

FORM-BASED CODE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

December 14, 2017

The duly advertised meeting of the Form-Based Code Committee was held on December 14, 2017, at 2:00 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, Conference Room 1A. John Straussberger called the meeting to order. Angela Wallace called the roll and swore in all those who would be addressing the Committee. John Straussberger explained the rules of procedures and announced that the meeting is being recorded.

Members Present: Heidi Hefferlin, Matthew Whitaker, Gabe Thomas, David Barlew, William Smith, John Straussberger and Jason Havron.

Members Absent: Ladell Peoples, Grace Frank,

Staff Members Present: Angela Wallace, Emily Dixon,

Applicants Present: Geoffrey Tarr; Ethan Collier; Allen Jones; R. Steve Hunt; Jill Allen

Gabe made a motion to approve the Minutes from the last meeting. The motion was seconded by Jason and unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Case #17-FB-00031 – 334 Market Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Kathy Wilton & Geoffrey Tarr, has applied for the following modifications:

- Transparency from 80% to 72%

Emily presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Discussion: Joey Tubbs addressed the Committee. Replaced storefront in building and put in a bi-fold window. I did not know I had to pull a permit for the replacement. We are 72% now. I apologize for coming forth before. We did get an engineering report.

Community Comments: None

Heidi – You said it had 2 coats of low-e? Joey – Yes, No. 2 and No. 4. William – Is there a need to ask for reflectivity? Emily – No they are at 11% and that is within the guidelines. Heidi – What they have done is the best you can do with transparency using any heat shield. Emily – A 12 month edit is

proposed for 60%. There are problems with meeting the 80% and have any type of coating. I think we are going to have a lot of these. We should stipulate that they are meeting the 12 month edit.

David made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00031 – 334 Market Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: it adheres to the 12 month edit.

Heidi seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Case #17-FB-00032 – 1400 Williams Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Ethan Collier, has applied for the following modifications:

- Screening – none
- Landscape island width from 13.5' to 8.93' and 9.5'
- Soil volume from 100 sf to 159 sf
- Parking trees from 1:5 to 4:2
- Parking perimeter shrubs – 6' strip to less than 6' and none at transformer

Emily presented the PowerPoint presentation.

Discussion: Ethan Collier addressed the Committee. On screening for wall mounted equipment. I cannot imagine how that can be relocated. We do not own that building. At present there is a parking lot next to that equipment. There will only be one view of this equipment and that will be a pedestrian alleyway. The FBC treats every parking lot the same. It makes the same requirement of us as if our lot fronted a main road. We are putting the building right on the street and putting the parking lot out of the public view. I do not think that is the way it should be. There are some existing trees and we would like to work around as many of those as possible. We are mounting all our electric and gas meters on the dumpster enclosure. We have worked hard to make this work. We are sharing parking between the 5 townhomes and the existing building.

Community Comments: None

Jason – The trees in the island, they are going to be gone anyway aren't they? Ethan – I'm sorry the 2 trees in the easement are not existing, we will be planting those. William – I don't think we should consider the No. 1 request because it is on the Evergreen building and he can't control that. Emily – They are doing work on the Evergreen property so we have to include it in this project. Ethan – The main reason we can't screen the equipment is that it will be a pedestrian access. If it has to be screened, the pedestrian walkway will go away. John – What about the cars next to the dumpster? Ethan – These are tandem parking spots. They can come in through the parking lot and they can pull out via the alley. This came out of our meeting with CDOT.

Matt – We should see what the qualifications of using soil cells are. There is a requirement of a width and a requirement for soil. I thought we went to 1:10 with the edits. Emily – That is only with the spacing. Matt – The equipment is not facing the pedestrian street so I do not think it needs to be screened. I would like to see some ways to get more trees on the property. Ethan – The class of tree is too large to use in this area. David – I agree with Ethan about the 2 trees next to the other property. Maybe we could specify a smaller tree at this location.

David made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00032 – 1400 Williams Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions: 1) approved - no screening for equipment; 2) approved - reduction 13.5 to 8.93 and 9.5 approved with sufficient soil condition for tree survival; 3) denied; 4) denied - reduction from 4 to 2, the two trees by the house can be reduced to smaller trees; 5) approved - utility equipment landscaping on the alley.

Heidi seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Gabe – recuses himself from this case.

Case #17-FB-00033 – 1201 & 1203 Carter Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant Allen Jones for ASA Engineering has applied for the following modifications:

- Lot frontage – from 80% to 61.9%
- Parking setback – from 30’ to 4’
- Parking setback – 10’ side street to 4’ (rear and side)
- Perimeter planting – 4’ landscape strip w/wall to 3’ and no wall in rear
- Parking lot islands – every 10 spaces to 11 spaces (2 areas)
- Parking lot islands – 13.5’ to 8’ (2 islands, use soil cells)

Emily presented the PowerPoint presentation. Matt – Can you go back over the wall requirements?

Discussion: Allen Jones addressed the Committee. (Holiday Inn Express) There were a couple of typos on the application. We are only asking for 1 area for the 11 spaces. Adding 800 cubic feet of soil cells for each tree. We are providing 114 rooms for the site and we need 91 parking spaces. We have looked at a number of options for parking. The requisition from 4 to 3 is because we are donating space to the city for parking and a potential drop off zone. We already have a wall at the interstate. We are still doing a plant buffer for that back wall. We are doing compact spaces also about 19%. The 10’ setback variance is because we are surrounded on 4 sides for right-of-way. Along the front we are going to carry the same materials across the front and we will have pedestrian access and parking access with columns.

Community Comments: None

David – The 6’ wall with breaks, will there be any vegetation? Allen – Yes there will be landscaping along all the walls. David – Front coverage reduction, what is the coverage percentage for the existing buildings? Emily - About 40-50%, certainly not in compliance with FBC. There is a large amount of right-of-way right now by the state that will be reduced when the interstate is complete. Then the owner wants to development more of that space. Heidi – Are we prepared to approve the amount of parking they want in the future? Allen – There are two separate lots here. We will have to do a subdivision here. But for simplicity sake we want to leave it as one lot. We would have to split that lot in half and look at the building. We can subdivide it and so 100% front coverage. Gabe - The make-up of this Committee is diverse. I understand having to have a certain amount of parking. This is a good application and it is trying really hard to meet the code here. When someone is trying to do

that, it is a reasonable request. David – We need to be clear on the motion about the reason for the setback and the frontage.

David made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00033 – 1201 & 1203 Carter Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: 1) approved - to meet the frontage requirement would exceed the maximum length; 2) approved ; 3) approved; 4) approved – one area was removed from application; 5) approved - has sufficient soil volume for tree; 6) approved.

William seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Case #17-FB-00034 – 605 Chestnut Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, R. Steve Hunt, has applied for the following modifications:

- Glazing – from 80% transparency to 40%

Emily presented the PowerPoint presentation. Existing transparency on the building is 40%.

Discussion: R. Steve Hunt addressed the Committee. Steve Billingsley – The building has been renovated in the last 5-7 years. We have replaced single pane glass with insulated glass. This is a lower reflectivity than Republic Center. The subject area faces due east. Steve Hunt – There are 1180 windows in Liberty Tower that are all the same and it would be a shame to have these not match.

Community Comments: None

Heidi – I agree with this all they are replacing are 2 doors/windows, it would be silly to have these windows be different. Matt – We would not allow SunTrust to do this on the first floor of their building. David – SunTrust was proposing all the windows. Matt – I just feel we should be consistent.

William made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00034 – 605 Chestnut Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: approved – to be consistent with rest of building windows.

Gabe seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. (Matt abstained)

Case #17-FB-00035 – 615 Chestnut Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant R. Steve Hunt has applied for the following modifications:

- Glazing – from 80% transparency to 33%
- Awning size – from 6' depth to 5'3"

Emily presented the PowerPoint presentation. This is all across the entire front of the building.

Discussion: R. Steve Hunt addressed the Committee. Steve Billingsley – It is a gray tinted glass. – This is the same glass used in the Republic Center and Mueller across the street. It previously had blinds that were always closed. The reflectivity is within the limits. The canopy match canopies across the street at Mueller, same dimensions. Steve Hunt – There will be plenty of visitors to this building. The window materials are very important to Mueller because they did not want to use blinds or shades. You can clearly see all the equipment in their existing building with the same windows as proposed.

Community Comments: None

Heidi – How old is the glass on the rest of the building. Steve Billingsley – I assume the 70's, I think it is the original glass. Heidi – Did you investigate glare reducing shades? Steve – No. they wanted this type glass on the research and development center. Heidi – I think they could do a different glass. They will eventually change out the glass in the entire building. Emily – On SunTrust we approved 35% on the upper floors. The proposed change to the code will be 60%. Heidi – I would like to see them comply with the 60%. Steve – You cannot see through the existing glass at all. Emily – There is an edit proposed to be 5 feet. Steve Hunt – This is a product showcase so they want people to see what is there.

Heidi made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00035 – 615 Chestnut Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: 1) approved - reduction from 80 to 60% only to match the edit proposal; 2) approved – canopy to 5' to match edits.

Matt seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Case #17-FB-00036 – 1100 Market Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant Jill Allen and James White, III has applied for the following modifications:

- Signage – from 300 sf to 656 sf (skyline)
- Signage – from 1 skyline to 2
- Signage – from 300 sf to 585 sf (projection)

Emily presented the PowerPoint presentation. The skyline sign was installed prior to application.

Discussion: Jill Allen addressed the Committee. We assumed the sign company pulled permits. I think it looks good. You have to be in a specific place to see the sign. I can see it from the top of the warehouse parking lot. If you are walking you cannot see it. We don't think it is that offensive. We don't want to get equipment to paint over it.

Community Comments: None

Heidi – I don't understand the second sign. Jill – This is like a projector sign – light shown on the building. What we are trying to do is tie the properties we own together. This covers all the buildings we own downtown. They are temporary projection signs and we would keep them up for 6-9 months and then do something different. It would be clean white light with that writing. John – So this message could be changed? Jill – Yes but we are not proposing that. John – The skyline was installed

and no application was made prior to the installation. Emily – It is more than 2 times what the code allows.

Gabe – We have been really tough on signage. This is too major. Heidi – I am on the Innovation group. These are being done all over. It has been discussed that Miller Park will project things. Matt – I don't understand why it is considered temporary. Six months seems to be a long time. I think that needs to be defined more. The code says 105 days during a calendar year. So it doesn't meet the criteria there either. David – I think technology has gotten ahead of regulations. John – Given the size of the sign and the definition of temporary, if you allow this you will find more people coming in with this and greater proposals. There is not anything in place to regulate this. William – This is something that is not addressed in the code at all. I do not think the projection is a sign. Matt – There is concern with glare and light projection. Matt – It is cool – innovative - but it puts us on a slippery slope. John – Whether it is cool or not, it is a different magnitude in the city. I am not comfortable taking this on. Matt – It does not fit the code. Gabe – There is nothing that regulates this. David – The other instances were centered on events and covered a very short time. The people of Patton Towers should have a voice in this. Emily – we are really just looking at the light and if we will allow a second skyline sign that exceeds the size requirement. John – It is very limited where you can see the skyline sign that is painted. David – I think it would be unfair to allow this sign. John – How big is the EDNEY part of the sign? Matt – Guessing, about 60% or about 595 sf.

Emily - If you deny this it will be an enforcement issue.

Jill – I am not the owner but I represent the owner. What are we doing is bringing this new development to the city. We thought the people we hired had done their job. We have tried to bring life to this building. The sign is big but it is hard to find the building. John – I don't know if we will get another case like this. The proportion to the building is not that out of sorts to me. Heidi – I would like to approve it if we can do it without opening the floodgates. William – I don't think the other one is a sign and we don't have anything as a basis to it. Matt – I could see us approving this one skyline sign but not 2 skyline signs with one of them being this size. John – If we can present a hardship that puts in a narrow corridor, we could justify it in the future.

William made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00036 – 1100 Market Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: 1) approved in consideration of the building and it is part of the innovation district and this approval applies only to the existing sign; 2) denied because the square footage of one allowed is more than double what is allowed in code; 3) denied - not clearly addressed in code.

Gabe seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE: January 11, 2018

John made a motion to adjourn.

Heidi seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at **4:40** p.m.

John Straussberger, Chair

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary