

DRAFT

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting
Minutes of August 10, 2016
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall
4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, William Eakins (arrived in meeting at 4:42 p.m.), Richard Fast, Julie Hansbury, Leslie Klingner, Elias George Mathes, Bryan Moffitt and Amanda Warren

Absent: Craig Cline and Woodard Farmer

Administrative

- After the meeting was called to order, Chair Ross invited Haley Mahoney from the Sustainability Department to give a brief presentation on the City's Workplace Challenge.
- Mr. Moffitt moved to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2016, meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hansbury and carried unanimously.
- Mr. Moffitt moved to continue the Certificate of Appropriateness - Local Landmark - Reynolds Summer House to a date uncertain. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hansbury and carried unanimously.
- After Chair Ross explained the public hearing rules, all those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

Consent Agenda

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness - Montford/Soco Intersection - Installation of two new bus shelters at east and west sides of intersection**

Owner/Applicant: City of Asheville/Montford Neighborhood Association
Subject Property: Montford/Cullowhee Intersection
Hearing Date: August 10, 2016
Historic District: Montford
PIN: ROW
Zoning District: RM-8

Property Description: Two existing concrete bus shelter pads within the public right-of-way on the east and west sides of the intersection, specifically at the northwest corner of Montford and Cullowhee and at the southeast corner of Montford and Soco.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Installation of two bus shelters; shelters will be located at the southeast and northwest corners of the intersection of Montford Avenue and Cullowhee Street. Shelters will be constructed of custom-welded metal vertical supports and rafters. Roof will be metal 5v-Crimp with 24" coverage and 0.5" depth in charcoal color. Clear acrylic side panels will be installed to shield the shelter from the elements. Interpretive panels illustrating Montford history will also be installed within the sides of the shelters. **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 guidelines for Sidewalks, Streets, and Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47 and Roofs found on pages 73-74 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 13, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

DRAFT

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

1. New public features will be located to minimize their impact to the historic district and will be compatible with the historic district in terms of design, material, and scale.
2. Metal roof will be of a design that is compatible with the historic styles in the district and will be medium to dark in color.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - project description and specifications (5 pages); Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – photographs of subject property (4 pages); Exhibit D – photograph of Grove Arcade vendor stalls; Exhibit E – bus shelter rendering and elevations (2 pages); Exhibit F – example of interpretive panel at Montford bus shelter; and Exhibit G – metal roofing specifications (received August 9 and August 10, 2016); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, Mr. Moffitt 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 27th day of July, 2016, 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 27th day of July, 2016 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 to install two bus shelters; shelters will be located at the southeast and northwest corners of the intersection of Montford Avenue and Cullowhee Street. Shelters will be constructed of custom-welded metal vertical supports and rafters. Roof will be metal 5v-Crimp with 24” coverage and 0.5” depth in charcoal color. Clear acrylic side panels will be installed to shield the shelter from the elements. Interpretive panels illustrating Montford history will also be installed within the sides of the shelters. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Sidewalks, Streets, and Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47 and Roofs found on pages 73-74 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted April 14, 2010, and amended May 13, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. New public features will be located to minimize their impact to the historic district and will be compatible with the historic district in terms of design, material, and scale.
 - b. Metal roof will be of a design that is compatible with the historic styles in the district and will be medium to dark in color.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

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

As there was no objection to the Montford/Soco Intersection being placed on the Consent Agenda, the FINDING OF FACT were adopted and the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

DRAFT

Public Hearings

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 83 Starnes Avenue - Construction of new one-story 397 sq. foot rear addition**

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole used site plans while she reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant: Elizabeth Gerson
Subject Property: 83 Starnes Avenue
Hearing Date: August 10, 2016
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-3058
Zoning District: RM-8

Property Description: Late 19th early 20th century 1-story vernacular Queen Anne cottage. Octagonal projection with octagonal roof, turned porch posts, plain spindle frieze. Constructed prior to 1907.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of new 375 square foot one-story addition on rear elevation. Addition will have wood siding matching existing and shed roof. Windows will be wood 2/2, double-hung; one 9-lite wood door will be reused and two new single pane French doors will be installed. A small overhang will extend over side door with _____ roof, posts, and landing, per attached drawings and plans. **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 concerns as to whether the proposed addition is compatible with the existing building in massing, roof form and pitch.
2. Staff has concerns about visual impact to the historic building based on proposed scale and size in conjunction with previous addition.

The guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on May 13, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend approval of the addition as proposed.

Ms. Cole explained that the house has an existing addition on the rear of the house, and that the new addition is being proposed to extend from that part of the building. She said that staff has concerns regarding the visual impact of adding another addition. Staff also has concerns as to whether it would be compatible with the existing house.

Ms. Elizabeth Gerson, applicant, stated that the proposed addition is for a master bedroom. She contacted a designer who was familiar with the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District. She stated that they were trying to best meet the guidelines.

Mr. Jody Kuhne, designer/engineer, showed images of the existing building. Using the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, he explained his interpretation of how this addition complies with specific guidelines with relating to massing, roof form and pitch. He noted that he re-measured the square footage and the new rear addition is actually 344 sq. feet, not 397 sq. feet. He also explained in detail why, based on mathematical calculations of surrounding properties, the addition would not be in conflict with the guideline regarding open green space. Depending on concerns raised, the applicant would be amenable to a continuance.

DRAFT

Mr. Carpenter had a concern about the roofline and suggested a solution might be a gable-end roof instead of the partial hip/shed roof proposed, which Mr. Kuhne and Ms. Gerson agreed might work.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:34 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:34 p.m.

Mr. Moffitt explained his concerns about the fenestration as proposed, as well as the roof form. He stated that the roof form of the existing addition in combination with the proposed new addition seems oddly elongated and is not compatible with the house. He noted that aligning the floor level of the additions might allow for a more congruous roof design. Mr. Moffitt also stated that the fenestration should be more in keeping with that of the main part of the house. He did not see an issue with 1/1, double-hung windows proposed, just their placement.

There was discussion, initiated by Chair Ross, on whether the addition was compatible in scale to the historic house. Ms. Cole said the original square footage of the house is approximately 1,350 sq. ft. and the existing addition (constructed approximately 10-12 years ago, which was reviewed and issued a Certificate of Appropriateness) is approximately 270 sq. ft. She noted that the addition as proposed would bring the total square footage added to the historic house to roughly 600 square feet, with the historic house square footage at 1,080 square feet.

Mr. Moffitt noted that since the parcel is so long, the site would not be affected. Ms. Cole said that staff does not have any concern regarding impact to the site being over-powered, and explained that staff's concerns related to the form as proposed, as well as the impact to the historic building.

Ms. Hansbury also expressed concern with the window placement and sizing and stated that the fenestration on east elevation should be more compatible with the west elevation. She noted that raising the floor level to be the same as previous addition might provide a good solution to designing a more compatible roof form.

Ms. Gerson said that she was happy to work on revisions that would more closely meet the guidelines.

At the request of Ms. Gerson, Mr. Moffitt moved to continue this matter until the September 14, 2016, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Other Business

Rules of Procedure Amendment

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that they are working with the City Attorney's Office some amendments to HRC Rules of Procedure; however, they are not ready to present it at this time. Staff proposes to present the amendment at the September meeting, and then the Commission can vote on the amendment at the October meeting. There was a brief discussion regarding time limits on quasi-judicial matters vs. legislative matters. Ms. Ashley stated legal staff may recommend some additional amendments so the Rules may not be ready for adoption in September, and also that legal would like to plan a training session with the HRC.

Ms. Merten said she is unsure as to when the retreat will be held, but hopefully will be sometime this fall.

She touched briefly on some rules for Commissioners, including no ex-parte communication regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness, and also that the Commission's decisions should be made only on information presented at the public hearing at which time they should make a decision. She said that if there is any additional information that the Commission feels they need to make a decision, they need to let staff know and staff will do their best to provide that information. Also, if a Commission member has

DRAFT

pertinent information to a case, they should provide that to staff and staff will provide it to the rest of the Commission.

Chair Ross inquired about some sort of identification for Commission members when they make site visits. Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole said that staff always lets the applicants know that Commission members will make a site visit. Ms. Merten also said that staff can pursue getting name tag badges, but understood that once an application is made, it basically gives the authority for Commission members to visit the site.

Montford Design Guidelines Fencing Amendments

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole provided the Commission with some pages from the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, and outlined the proposed amendments regarding fencing and retaining walls.

It was the consensus of the Commission that all fences in front yards and retaining walls taller than 4 feet or longer than 10 feet will be a major work.

Ms. Cole wondered if the Commission would like to add language regarding the possibility of including screening requirements for retaining walls over a certain height. After discussion, noting that there is a Unified Development Ordinance requirement regarding screening for retaining walls over 6 feet, it was the consensus of the Commission to not add any additional requirements for screening. However, it was the consensus of the Commission to add language regarding retaining walls specifying that non-traditional materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that staff will provide Mr. David Patterson with revised pages of the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District for him to review with the Montford Neighborhood Association Board.

In response to Chair Ross, Ms. Cole said that staff has a brochure that explains the purpose of the HRC and Certificate of Appropriateness requirements.

Ms. Merten explained the enforcement process when Ms. Hansbury questioned what happens when people make changes that are out of compliance with the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Adjournment

At 5:35 p.m., Mr. Moffitt moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.