

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting
Minutes of April 8, 2015
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall
4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Brendan Ross; Nan Chase (left meeting at 5:50 p.m.), William Eakins, Woodard Farmer, Richard Fast, Bryan Moffitt, David Nutter, Rachel Sudnik and Joanne Stephenson.

Absent: David Carpenter, Tracey Rizzo and Amanda Warren

Administrative

- Mr. Eakins moved to approve the minutes of the March 11, 2015, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Nutter and carried unanimously.
- All those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

Consent Agenda

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 36 All Souls Crescent - Demolition of Non-Contributing Building

Owner/Applicant:	Gary Davis/PE-Davis
Subject Property:	36 All Souls Crescent
Hearing Date:	April 8, 2015
Historic District:	Biltmore Village
PIN:	9647.69-1726
Zoning District:	HB

Property Description: Mid- to late-20th century one-story commercial building with stone and wood siding.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is to demolish the existing non-contributing building to install surface parking, landscaping elements, and brick sidewalk. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements: Staff has no concerns.

The Goals for the Biltmore Village Historic District found on pages 7-9 of Chapter 2, Book 1, Guidelines for Site Design for Cottage and Mixed Use Areas and Parking Lots in All Areas found on pages 23 - 26 and 32-34 of Chapter 5, Book 1 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Guidelines adopted October 1, 1988, and the Biltmore Village Development Plan, adopted May 1, 1992, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons:

1. The building is non-contributing to the district.
2. The building does not meet the goal of re-establishing and strengthening the image of the original character of the district.
3. Surface parking is congruent with the economic development goals of the district.
4. Proposed landscaping and sidewalk are compatible with the historic character of the district.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – site plan showing existing building; Exhibit B – proposed surface parking and landscaping plan with details (3 pages); Exhibit C – photos of subject property (5 pages); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, it was the consensus of the Commission to adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT.

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of March, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 24th day of March, 2015, as indicated by Exhibits (E) and (F).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to demolish an existing non-contributing building to install surface parking, landscaping elements, and brick sidewalk. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the Goals for the Biltmore Village Historic District found on pages 7-9 of Chapter 2, Book 1, Guidelines for Site Design for Cottage and Mixed Use Areas and Parking Lots in All Areas found on pages 23-26 and 32-34 of Chapter 5, Book 1 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Guidelines adopted October 1, 1988, and the Biltmore Village Development Plan, adopted May 1, 1992, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The existing building is non-contributing to the district.
 - b. The existing building does not meet the goal of re-establishing and strengthening the image of the original character of the district.
 - c. Surface parking is congruent with the economic development goals of the district.
 - d. Proposed landscaping and sidewalk are compatible with the historic character of the district.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruent with the special character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

As there was no objection to the 26 All Souls Crescent Certificate of Appropriateness being placed on the Consent Agenda, the FINDINGS OF FACT were adopted and the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

Public Hearings

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 23 Courtland Avenue - Amendment to Shift, Add, and Restore Windows and Doors and to Construct a Skylight**

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Patrick McCarthy Construction, LLC
Subject Property:	23 Courtland Avenue
Hearing Date:	April 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.11-1820
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: Early 20th century two-story, irregularly massed vernacular dwelling, possibly designed by Richard Sharp Smith. Shingle over weatherboard exterior, brick foundation, Montford brackets, and simple detailing.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is an amendment to Permit No. 14-15547PZ - To rehabilitate structure per attached drawings and specifications. The work will include the following: replace roof with "Charcoal Black" asphalt shingles; install new HVAC at rear of structure per site plan, remove non character defining brick chimney; repair and repaint exterior surfaces as needed; remove non-original left side (southeast) porch; install 2 new windows in original openings in basement level on west elevation. Rebuild rear addition per attached drawings, including a new two level porch addition with all materials to match existing. Replace 12 lite window on first floor rear elevation with new door and on 2nd level add new door and remove one 12 lite window. New windows will be wood, double hung, two over one, SDL. New doors will be wood. **Restore one single-lite window along front façade. Enlarge basement door opening and construct a retaining wall along the west elevation. Shift location of two approved new windows and insertion of one new window at basement level along rear elevation. Removal of alcove and entry door and shifting of two windows at basement level along the east elevation. Modification of one twelve-lite window to an eight-lite window to an eight-lite window and insertion of a door in existing window opening on 2nd level of rear elevation. Construct new skylight that will extend beyond roofline. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has asked the applicant to confirm material for proposed retaining wall.
2. The proposed window and door on the second level of the rear elevation are not in keeping with the historic character of the house.
3. Staff has asked the applicant to submit historical documentation for proposed skylight.

That the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, the guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75, and the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons, provided that staff concerns are addressed:

1. Restoration of an original window opening on the primary façade contributes to the historic character of the building.
2. Additional and modified window and door openings are not located on the primary façade and are compatible with the overall design of the building.
3. Proposed windows on addition are similar to those of the original building in proportion, spacing, and materials.

Ms. Merten pointed out that Sheet A-204 on the list of drawings is labeled as East Elevation (in the package it was listed as North Elevation). After reviewing her three concerns outlined above, her outstanding concerns are (1) the configuration of the second level of the rear elevation proposed window and door, which she noted the applicant has a revised drawing; and (2) the request for historic documentation for the proposed skylight. She noted that the applicant has confirmed that the material for the retaining wall will be brick to match the existing foundation.

Upon inquiry of Mr. Moffitt, Mr. Patrick McCarthy, representing the owner, explained that he made an error in planning, thus requiring the removal of the alcove and entry door and the shifting of two windows at basement level along the east elevation.

After considerable discussion regarding the proposed window and door on the second level of the rear elevation, Mr. Moffitt suggested, and Mr. McCarthy agreed, to install an oversized door with one twelve-lite window on the 2nd level of the rear elevation which will allow the trim around the corner.

In response to Mr. Farmer regarding the skylight, Mr. McCarthy explained that he looked at the framing and the decking of the flat roof and even though he has been unable to find any photographs or drawings of a previous skylight, a man passing by said that he remembered when they removed the skylight that was there.

Mr. Mahan Kalpa Khalsa, owner of 23 Courtland Avenue, said that he has another house at 211 Montford Avenue that has the original skylight. From an I-Pad, he showed the Commission a photograph of the existing roofline and a view of standing underneath the existing ceiling at the house at 23 Courtland Avenue.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:35 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:35 p.m.

Mr. Farmer, along with Mr. Nutter, supported the skylight and even though the applicant has not been able to find any physical evidence of an existing skylight on the roof. He felt that a skylight would fit into the spirit of the historical character of this house in the Montford community.

Mr. Moffitt said that he would prefer to see more investigation into the historic documentation of the skylight, prior to approving this particular configuration at this time. He felt that if the skylight is installed, it should be installed the way it was originally.

Mr. Fast supported the insertion of the oversized door, but agreed with Mr. Moffitt in requesting additional information on the skylight.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – description of proposed work; Exhibit B – 1 photo of original window opening; Exhibit C – 1 photo of façade of house; Exhibit D – photos of existing skylight at nearby property; Exhibit E – proposed skylight specifications; Exhibit F – approved and proposed floor plans and elevations (18 pages); Exhibit G – revised south elevation; and Exhibit H - two photographs of the existing roof; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, Mr. Nutter moved that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of March, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 24th day of March, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (H) and (I).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is an amendment to Permit No. 14-15547PZ – To rehabilitate structure per attached drawings and specifications. The work will include the following: replace roof with "Charcoal Black" asphalt shingles; install new HVAC at rear of structure per site plan, remove non character defining brick chimney; repair and repaint exterior surfaces as needed; remove non-original left side (southeast) porch; install 2 new windows in original openings in basement level on west elevation.

Rebuild rear addition per attached drawings, including a new two level porch addition with all materials to match existing. Replace 12 lite window on first floor rear elevation with new door and on 2nd level add new door and remove one 12 lite window. New windows will be wood, double hung, two over one, SDL. New doors will be wood. **Restore one single-lite window along front façade. Enlarge basement door opening and construct a brick retaining wall to match existing foundation along the west elevation. Shift location of two approved new windows and insertion of one new window at basement level along rear elevation. Removal of alcove and entry door and shifting of two windows at basement level along the east elevation. Modification of one twelve-lite window and insertion of door per revised elevation drawings on 2nd level of rear elevation. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, the guidelines for Roofs found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Restoration of an original window opening on the primary façade contributes to the historic character of the building.
 - b. Additional and modified windows and door openings are not located on the primary façade and are compatible with the overall design of the building.
 - c. Proposed windows on addition are similar to those of the original building in proportion, spacing, and materials.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruent with the special character of the Montford Historic District.

This motion was seconded by Ms. Chase and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Nutter moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued, with the condition that revised drawings of the rear elevation be submitted for staff review. This motion was seconded by Ms. Chase and carried unanimously.

Mr. Nutter moved to continue the issue of the construction of the new skylight until the applicant can provide additional documentation of its previous existence. Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley said that a motion would not be necessary, and explained that if the Commission does not approve the skylight at this time, the applicant can apply for another amendment at a later date, provided they have adequate documentation to support the proposed skylight.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 42 Cumberland Avenue - Amendment to Increase Setback, Remove Stairway on South Elevation, and Removal of Two Trees Along Property Boundary

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Larry Golson
Subject Property:	42 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date:	April 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.21-0881
Zoning District:	RM-8

Property Description: This is a vacant parcel. Plans for new construction of a two-story single-family dwelling on the lot were approved March 12, 2014.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is an amendment to Permit No. 13-08138PZ - To construct new two-story 2,600 Sq. ft. home with accessory apartment per attached plans and specifications. New structure will have concrete block foundation with stone and stucco veneer. Siding will be a combination of smooth sided wood lap Hardi-board with 6.5" reveal and cedar shake per drawings. Roof will have a 12/12 pitch with clipped gable and shed dormers, covered in *chestnut* composition asphalt shingles. Chimney will be stone. Windows will be wood, SDL, two over 1 with casements on 2nd level. Details include decorative eave brackets and window and door surrounds. Front porch will have 6" x 6" support columns with a wood T&G floor and ceiling. Front walk will be stone. Driveway will be gravel. Foundation and buffer area landscaping per attached landscape plan. **Per attached revised site plan, submitted March 22, 2015, to allow additional setback, remove proposed stairway along south elevation, and removal of two trees along property boundary.**

Issued with the following condition: Window specifications, door specifications and stone sample be submitted for staff review.

All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff asks that the applicant confirm whether the request is for 53' or 55' setback.
2. Staff has concerns regarding the removal of two large trees on the property.

That the guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request was used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons:

1. Proposed site of the building is similar to the historic pattern of the district in terms of orientation, setback, retention of green space, and spacing between structures.
2. Design of the building is in keeping with the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site.

Ms. Merten said that the applicant is requesting for an additional setback of 55' feet (confirmed by applicant) due to relocation of a power line on the property. Her other concern was the removal of the two large trees on the property. Regarding the removal of the proposed stairway along the south elevation, she recalled the Commission was uncomfortable with that addition, and was pleased it will now be removed.

Mr. Larry Golson, applicant, said that he has been told by multiple contractors that during construction of the house, the root system of the two trees would be damaged and would have to be removed. His preference is not to remove the trees and would try to avoid root damage; however, if the trees are damaged during construction, he would like to have permission to remove them.

In response to Mr. Farmer, Mr. Golson explained that he has been working with Duke Energy Progress for the past eight months to get the power pole relocated, but at this point, they will not. He explained that is the reason why he has to request the setback.

Mr. Farmer pointed out that the revised drawing proposed the driveway ending near the front of the house, and noted that the guidelines do not permit parking in the front yard. He suggested that the driveway

could be extended further to the west so that a car could be parked along the side of the house. Mr. Golson agreed to that suggestion.

Regarding the removal of the two trees, Mr. Moffitt explained that the constant construction traffic of unloading materials is what causes root damage, and suggested that since there is room, both trees have some type of protection around them. Mr. Golson agreed to that suggestion. Ms. Merten noted that if a problem with the tree is encountered during construction that the applicant should contact her and she may be able to approve a removal.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:03 p.m.

Mr. David Patterson, resident at 33 Short Street, cautioned Mr. Golson about the natural stream line running through the 42 Cumberland Avenue property as it cannot be disturbed or built on, per the N.C. Dept. of Natural Resources guidelines. He also hoped that the two trees would not be removed as they provide a nice natural buffer.

Chair Ross closed the public hearing at 5:05 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – letter to the commission; Exhibit B – proposed site plan; Exhibit C – approved site plan; Exhibit D – proposed site plan showing adjacent properties; and Exhibit E - revised drawing of the south side elevation; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members; Ms. Stephenson moved that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of March, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 24th day of March, 2015, as indicated by Exhibits (F) and (G).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is an amendment to Permit No. 13-08138PZ - To construct new two-story 2,600 Sq. ft home with accessory apartment per attached plans and specifications. New structure will have concrete block foundation with stone and stucco veneer. Siding will be a combination of smooth sided wood lap Hardi-board with 6.5" reveal and cedar shake per drawings. Roof will have a 12/12 pitch with clipped gable and shed dormers, covered in chestnut composition with asphalt shingles. Chimney will be stone. Windows will be wood, SDL, two over 1 with casements on 2nd level. Details include decorative eave brackets and window and door surrounds. Front porch will have 6" x 6" support columns with a wood T&G floor and ceiling. Front walk will be stone. Driveway will be gravel. Foundation and buffer area landscaping per attached landscaped plan. **To allow additional setback and remove proposed stairway along south elevation.**

Issued with the following condition: (1) Window specifications, door specifications and stone sample be submitted for staff review.

All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.

4. That the guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 and the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 2013 were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Proposed site of the building is similar to the historic pattern of the district in terms of orientation, setback, retention of green space, and spacing between structures.
 - b. Design of the building is in keeping with the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruent with the special character of the Montford Historic District.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Ms. Stephenson moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued, with the following conditions: (1) that the trees in question at the southwest corner of the property be given tree protection during the construction process; (2) that the driveway be extended as much as feasibly possible along the side elevation of the property; and (3) that a revised plan showing the tree protection and the extended driveway be submitted to staff for review and approval. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 14 Lodge Street - Replacement of Granite Kick Plates and Front Entry Doors

Ms. Chase moved to continue this public hearing until May 13, 2015. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Preliminary Review - None

Other Business

Castanea Landmark Preliminary Application - 57-63 Haywood Street

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that the property description is that it is a three-story brick commercial building designed by architect William J. East. Constructed in 1921, the Castanea Building features a curved orange-brown brick façade that mimics the curve along Haywood Street. Corbelled pilasters with contracting brick bases divide the horizontal bands of windows. Storefronts line the street level along the front façade, glass block kick plates, display windows, double-leaf and single doors, and multi-light or glass block transoms. A single door at the southwest corner of the building provides access to the upper stories, which also retain a good degree of original architectural character. The building was rehabilitated utilizing historic tax credits in 2001.

HRC staff concerns per the applicable guidelines and submittal requirement are as follows: (1) documentation and argument for special historic or cultural significance based on the architectural character of the building is not sufficient to denote designation; and (2) additional documentation and argument for special historic or cultural significance based on the property's association with local community development is not sufficient to denote designation.

Therefore, staff does not recommend that the applicant pursue a final Local Landmark application for the subject property. She said that the building does have a lot of integrity, but she cannot recommend it for landmark designation. She also said that there has been some preliminary consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and there is general agreement that the significance is not there.

Ms. Chase noted that Ms. Merten's recommendation was also the agreement of the Executive Committee. In response to Mr. Nutter, Ms. Merten said that the Landmark Committee arrived at the same recommendation.

Mr. Moffitt felt the strongest part of the building is the interior, but the exterior part has not retained its integrity.

Ms. Sudnik noted that according to Sanborn maps, the Castanea Building was one of the earliest buildings constructed along Haywood Street. Ms. Merten concurred, but pointed out that the application doesn't illustrate that the Castanea Building was the catalyst for development along Haywood Street.

There was considerable discussion on this issue, including mentioning what other buildings on Haywood Street that have been designated local landmarks. Ms. Merten said that to determine landmark status, it first has to meet one of the significant criteria. Once that has been established, the next test is whether or not the level of integrity would convey, relative to the established special significance.

Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley said that the statutes are stringent with regard to local landmark designations. They are written to say "you shall not designate a property, unless it is deemed and found by the preservation commission to be of special significance in terms of its historical, pre-historical, architectural or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design setting workmanship, materials, feeling and/or association."

In response to Mr. Moffitt, Ms. Merten agreed that there are additional tools for preservation if landmark status is not pursued or approved.

Ms. Sybil Argintar, drafter of the application, felt that comments by the Commission establishes that the architectural integrity is present. The one change is the altered façade on one storefront. She stated that the building is associated with events that have contributed significantly to the history of Asheville and Buncombe County - noting that it needs to meet only one of the following criteria: (1) The building was significant in the early development of the Haywood Street commercial corridor: It was one of the first that started that commercial development. (2) It is associated with the life of a person significant to our local history: Architect William J. East and developer Julian Woodcock. (3) It embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, which relates back to integrity. It is a very intact building and the concave façade is very unique and nothing else is like that in downtown Asheville. (4) It represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values. She noted that William J. East was a very prominent architect. Of the two buildings that they know of which he has designed in downtown Asheville (Haywood Building and the Castanea Building), this building is by far the most intact representation of his work as far as commercial-building property type. (5) Likely to yield important historic or pre-historic information - which is not applicable to this property.

Chair Ross said that the Commission has discussed this issue at their February 11 meeting and made a site visit. She felt that neither the special significance or the integrity has been established.

There was discussion, initiated by Mr. Fast, regarding whether William J. East being met the requirement of association with a master architect. Mr. Farmer read an excerpt from the N.C. State Architectural Library Commentary of Mr. East.

Ms. Carol Lytle, one of the original condominium owners of the Castanea Building, felt that the application meets at least three of the five criteria regarding special significance: (1) association with architect William J. East; (2) the building has architectural significance in that it is intact and has unique work detailing on the interior in particular; and (3) the building's role in the development of the commercial arm along Haywood Street.

Mr. Nutter felt that based on the special significance criteria outlined by Ms. Lytle, he supported allowing the applicant to move forward with a full study of the Local Landmark application. He recommended the applicant research further the significance of (1) the architect and his work; (2) the architectural significance of the building itself; and (3) the historical significance of it's role and place in the development of downtown Asheville.

In response to Mr. Fast, Ms. Merten said that she did not think that the building contributes to the broad pattern of history in a way that is special enough to say that it should be landmarked. The architect has a little bit more promise perhaps, but the application doesn't develop that enough at this stage to say that it's significant. Her biggest concern is that if the architect criteria is what we want them to pursue, then the integrity issue will come into play and she also has concerns about that.

Ms. Stephenson said that whatever decision the Commission makes doesn't demean what the building is and it doesn't mean the Commission doesn't want it to be preserved. The City has hundreds of wonderful buildings in Asheville and fantastic architects, but is the Castanea Building significance enough to achieve local landmark status.

Ms. Chase agreed with Ms. Stephenson. She identified an event as a day, a battle, a signing of something, or a single distinct thing. She could not support moving forward on the grounds that the process of development is the same as an event. At this time, Ms. Chase left the meeting for a prior commitment.

Mr. Eakins said that as an attorney looking at the language in the North Carolina statutes, there is no case to be made that would bring him to vote for local landmark status for the Castanea Building. If the applicant chooses to move forward, he suggested they research the architect and possible connection to local history in the form of the Woodcock family are the stronger arguments.

Mr. Farmer moved that the application move forward. This motion was seconded by Mr. Nutter and carried on a 5-3 vote with Chair Ross, Mr. Moffitt and Ms. Sudnick voting "no."

Ms. Merten said the next steps are that the applicant will have as much time as they need to develop the final report. Staff and the Landmark Committee will review it, and may suggest revisions. Once they feel it is ready, they will forward it to the State Historic Preservation Office for comment, and possible revisions. The Commission will then have a hearing on determining whether the Building does have specific significance and integrity to convey that significance. Finally, the recommendation of the Commission will be forwarded onto City Council for review.

Education Committee Report

Mr. Nutter said that the Education Committee discussed the revamping of the HRC website. He noted that with all the growth going on in the City, with the update to the City's Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Ordinance, this is a good time to think about the education piece.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten reminded the Commission that the Education Committee meets every other month and the next one will be June 3 at 3:00 p.m. She encouraged the Committee to attend.

Secretary Klutz Visit Report

Chair Ross said that Secretary Klutz' visit to Asheville was successful, as she personally has used the historic tax credits.

Biltmore Village Walk Update

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that the City's Neighborhood Coordinator Marsha Stickford, organized the Biltmore Village Walk. She said the landscaping issue came up again, noting that the landscaping issue also came up when the Commission went on their own walk. The Village was interested in contributing some money of their own towards landscaping. The Commission has about \$4,500 returned from the Biltmore Village Redevelopment Fund from the State Rural Center after the flood. She said her interest was would trying to restore the Ulmstead landscape to the extent possible.

Nominating Committee Report

Mr. Fast moved to accept the Nominating Committee report for the Executive Committee and Chair - effective July 1, 2015: Brendan Ross as Chair; Joanne Stephenson as First Chair; Woodard Farmer as Second Chair; and Bryan Moffitt as Third Chair. All nominees have agreed to their nomination. There being no other nominations from the floor, the nominations were closed. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley said that at the Commission's next meeting, a final vote will be made on the nominations.

Sondley Award Nomination

On behalf of the entire Commission, Chair Ross was pleased to present the Sondley Award to Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten, for her outstanding work on the Historic Preservation Master Plan, in addition to her regular duties as Historic Resources Director.

Ms. Merten thanked the Commission for their support.

Adjournment

At 6:10 p.m., Mr. Nutter moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.