

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2013

- Members Present:** Capi Wampler, Brendan Ross, Nan Chase, David Carpenter, J. Ray Elingburg, Woodard Farmer, Richard Fast, David Nutter
- Members Absent:** Brian Cook, Patricia Cothran, Tracey Rizzo, Jo Stephenson
- Staff:** Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley
- Public:** Robert Tierney, Frank Hallstrom, Patsy Brison, Bridgett Putt Bounds, Jeanette Syprzak, Bruce J. Ikelheimer, Rob Motley, Gus Katsigiannis, Mark Marshall, Jody Kuhne, Andrea Lahti, Brian Astle, Barry Friedlander, David Patterson
- Call to Order:** Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.
- Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Nutter moves to adopt the November 13, 2013 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

- Owner/Applicant:** Jeanette Syprzak
Subject Property: 41 Starnes Ave.
Hearing Date: December 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-8325
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – storyboard; Exhibit C – location map; Exhibit D – site plan; Exhibit E – seven photographs of project area; Exhibit F – porch floor plan; Exhibit G – west and south elevation drawings; Exhibit H – photograph of existing porch column, with measurements; Exhibit I – detail drawing of proposed porch column and railings; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move 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 November, 2013, 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 November, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits J and K.

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 Construct new 8 x 16 ft. side porch on west side of house with shed style roof per attached plans and specifications. Porch will have T & G flooring and bead board ceiling to match existing. Porch posts and railings will match front porch. Remove existing non- original south facing door and infill with wood siding to match existing. Replace single non-original west facing window and add new salvaged wood, full light door to access porch with all trim to match existing. Roof material, paint and all details will match existing house. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows & Doors found on pages 84-85 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. The porch is compatible with the existing structure in scale, material and detail and does not obscure character defining features.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Ross

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Ross

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2. Owner/Applicant: | Bruce Ikelheimer |
| Subject Property: | 89 St. Dunstan's Road |
| Hearing Date: | December 12, 2013 |
| Historic District: | Montford |
| PIN: | 9648-51-1777 |
| Zoning District: | RS-8 |
| Other Permits: | Building & Zoning |

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – photograph of existing project area; Exhibit B – project description; Exhibit C – site plan; Exhibit D – eighteen

photographs of existing conditions; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move 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 November, 2013, 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 November, 2013 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 rehabilitate structure per attached plans and specifications. Remove broken concrete stairs and replace with re-poured concrete stairs on kitchen porch. Tile kitchen porch to match front porch and level out. Replace iron fence rail with wood to match existing wood rails on house. Paint foundation walls white to match existing on front side. Tile stair tread and construct wood hand rail to match existing front porch rail. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 66-67, in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan's Historic District, adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The stairs and railings will be replaced with similar materials that are compatible with the existing structure.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the St. Dunstan's Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Ross

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Ross

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Elzy Lindsey & Lauren Carlisle/Mark Marshall
Subject Property: 226 Flint Street
Hearing Date: December 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-15591
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten explains she did not receive the revised drawings until after the staff reports were written. The revised drawing is distributed to the Commission (<i>submitted 12/10/13</i>). She discusses the drawing, and explains there are issues with a retaining wall.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel, former site of 2 story dwelling.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: A single off-street parking space located on southeast corner of lot. Remove 24” Black Walnut. Install landscaping per landscape plan. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking should not be located in front of the structure. 2. More detail is needed for the landscape plan 3. Staff has asked the applicant for a revised plan. <p>The guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 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.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the application be continued until a revised plan is submitted.</p>
------------------------------	---

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Farmer says at the Preliminary Review it was recommended the building footprint be moved to the south side to allow parking on the other side. Commissioner Nutter asks for the discussion to be read from the October 9, 2013 minutes. Ms. Merten reads from p.18, “Commissioner Farmer asks about the plans for parking in front. Ms. Merten notes the guidelines say parking should be in the rear, or on the sides of a house. Mr. Marshall says there is a steep slope in the rear that prevents this. He notes there is a wall between the two houses that would come into play.

Commissioner Stephenson asks if there are retaining walls planned in the back, and how much excavation will take place. Mr. Marshall says there will be terraces in the back and a patio to the rear accessed from the first floor.

Discussion follows about citing the house differently, to address the parking concerns. Mr. Marshall thinks it could be shifted to the left, so that a driveway could be along the right side.”

Ms. Merten says she thought this would be addressed in the revised landscape plan, but it was not. She asks Mark Marshall to explain. Mr. Marshall says a site issue is determining the house placement. He has had a grader/excavator and an engineer look at the stone retaining wall on the left, which has a 5’ drop in the back towards the adjoining property. He says they need a 6’ clearance from the footer to the wall, in order not to blow out the wall. The house has to be moved 4’ to 5’ up to the right setback, in order to avoid damaging the wall. He says a driveway could go along the south side, about halfway to where the stone wall starts up the rise. He says the driveway apron is approx. 19’ wide and the drive way will be 15’ wide.

Commissioner Farmer asks if the setback is a zoning setback (*yes*). Mr. Marshall notes parking is allowed in the setback. He says by the January meeting he will have plot maps drawn to show the driveway placement.

Commissioner Nutter asks if he will also respond to Ms. Merten’s concern about the plantings. Mr. Marshall says they can pull them more to the left side, and make a break along the property line. Ms. Merten does not want them to highlight the parking area. She notes the fruiting variety of ginkgo is a concern, and recommends a fruitless variety or a native tree.

Commission Action

MOTION TO CONTINUE

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Elingburg

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Andrea Lahti/Jody Kuhne
Subject Property 78 Flint Street
Hearing Date: December 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.21-6905
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report. She notes there are inconsistencies in the drawings that should be addressed. Property Description: Vacant parcel with existing accessory structure being subdivided from 76 Starnes.
-----------------------	---

	<p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new two-story 1,850 sq. ft single family structure with front porch per attached plans and specifications. New structure will have block foundation with brick veneer and wooden shingle siding. Roof will be gabled in form with a 12:9 primary pitch and 4:12 pitch over porch. Roof material will be 5v groove slate grey metal. Windows will be double-hung, aluminum clad, SDL, six over one and some multi-light aluminum clad, SDL casements. Door will be wood. Porch will have T&G flooring, plywood ceiling, shingled columns and railings 2” wide, 5” on center. Details include 4 and 5” window and door surrounds and decorative lintels. Front walk will be concrete.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant has been asked to submit revised drawings and landscape plan to address concerns and omission on original drawings. 2. Door specifications needed. <p>The guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines for Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 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.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval provided revised drawings are complete.</p> <p>Reasons: The structure is compatible with the district in scale, texture and material.</p>
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Jody Kuhne, property owner, passes around revised drawings and the storyboard. He describes changes that were made as a result of the Preliminary Review. He notes the porch columns are now more traditional and match others in the neighborhood. He notes they have changed the Prairie style windows to 6 over 1.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhne points out areas of the foundation where they have changed from brick to siding, showing photographs of neighboring houses with this treatment. He says the area under the porch is not a finished space, but came about when the retaining walls were designed. He says the openings will be filled with square lattice. The window in the basement is very visible, and they want it to have privacy. Commissioner Carpenter asks about the trim (8”x8”). Ms. Merten notes it will be painted.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer asks about the window bank on the front façade. Mr. Kuhne shows photos of neighboring houses he is using for inspiration, says his examples come mostly from Flint St. Mr. Kuhne shows a sample brick, Commissioner Carpenter asks about the color of the mortar (<i>gray, or could color if required</i>). Mr. Kuhne says his mason grew up on Starnes</p>

	<p>Avenue in the 1950s. He shows his landscape plan, noting the footprint of the house and the setbacks. Ms. Merten describes the subdividing plan, and notes an existing accessory structure will be part of the property where the new house will be. Mr. Kuhne says he plans to paint the accessory structure to match the new house.</p> <p>Commissioner Carpenter asks about the roof material. Mr. Kuhne says he could use either metal or asphalt, but prefers metal. He submits a sample of 5V crimp, noting it will not be shiny. It will be a baked on charcoal gray color.</p> <p>Commissioner Nutter asks Ms. Merten to clarify whether the Commission can define the roof material. Ms. Merten says new construction allows metal, if the details are consistent with the overall scheme and design. She says metal roofs were used historically in the district. Commissioner Fast notes the subtle color chosen will prevent the roof from overpowering the rest of the house, Commissioner Chase agrees. Commissioner Ross says although she leans towards shingles, the simplicity of the metal roof may tone down some of the busyness of the siding shingles and bricks. Commissioner Carpenter notes the applicant is proposing a metal roof design that meets the guidelines, Commissioner Elingburg agrees.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhne says only a 5” maple tree will have to be removed. He says the rest of the trees were established 6-8 years ago, and gives details of other proposed plantings.</p> <p>Commissioner Ross asks if there will be handrails on the front steps. Mr. Kuhne says if code requires, he will use simple wooden rails that will match those on the porch. Ms. Merten says he should submit a revised drawing if one is required.</p>
--	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
Bridgett Putt Bounds	Ms. Bounds, Montford resident, says she has known Mr. Kuhne for many years, and has worked with him on projects. She thinks he always does a good job.
Brian Astle	Mr. Astle, Montford resident, asks if the headers on the windows will be visible from the street. Mr. Kuhne says they will. Commissioner Carpenter asks if the three small windows will have the same header (yes).

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners Carpenter and Ross note that the house’s appearance will be more unified when the shingles are painted.

Commission Action

<p>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction worksheet; Exhibit B – window specifications; Exhibit C – east, north, south and west elevations; Exhibit D – site plan; Exhibit E – floor plans for 1st floor, basement and 2nd floor; Exhibit F –</p>

storyboard; Exhibit G – revised drawings (*submitted 12/11/13*); Exhibit H – ten photographs of neighboring houses; Exhibit I – color sample for siding; Exhibit J – roof color sample; Exhibit K – roof sample; Exhibit L – brick sample; Exhibit M – cedar shake sample; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move 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 November, 2013, 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 November, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits N and O.
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 construct a new two-story 1,850 sq. ft single family structure with front porch per attached plans and specifications. New structure will have block foundation with brick veneer and wooden shingle siding. Roof will be gabled in form with a 12:9 primary pitch and 4:12 pitch over porch. Roof material will be 5v groove slate grey metal. Windows will be double-hung, aluminum clad, SDL, six over one and some multi-light aluminum clad, SDL casements. Door will be wood. Porch will have T&G flooring, plywood ceiling, shingled columns and railings 2” wide, 5” on center. Details include 4 and 5” window and door surrounds and decorative lintels. Front walk will be concrete. **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, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 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. The structure is compatible with the district in scale, texture and material.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter
Second by: Commissioner Carpenter
Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter
Second by: Commissioner Elingburg
Vote for: ALL

(26 Cumberland Circle withdrawn)

Preliminary Review:

1)

Owner/Applicant: Bridget Putt Bounds
Subject Property 97 Santee Street
Hearing Date: December 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639-85-5135
Zoning District: RS-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows photographs of the newly constructed driveway and reviews the following staff report. After her site visit, she is not sure there can be much landscaping enhancement around the driveway. She expresses concern about the minimal detail shown on the elevation drawings. She notes the house next door (also owned by the applicant) is similarly simple and though approved by the HRC, she is concerned that it was not constructed in accord with the CA noting that the windows on the house are not SDL.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel where driveway has recently been constructed.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two-story 20' x 22' residential structure with front porch and 12' x 16' accessory structure per attached plans and specifications.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. All drawings must be to scale and consistent, accurately depicting elevations, height above grade, foundation materials, and other details.2. Walkway is not in a traditional configuration3. Enhance foundation, driveway and parking area landscaping4. Sample of roofing material, house colors, foundation and story-board are required for final5. Detailing on new structure is very minimal, creating a texture that is inconsistent with the neighborhood. <p>The guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 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.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
-----------------------	---

Applicant(s)	Bridgett Putt Bounds, property owner, says she would like to build a two-story house, and make it as simple as possible. She describes the neighboring houses and parking situation. They are mostly rancher rentals, with lots of on-street parking. She shows the proposed site plan, and says she does not want to remove the trees. She says her drawings have been corrected to scale. She says the plans match her existing house, and she wanted them to be simple.
---------------------	--

Commission Comments/Discussion

Ms. Merten says the windows on her existing house seem to have snap-in muntins, which the guidelines do not allow. Ms. Bounds says they are snap-in, she likes these because they are easier to clean, and they were approved several years ago by HRC.

Chair Wampler asks the applicant if she has an updated copy of the guidelines, and encourages her to look at the ones posted online for the latest version. Ms. Merten explains only SDLs are allowed, Ms. Bounds says she could change to those. Montford resident Brian Astle notes they are easier to clean, because the snap-in parts don't have to be removed.

Commissioner Farmer asks about the foundation materials shown on the drawing, saying they vary. Ms. Bounds says they will be block, covered with square lattice. She says the foundation and the porch columns will be exactly the same as her existing house. Commissioner Farmer asks about the metal roof material, she says it will be 5v crimp. Ms. Merten instructs her to bring a sample to the final review.

Commissioner Carpenter asks about the siding reveal, Ms. Merten says it is too wide. Commissioner Carpenter asks about the extent of the siding, and a scratched out part of the drawing in the gable area. Ms. Bounds says she considered cedar shakes for the gable, but now wants only siding for simplicity. There will be nothing in the gable. Ms. Merten points out that the door in the foundation should be drawn to scale.

The walkway plan is discussed, Ms. Bounds does not want to put one straight to the street. Ms. Merten says that is not required, but the plan as shown is too close to the house. She asks if the house can be moved back. Ms. Bounds said she located the house to align with neighboring houses. Ms. Merten says the location is bad for the trees, they will grow into the house and there is no room for the walkway. Ms. Bounds says she plans to top the trees, because she doesn't want to cut them down. They are Douglas firs. Ms. Merten says topping would create a hedge, and is not healthy for the trees. Ms. Bounds says she thought trees had to be preserved. Ms. Merten says trees can be removed for new construction, and these trees are not very old. She says either the house will have to be set back some, or the trees removed. Commissioner Nutter says preserving the trees would justify moving the house back a bit.

Ms. Merten suggests the applicant also consider removing the trees on top of the driveway entrance, saying they may put too much pressure on the rock wall. Ms. Bounds notes some of their roots are showing after the driveway excavation.

Other placements for the walkway are discussed. Commissioner Chase suggests starting it closer to the street and routing it through the trees. Ms. Bounds says this will not work because she does not want to remove an existing fence. Commissioner Nutter asks if the applicant would be willing to work with someone to create a better site plan. Ms. Bounds answers no.

Ms. Merten tells the applicant what she will need to submit for the final review – detailed elevations, landscape plan, storyboard, material samples and specifications, and floor plans. She

notes the floor plans do not seem to be complete. Ms. Bounds says the floor plans she submitted are the final plans, and there are no walls inside the house.

Commissioner Chase asks about the height of the foundation in the front of the house. Ms. Bounds says it will be about 8', and 3' in the back of the house. She says 315 Pearson Drive has a huge rock foundation, and her house at 317 Pearson Drive has a 10' foundation in the front. Ms. Merten says if she is proposing to cover it with lattice, it should show clearly on the drawings. They discuss the plantings along the driveway.

Ms. Merten reminds the applicant she will need to schedule a pre-application conference with her before she submits her final application. Ms. Bounds says she has already made her copies, and doesn't understand what should change. Ms. Merten says she needs to make changes based on issues that have been discussed in this Preliminary Review, to meet the guidelines.

Commissioner Chase says she would like to see a better drawing showing the foundation of the rear cottage. Commissioner Carpenter asks about the long windows, and thinks the window locations seem haphazard. Ms. Bounds says an interior staircase defined the placement, and she has aligned the tops of the windows where she can. She says the building code wouldn't let her put a larger window at the stair landing. Commissioner Carpenter says she needs to meet the code, but should look for another configuration that looks better from the street.

Ms. Bounds says she will not be present for the final review, but will have someone represent her.

2)

Owner/Applicant: Robert Motley
Subject Property 47 Short Street
Hearing Date: December 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.11-8891
Zoning District: RM-8

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten says she has received a complaint about posts put up on this parcel to prevent parking, but does not think that will be a problem once the house is build. She shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel at corner of Short Street and Cumberland Place.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two-story structure with front porch per attached plans and specifications.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guide lines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Massing is good and style is appropriate. 2. Detailing is somewhat out of character with district. 3. Drawings should accurately depict elevation grading. 4. Sidewalk should be perpendicular to the street/material?
------------------------------	---

	<p>5. Landscape plan required, story board, window and door specifications and sample materials required for final.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Rob Motley and Gus Katsigiannis offer to answer questions. He says they are in the due diligence phase before purchasing the lot. Mr. Motley says the lot is non-conforming but legal and buildable lot. He says they will be building the house as a spec project. He asks the Commission and Ms. Merten to clarify the concerns so they can find an appropriate design. He notes the lot is small, and wants to learn about setback flexibility. The current design is only 22’ wide. He thinks its scale and massing would fit in with the neighboring houses and be within the setbacks. Mr. Motley says they want to use historical materials where appropriate, such as wood siding.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Ms. Merten says the plan submitted has more of a Low-country feel than Montford style. Commissioner Fast agrees. Mr. Motley says he is seeking a preliminary green light to see if they are on the right track before they purchase the property. Chair Wampler tells the applicants they should not be concerned, the massing fits the lot and the Commission can help with the details. She likes the fish scale detail, noting it may be the first time she has seen it presented for new construction. She notes the headers on the windows are not typical, and suggests they look at houses in the neighborhood for examples. Commissioner Nutter suggests the applicant use nearby Sallie’s Cottage as inspiration.

Commissioner Chase asks about the setback requirements since it is on the corner. Ms. Merten says that would make it 7½’ on the side. Mr. Motley says he has a letter from the City saying 6’ is sufficient, and if that is not correct his plan wouldn’t work on the small lot. Ms. Merten notes that is the correct setback for the zoning district, except for corner lots. Commissioner Farmer notes the HRC has the authority to vary a setback requirement.

Commissioners agree the applicant is on the right track. Mr. Motley thanks them for their input.

3)

Owner/Applicant: Mark Marshall
Subject Property 42 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date: December 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649-21-0881
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report. She says her major concerns are with the windows on the upper</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>level. She says there is a specific need for the exterior staircase, and asks the applicant to explain.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two-story 2,600 Sq. ft. home with accessory apartment per attached plans and specifications.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some windows have non- traditional muntin orientation. 2. Yard tree and foundation plantings required. 3. Parking should not be located in front of the structure. <p>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.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Mark Marshall, Trio Construction, says they are willing to make changes in window styles. He says the exterior staircase is required for an auxiliary apartment on the 2nd floor. They looked at internal solutions, but faced fire code problems.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Chase asks that two solutions be presented for the staircase, enclosed and not. Commissioner Farmer questions the lapped siding on the front of the house, whether it should continue across. Ms. Merten thinks there are other houses in the district with this treatment, but they are new construction. Commissioner Carpenter says only existing houses should be used as precedents.

Chair Wampler asks about the driveways. Mr. Marshall says one is planned for later, says all future plans will be removed from the final application. He is proposing one on the left side following the natural line of the property, and says there is a bank there that forms a natural barrier. A large oak that would have to be removed if the driveway continues to the back of the house. Commissioner Farmer asks if the parking could be further back, so the parking would be more on the side than the front (*yes*).

Mr. Marshall answers questions about the foundation material (traditional masonry with stone appliqué), and says the chimney will be the same.

Other Business:

Annual Retreat. The Commissioners’ annual retreat is scheduled for February 19, 2014.

Update on Preservation Plan. The next public meetings for the Preservation Plan will be on January 30 and March 20. Ms. Merten and Chair Wampler note the turnout for the first meeting

was very good given the short notice and weather. The contract had been signed only a few days beforehand. Also, the attendees were not just from the preservation community.

Commissioner Farmer comments about the possibility of conservation districts. Ms. Merten says they are researching their feasibility. She is putting a list of stakeholder/focus groups together for the consultants' next visit. Commissioner Nutter says he hopes groups will be found from the unincorporated portions of Buncombe County. Ms. Merten expresses concern about resources and the timeline, but agrees there should be at least one group from the County. Commissioner Ross says even though money drives the concerns, she thinks it would be very important.

Metal roof guidelines. Commissioner Carpenter expresses concern that there should have been a limit put into the guidelines for the width of a drip edge when the revisions were made. He notes they are being installed in Montford with widths up to 4 or 5 inches, which is not historic at all. Ms. Merten says the Commission could vote to change the wording, asks if 1½ inch would work. Commissioner Farmer offers to research available materials. Atty. Ashley says the Commission would have to vote on any change to the guidelines.

Council Liaison. Ms. Merten reports that Mayor Manheimer will continue as the City Council liaison for HRC.

Commissioner Nutter moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Carpenter

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 6:09 pm.