

**Historic Zoning Commission
Special Called Meeting
Minutes
July 31, 2018**

The Historic Zoning Commission held a special called meeting on July 31, 2018 at 5:30 pm in the Commission Chambers at the Municipal and Safety Building.

Members Present: Mr. Hal Hunter, Chairman
Mr. Wesley Forsythe, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Tom Mozen
Ms. Valda Jones
Mr. Nathan Brand

Members Absent: Ms. Liz Biosca
Mr. Mike Williams, Planning Commission Representative

Staff Present: Matthew Manley, Senior Planner, City of Johnson City
Will Righter, Planner, City of Johnson City
Nicole Lawrence, Admin. Coordinator, Development Services

Chairman Hal Hunter called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. A quorum was present.

Approval of the Johnson City Historic Zoning Commission agenda was put forth with an addition to the agenda. Staff requested an item be added regarding 404 W. Pine St. and the demolition of a chimney. Commissioner Jones made a motion for approval with a second from Commissioner Forsythe.

The agenda was then approved by a unanimous, verbal vote.

The minutes from the Historic Zoning Commission regularly scheduled meeting held on June 26, 2018 were approved with a motion from Commissioner Forsythe and a second from Commissioner Brand.

New Business

Staff made an introduction of the two new Historic Zoning Commissioners, Nathan Brand and Mike Williams who will be the Johnson City Regional Planning Commission representative. Commissioner Williams was unexpectedly unable to attend this meeting.

The second item of business was the consideration of CoA application #2018-200, a color scheme approval for 117 Spring St. The original proposal was presented and approved by the Historic Zoning Commission at their April 24, 2018 commission meeting.

The final piece of this renovation is to approve the following;

Painting the existing brick, new brick veneer and EIFS with silicate paint. The brick will be painted with Sherwin Williams (SW) 7061 "Night Owl"; the recessed panels in EIFS, EIFS window lintels and cap/fascia using SW 7039 "Virtual Taupe" and Window trim, SW 6108 "Latte".

Staff recommended approval of the proposed color scheme.

Public hearing was opened;

The applicant's architectural representative from Ken Ross Architects, C.W. Parker, was present to answer any questions regarding the proposed color scheme.

Seeing no one wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

A motion to approve the color scheme as proposed was put forth by Commissioner Jones with a second from Commissioner Mozen.

Motion Approved 5-0

The next item on the agenda was consideration of CoA Application #2018-2019, approval of a proposed color scheme and signage for 121 Spring St. The petitioner wishes to paint the exterior of the second floor of the building at 121 Spring St. The proposed colors are Sherwin Williams (SW) 2839 "Roycroft Copper Red" (Base) and SW 2850 "Chelsea Gray" (Window Trim). The proposed material is Edison Coatings' Elastowall paint. This is for the second story portion of the building only. The first story is currently unpainted brick and the petitioner does not have intentions of painting that area at this time.

Public hearing was opened;

Commissioner Mozen asked staff, how does the Historic Commission guarantee applicants use the appropriate and approved materials after the CoA is approved? Staff replied that it is very difficult to guarantee applicants use the approved materials once the CoA is approved however, we currently depend on the City Building Inspectors to hopefully catch any unapproved materials during their inspection process. Staff then

agreed to look into this matter further and follow up with the HZC on ways to monitor projects that are currently in progress.

Chairman Hunter felt the red color being presented was too bright and too much in contrast with the surrounding buildings.

The applicant stated she was open to other color recommendations. The applicant then stated she was not planning on painting the lower portion of the building at this time due to financial reasons. She will paint it at a later date, hopefully in the next two years.

The commissioners ensued in a conversation with the applicant regarding more appropriate colors for the top portion of the building that would “complement or harmonize” with the existing brick on the first floor. This was in accordance with the design guidelines policy to create a coordinated color scheme. Sherwin Williams color “Caribbean Coral” was agreed upon for the second story of the building with Sherwin Williams color “Chelsea Gray” to be used around the trim of the second story windows.

Commissioner Brand was concerned that the first floor of the building was not being painted at the same time - referencing the design guidelines policy for the façade to read as a “single composition”. Commissioner Brand asked if there was a time frame they could place on the applicant that they must paint the remainder of the building? Staff replied that a CoA was valid for six (6) months from the date work begins. Commissioner Brand suggested a time frame be included in the motion for the CoA approval so the applicant must paint the first floor of the building as well, using the same color as the second story, “Caribbean Coral” by Sherwin Williams.

Seeing no one else wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

A motion was put forth by Commissioner Jones that the applicant must use the approved paint material, Elastowall, the approved colors of “Caribbean Coral” for the building and “Chelsea Gray” for the window trim. The applicant must paint the lower level of the building using the same color as approved for the second story within one year of start date of the painting of the second level using this CoA #200-209. A second was made by Commissioner Forsythe.

Motion Approved 5-0

The second part to this CoA involved a permanent sign and temporary sign for the business. The applicant is asking for a temporary banner on the front and back of the building for 90 days. The applicant is also requesting approval for the permanent signage as proposed in this CoA.

In reviewing the proposal, staff feels the proposed sign conflicts with some of the guidelines of Policy 10 in the Downtown Historic Guidelines. In particular, staff pointed out that projecting signs are more commonly used in this area and that exterior illumination would be more appropriate than the internal backlit vinyl sign as proposed. Staff would like to see a sign design to be in balance with the overall character of the property. Staff reminded the commissioners that the Historic Zoning Commission cannot judge any sign proposal for this district on the content of the sign, as this is not within the powers of the commission.

Public hearing opened;

Several of the commissioners had objections to this particular sign such as: Chairman Hunter felt it was too large for the area and that it did not mount within the existing recess on the front center of the building as called for in Policy 10. C. Commissioner Jones had some concern about the proposed font. Commissioner Mozen had issues with the overall appearance of the sign from color to design and size.

Commissioner Brand noted several issues with the proposed sign and the regulations for this district stated in Policy 10 of the guidelines such as: a projecting type sign is preferred, the sign is too large for the area, the sign does not conform to the area, internal illumination is not preferred and vinyl is not allowed. He suggested a smaller projecting type sign with external illumination that is more in line with the other signs being used in this area.

The commission suggested the petitioner use lettering on the windows of the business, following the design guidelines for the district and use a smaller, hanging projecting type sign. The commission recommend the petitioner meet with staff and look into other types of signage that are more conforming to this particular area.

The petitioner spoke in opposition to the recommendations from the commission stating that the Historic Zoning Commission had approved signs in the Downtown Historic District much larger in size from the one she is proposing. The petitioner stated some of the current signage on Spring St. were just as colorful and some larger than the one she is proposing. The petitioner agreed to meet with staff, however was not in agreement with all of the issues with the proposed sign the commissioners were stating.

Seeing no one else wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

A motion for denial of the permanent sign as proposed with an approval of the temporary banner signage for 90 days as proposed was put forth by Commissioner Jones with a second from Commissioner Brand. Motion to deny permanent signage as proposed was approved 5-0. Motion to approve temporary banner signage for 90 days as proposed was approved 5-0.

The final item on the agenda was approval of a chimney demolition located at 404 W. Pine St. The petitioner is proposing to replace the roof with the same material and color as the existing shingles (staff approved) and as part of the new roof he is proposing to remove the chimney. As the demolition of a structural object, this request must be approved by the HZC. Staff recommends approval of the proposed chimney demolition.

Public hearing opened; seeing no one wished to speak, public hearing was closed.

A motion to approve the chimney demolition as presented was put forth by Commissioner Mozen with a second from Commissioner Brand. Motion approved 5-0.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.


Hal Hunter - Chairman