

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting
Minutes of December 9, 2015
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall
4:00 p.m.

Present: Vice-Chair Woodard Farmer; David Carpenter, William Eakins, Richard Fast, Julie Hansbury, Leslie Klingner (arrived at 4:10 p.m.), Bryan Moffitt, David Nutter and Rachel Sudnik

Absent: Chair Brendan Ross, Joanne Stephenson and Amanda Warren

Administrative

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

Consent Agenda

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 70 Magnolia Avenue - Reconstruction of existing rear addition

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

Owner/Applicant:	Patricia Dunn/Molly Cassidy
Subject Property:	70 Magnolia Avenue
Hearing Date:	December 9, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.13-7205
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: Late 19th century early 20th century 1 ½-story vernacular Shingle style dwelling. Shingle siding, shingled porch posts, recessed porch, rounded tower, stone foundation. Constructed prior to 1917.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Reconstruction of a one-story, heavily altered accessory structure that was previously attached to the rear of the main house in the 1960s. Reconstructed attached accessory structure will have concrete foundation with stone veneer matching existing. Roof form will include reconstruction of existing gable-ends facing east and west elevations and constructing a cross-gable that will attach to the main house 12” below existing ridge; roof will be asphalt shingle and have 13/12 pitch matching main house. Siding will be cedar shake and will be painted to match main house. Existing multi-lite diamond casement and 4-lite casement windows will be reused. One pair of multi-lite, wood French doors will be installed on east elevation and two half-lite, wood paneled doors will be installed on west elevation. Existing chimney will be retained, and rebuilt as needed. Existing concrete retaining wall in rear yard will be replaced with a new stone veneer retaining wall, per the attached drawings and plans. Reconstructed attached accessory structure will be built in the same location and footprint as existing which is encroaching required setback; a Flexible Development Application has been approved for 16” side and 32” rear setback to reconstruct in existing footprint. **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 regarding modification of cantilevered gable end on west elevation.
2. Staff has concerns regarding fenestration on east elevation.

The guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, Additions found on pages 88-89, Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, Roofs found on pages 74-75, Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Architectural features that are character defining elements of the accessory structure, including roof form, windows and chimney, will be maintained.
2. Replacement materials will match the historic materials in composition, dimension, shape, and pattern.
3. Replacement structure will be located in the same footprint as existing, which is sited on the rear elevation.
4. Windows will be similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing and materials.
5. Doors and door openings to be replaced are non-historic; new doors will be wood and new door openings will be installed on a non-character defining façade.

Ms. Cole said that the applicant has provided revised drawings.

Ms. Molly Cassidy, daughter of the owner, said that they are learning about the history of the house. Due to existing conditions, she has been advised by contractors that the chimney will likely need to be rebuilt rather than just repaired.

Mr. Moffitt confirmed that rebuilding of the chimney is part of the permit application.

Vice-Chair Farmer opened the public hearing at 4:13 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 4:13 p.m.

Mr. Moffitt stated that the applicant had addressed the issue regarding fenestration and he did not have any objection to modification of the cantilevered gable end on west elevation.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Flexible Development form; Exhibit B – Sanborn Fire Insurance map; Exhibit C – project description; Exhibit D – Existing conditions assessment (8 pages); Exhibit E – floor plan of existing accessory structure; Exhibit F – GIS parcel map; Exhibit G – photographs (12 pages); Exhibit H – lighting specifications; Exhibit I – window specifications; Exhibit J – color sample; Exhibit K – exterior wall dimensions; Exhibit K – existing floor plan; Exhibit L – proposed accessory structure floor plan; Exhibit M – proposed roof plan; Exhibit M – existing roof and floor plan; Exhibit N – proposed elevation drawings (2 pages); Exhibit O – aerial photograph of property; Exhibit P – revised demolition plan and proposed roof plan; Exhibit Q – revised existing and proposed site plan; Exhibit R – revised existing and proposed elevation drawings (4 pages); Exhibit S - photograph of west elevation; Exhibit T - revised drawings (6 pages) dated December 9, 2015; 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 November, 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 November, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (U) and (V).

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 reconstruct a one-story, heavily altered accessory structure that was previously attached to the rear of the main house in the 1960s. Reconstructed attached accessory structure will have concrete foundation with stone veneer matching existing. Roof form will include reconstruction of existing gable-ends facing east and west elevations and constructing a cross-gable that will attach to the main house 12" below existing ridge; roof will be asphalt shingle and have 13/12 pitch matching main house. Siding will be cedar shake and will be painted to match main house. Existing multi-lite diamond casement and 4-lite casement windows will be reused. One pair of multi-lite, wood French doors will be installed on east elevation and two half-lite, wood paneled doors will be installed on west elevation. Existing chimney will be retained and rebuilt as needed with mortar to match existing. Existing concrete retaining wall in rear yard will be replaced with a new stone veneer retaining wall, per the attached drawings and plans. Reconstructed attached accessory structure will be built in the same location and footprint as existing which is encroaching required setback; a Flexible Development Application has been approved for 16" side and 32" rear setback to reconstruct in existing footprint. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, Additions found on pages 88-89, Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, Roofs found on pages 74-75, Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015 were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Architectural features that are character defining elements of the accessory structure, including roof form, windows, and chimney will be maintained.
 - b. Replacement materials will match the historic materials in composition, dimension, shape and pattern.
 - c. Replacement structure will be located in the same footprint as existing, which is sited on the rear elevation.
 - d. Windows will be similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing and materials.
 - e. Doors and door openings to be replaced are non-historic; new doors will be wood and new door openings will be installed on a non-character defining façade.
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. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Nutter moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 34 All Souls Crescent - Variance to exceed maximum size for porch-mounted sign

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

Owner/Applicant: Ron Clemmer/Libby Endry
Subject Property: 34 All Souls Crescent
Hearing Date: December 9, 2015
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9647.69-1667
Zoning District: HB

Property Description: Two-story pebbledash and brick veneer cottage with recessed porch, multiple gables, and decorative half-timbering; architect R.S. Smith.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Request to exceed the maximum porch-mounted sign allowance size of 4 square feet and to install a 5.3 square foot, wood, porch-mounted sign painted to match building trim, 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. The Biltmore Village Historic District guidelines limit porch-mounted signs in the Cottage Type Sign Area to 4 square feet. However, per the guidelines, the HRC has the authority to grant variances to the size guidelines if special circumstances warrant them.
2. Since the porch on this particular cottage is wider than most cottages in the district, the additional square footage requested does not overwhelm the space and is not out of character with the district. Staff supports approval given the special circumstances.

The guidelines for Signs found on pages 35-40 in Chapter 6, Book 1 of the Design Review Guidelines for the Biltmore Village Historic District adopted on October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Porch is wider than those on most cottages in the district, and additional square footage of sign does not overwhelm the space.
2. Sign material and color will be compatible with the building.
3. Sign will hang from the boxed beam above the porch.

Ms. Alice Cary, manager, asked for the Commission's support and offered to answer any questions.

Vice-Chair Farmer opened the public hearing at 4:28 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 4:28 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - project description; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – sign rendering; 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 25th day of November, 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 November, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (D) and (E).

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 a request to exceed the maximum porch-mounted sign allowance size of 4 square feet and to install a 5.3 square foot, wood, porch-mounted sign painted to match building trim, per attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Signs found on pages 35-40 in Chapter 6, Book 1 of the Design Review Guidelines for the Biltmore Village Historic District adopted October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Porch is wider than those on most cottages in the district, and additional square footage of sign does not overwhelm the space.
 - b. Sign material and color will be compatible with the building.
 - c. Sign will hang from the boxed beam above the porch.
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 Biltmore Village Historic District.

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

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 23 Harrison Street - Retroactive approval for installing metal roof over shingle roof

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

Owner/Applicant:	Charles D. Keller
Subject Property:	23 Harrison Street
Hearing Date:	December 9, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.21-6723
Zoning District:	RM-8

Property Description: Early 20th century plain 1-story bungalow. Asbestos rock siding with shingled gable.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Retroactive approval to install a new Tuff-Rib, 29 Gauge metal roof in galvalume color over previously existing gray asphalt shingle roof, 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. Roof should be painted or have an opaque factory applied finish.

The guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Metal roof is consistent with the style of the house.
2. Metal roof is compatible with the historic metal roof styles in the district.

When Mr. Eakins cited the provision regarding the use of metal roofing, Ms. Cole said that staff's determination is that the metal roofing does suit the style and character of the house and the district.

Mr. Charles Keller, applicant, provided the Commission with several examples of houses in the surrounding area that have metal roofs, noting one house in particular on Bishop Place with a light-colored metal roof that had been recently constructed. He noted that this contractor said that the color of the metal installed will take on patina after a period of time.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten noted that she would have to review the file records for the property Mr. Keller cited; however, it's possible that the color of the metal roof was reviewed under an earlier version of the design guidelines, and the Commission is tasked with review of this application under existing guidelines.

Mr. Carpenter said that in Montford there are many pressed decorative metal roofs that were not painted when they were first built and installed, but some have been painted over the years.

Vice-Chair Farmer opened the public hearing at 4:43 p.m.

Three neighbors spoke in support of the application.

Vice-Chair Farmer closed the public hearing at 4:46 p.m.

In response to Mr. Nutter, Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley explained that if the Commission does not approve the retroactive request, the applicant will be issued a Notice of Violation. The applicant will then have a certain amount of time to remedy the situation before a fine would be issued.

In response to Mr. Nutter, Ms. Merten said one remedy would be to paint the roof a medium to dark color.

Ms. Merten said that the Commission can revisit amending the portion of the guidelines regarding roofs if HRC feels strongly this type roof should be allowed. The applicant would have an option to continue his application until that review could be completed; however, that process may take several months and there is no guarantee that any amendment would be made. But Ms. Ashley advised that Mr. Keller would still be subject to review by the current guidelines, so the option was dropped from the discussion.

There was considerable discussion with the applicant regarding his options to either replace the entire roof or paint it a darker color in order to meet the guidelines.

Mr. Keller asked for a continuance so that he can investigate paint colors and costs. Mr. Carpenter recommended that Mr. Keller not choose black paint as it tends to fade badly over time.

Mr. Moffitt moved to continue this matter until January 13, 2016. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Other Business

Policy Recommendations for City Council

After considerable discussion regarding the policy recommendations to City Council, the following items were discussed: (1) Make preservation of City-owned historic buildings a priority; (2) Identify historic properties, including buildings, sites, landscapes and archeological areas, owned by the City and/or County and to provide for their historic preservation; (3) Coordinate early design review by Historic Resources Commission with other design review functions of the City; (4) Seek opportunities in the City and County for additional local historic districting; (5) Work in partnership between the City and County to extend historic preservation throughout the County; (6) Encourage the City to provide the necessary staff to pursue the goals of the Historic Preservation Master Plan; (7) Investigate downtown being designated a local district; and (8) Investigate establishing small local historic districts where the downtown commission has determined that involvement of the HRC is needed to protect their historic character. It was then the consensus of the Commission that Ms. Merten word-smith the discussed policy recommendations based on the discussion.

Ms. Merten noted that Councilwoman Julie Mayfield is now the City Council liaison to the Commission.

Committee Reports

Ms. Merten said that Education Committee discussed Mr. Moffitt making his presentation from the HRC retreat at an AIA meeting and/or possibly to the Planning & Zoning Commission, City Council, and the Planning & Economic Development Commission.

Mr. Moffitt said that he is a member of the Development Customer Advisory Group and noted that the City will be presenting educational meetings on how to navigate the system. The Historic Resources Commission will need to be a part of that process.

Vice-Chair Farmer said that the Montford area is always asking for articles on timely topics for their newsletter. He noted that because there are many new residents in the Montford area who may be unfamiliar with the process of acquiring a Certificate of Appropriateness, perhaps a brief article summarizing HRC processes might be a timely submission for the newsletter. Mr. Fast said that the Education Commission had discussed continuing education for realtors. He is also researching the potential of educating a group of realtors who might become more involved in providing new homeowners information on the design review process.

Comments from Commissioners, Public and Staff

When Mr. Nutter suggested we consider some kind of event at the national meeting of the Thomas Wolfe Society meeting in May, Mr. Carpenter said that The Preservation Society is planning something in conjunction with that event and suggested HRC coordinate with them.

Adjournment

At 5:44 p.m., Mr. Moffitt moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Nutter and carried unanimously.