85 inch gate and to the left of that there is an 18 inch or so section of fencing and that would hide that. Now, you previously granted us a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that we clad this

fence and gate with trex decking and after further consideration, we have some other ideas. One thing again this is just a pencil drawing you cannot see that this is powder coated black but the fence and gate shields the smoker by itself just being there. First we ask that you not require us to clad this fence and gate with anything but if you do require that, being a cabinet maker I know if you build a book case and is very wobbly and you put a flat piece of plywood on the back that it will stiffen it. The trex decking due to the fact that it strips and it is heavy, negatively leave an effect of structural integrity of this gate and it will weaken it over time and cause it to sag. So, would you allow us to have only the fence and gate without any kind of cladding? If you do insist that we put something on the back of it to shield the street would you allow a solid sheet of stainless steel or aluminum? The company that is building this said that they could put powdered coated metal of the color of our choice or your choice on the back of this.

Mr. Ranson stated so if you were required to put a stainless steel or aluminum you would paint that to match the fence?

Mr. Dalton stated I want it to be as maintenance free as possible so stainless or aluminum would be perfect. If it is powdered coated, it would last some time but it will have to be recoated.

Dr. Davis stated where the cement slab is entire area going to be enclosed or just the part facing that street?

Mr. Dalton stated just the part facing Lynn Street; however, there is a short section fence that would be perpendicular to this that would go over to the smoker.

Mrs. Nicholas stated this would allow them to open the whole thing up and clean it out. We were just worried at the time for it being an attractive nuisance and being able to see it.

Mr. Davis stated again in my opinion the equipment down here next to the police station is much more visible than what this is going to be.

Mr. Ranson stated I think stainless steel or aluminum would be a much better alternative.

Mr. Davis stated how tall did you say the fence would be?

Mr. Dalton stated smoker itself is 78 inches tall and it sits on a 7-inch slab so about 85 inches tall.

Mr. Davis stated about 7 feet.

Mr. Ranson stated is 85 inches acceptable?

Mr. Johnson stated for where that is yes.

Mr. Dalton stated you people also asked for us to put a fence on the lower level so no one could get to the smoker, touch it, and possibly be burned. I have learned since then that the smoker never ever gets more than warm to the touch. It would be impossible to touch it and be burned. We asked if you would not require us to put a fence up around the base of it because it is not

necessary. There was some complication in putting that fence up because it goes around the transformer and obviously, there are high voltage wires.

Mrs. Nicholas stated can I see the original motion because I am not comfortable changing a motion without knowing what the motion said? I have a good memory but not that god.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion to amend the May 29, 2019 Certificate of Appropriateness 530 Craghead Street Unit 200 to remove the requirement that the required screening material be clay trex to act as a screen around the smoker, in doing so we will permit the use of stainless steel or aluminum interjection with the approved fencing as screening material around the smoker powder coated black if that is the necessary otherwise screening material be chosen not to be necessary, so therefore should be granted a new amended Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Lackey seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

4. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 311 Memorial Drive to install six (6) overflow roof scuppers.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Walter Lucas, Public Works Project Manager. Mr. Lucas stated what we are doing is replacing a roof cover at the FSC building. Currently there are no overflow roof drains or scuppers and what we are putting up is identical to what was approved by this committee for this building and City Auditorium purpose of these are if the standard roof drainage clog up this will alleviate all standing water.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that this item meet the guidelines as presented and they should issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented at 311 Memorial Drive. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

5. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 629 Craghead St. to construct a 25' long by 17' wide storage building on a concrete slab. The exterior will be covered with brick veneer, closely matching the brick of the Community Market building, a red colored metal hip roof, a 10' by 7' garage door on the parking lot end of the building, a 3' by 6'-8" single door on the Bridge Street end of the building, and overhead electrical service that will be installed to the building from the existing electrical load center located in the rear parking lot.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Walter Lucas, Public Works Project Manager. Mr. Lucas stated what we want to do is Parks and Recreation would like to have a storage building constructed behind the Community Market in the grass area matching the storage building that they already have in the Carrington Pavilion compound. It will be a little bit larger than what is

existing at the Carrington but for the most part it will be identical but it will have electricity where the one at Carrington does not.

Mr. Davis stated and this is just in the grassy area behind where that garden is?

Mr. Lucas stated you have two trees right next to that garden and it will sit perfectly right in front between those trees and the concrete slab will be up against the asphalt going into the grass 25 feet.

Mrs. Nicholas stated it looks similar if I am not mistaken to the bathrooms that were installed.

Mr. Davis stated the load center that you have pictured that is really a telephone pole with panel beside it.

Mr. Lucas stated the parks and recs were using when they had activities and it's got a panel box in it and a whole bunch of receptacles there that they use to use when they had trailers there for different activities for the Community Market. The existing panels have enough capability to use service for a 60-amp shed.

Mr. Davis stated I noticed in the write up that there is a question about the lines going from that pole to down to the building. Where low hanging lines?

Mr. Lucas stated they would be as high as the electrical code requires them to be off the surface. I think the code requires them to be 10 to 12 feet off the driving surface. The panel box for the shed will be right next to the roll up garage door, you will have a mass of the weather head coming out of the metal roof, and wires come and go to the transformer to that power pole there.

Mr. Ranson stated so the mass could be pretty tall?

Mr. Lucas stated about 6 or 7 feet above the roofline.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so it should not in any way interfere with trucks trying to come through.

Mr. Lucas stated no, we do have the capability that we can crunch up the asphalt and go underneath it if that is required.

Mr. Ranson stated it seems like going underground is usually a more satisfactory solution anyway.

Mr. Lucas stated but you are looking at when you start patching asphalt you got more problems with patch going bad and then you have to repave the whole parking lot eventually before you really want to.

Mr. Ranson stated or you could pour it?

Mr. Lucas stated no you could not pour it because you have asphalt all around the pole.

Mr. Davis stated John are you okay with the lines going across?

Mr. Ranson stated honestly in my heart of hearts, electrical lines should be underground. I do not know that it is a big deal here.

Mrs. Nicholas stated what is the distance from that load site to the proposed building?

Mr. Lucas stated about 25 to 30 feet.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion that the request is in compliance with the requirements with the conception that the electrical service should be underground rather than in the air and so should be granted Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Lackey seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

6. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 667 Craghead Street to install a new, two (2) panel sign – top panel will be a 2' x 3' and bottom panel will be an 18" x 24" – outside the main entrance for the Community Garden located behind the Community Market.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Bill Sgrinia, Parks and Recreation. Mr. Sgrinia stated it is a simple request we are looking to put a sign that helps to identify the Community Gardens.

Mr. Lackey stated I just have one question are we trying to color code signs?

Mr. Sgrinia stated I am not aware of any standard colors.

Mrs. Nicholas stated who designed this?

Mr. Sgrinia stated Bruce Wilson with the Community Group based on his design for it.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the signs as presented are acceptable in terms of the guidelines and issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The August 8, 2019 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Approved By: