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

Present: Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, William Eakins, Woodard Farmer, Richard Fast, Bryan Moffitt, David Nutter, Tracey Rizzo and Amanda Warren

Absent: Rachel Sudnik and Joanne Stephenson

Administrative

- Mr. Eakins moved to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2015, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Carpenter and carried unanimously.
- All those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

Consent Agenda

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 10-1/2 All Souls Crescent - Replacement of Existing Awning and New Siding

Owner/Applicant:	Elite Biltmore, LLC
Subject Property:	10 1/2 All Souls Crescent
Hearing Date:	July 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9647.79-1517
Zoning District:	CB-I/INST

Property Description: One-story concrete-block commercial building with asphalt shingle awning.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: To remove existing brick veneer on façade of building and to apply and paint pebble-dash siding over existing concrete exterior. Removal of asphalt shingle awnings and installation of 13'2" x 3'2" fabric awning along façade. **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 Rehabilitation of Auto-Oriented Commercial Buildings found in Book 2, pages 21-22, the guidelines for Color found in Book 1, pages 43-44 in the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines, adopted October 1, 1988, 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) Brick, stucco, and rough-textured stucco similar to pebbledash are encouraged as the primary façade materials; (2) Base and trim colors are from the approved color palette the colors will coordinate façade elements in an overall composition; and (3) Adaptations, such as Commercial Building-style awnings, are encouraged in the rehabilitation of auto-oriented commercial buildings.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – paint color samples (2 cards); Exhibit B – photographs of subject property (3 pages); Exhibit C – renderings of proposed alterations;

Exhibit D – photograph of existing siding; 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 24th day of June, 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 22nd day of June, 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 remove existing brick veneer on façade of building and to apply and paint pebble-dash siding over existing concrete exterior. Removal of asphalt shingle awnings and installation of 13'2" x 3'2" fabric awning along façade, per attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Rehabilitation of Auto-Oriented Commercial Buildings found in Book 2, pages 21-22, the guidelines for Color found in Book 1, pages 43-44 in the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines, adopted October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

   A. Brick, stucco, and rough-textured stucco similar to pebbledash are encouraged as the primary façade materials.
   B. Base and trim colors are from the approved color palette and the colors will coordinate façade elements in an overall composition.
   C. Adaptations, such as Commercial Building-style awnings, are encouraged in the rehabilitation of auto-oriented commercial buildings.

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 St. Dunstan's Historic District.

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

As there was no objection to the 10 ½ All Souls Crescent Certificate of Appropriateness being placed on the Consent Agenda, the FINDINGS OF FACT were adopted and Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

<u>Public Hearings</u>

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 339 Cumberland Avenue - Construction of New Driveway and Retaining Wall

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

Owner/Applicant:	Jonathan Mark Ferguson
Subject Property:	339 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date:	July 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.05-5252
Zoning District:	RM-8/RS-9

Property Description: Unopened alley leading from subject property to the public right of way.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Grading and construction of retaining wall to provide driveway access to residential lot. Retaining wall will be 9.5 feet at its highest elevation and slope down over a 20' run to 2". Driveway will have a concrete apron for first 10' then transition to brown pea gravel. Wall will have a 2" stone veneer and be topped with a 16" wide cap stone and metal railing. Remove 30" Box Elder, *Acer negundo* for construction of driveway apron. Wall will be landscaped with mountain laurel and rhododendron. **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. Frasier fir are short lived in Asheville, consider rhododendron as an alternative.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide specifications for stone veneer.
3. The block style wall and metal rail seem out of character with the residential character of the neighborhood.

The guidelines for Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 and Walkways, Driveways 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 May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons, provided the concerns are addressed: (1) The driveway will be located so that a large mature sycamore tree is preserved; (2) The driveway will be constructed of concrete and dark gravel; and (3) The wall will be in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Merten stated that a similar application for the subject property was previously approved by the Commission in 2008 but that since the driveway was never constructed the Certificate of Appropriateness has expired. She noted that the previous application called for removal of a large sycamore, and that the current applicant is planning to install the driveway in such a way as to keep the tree. One 30" Box Elder tree at the head of the proposed driveway will be removed. Since Building Code requires that any wall above 30" have some type of railing, the applicant is proposing a metal railing on top of the stone cap wall. Although the Guidelines do not specifically address railings applied to the tops of walls, Ms. Merten stated that in staff's opinion a railing applied to a wall would be out of character with the historic character of the neighborhood. She suggested that a stone cap be applied to the wall so that the height requirement could be met, thus eliminating the need for the railing.

Mr. Mark Ferguson, applicant, provided the Commission with an alternative stone sample for the retaining wall and said that he had no problem with using the alternative material. He picked the stacked block wall because he felt it was more appropriate. The applicant stated that if he used a poured wall system, footers would be required which would damage the sycamore tree. Using the stone block for the wall material would negate the need for footers, so they will be able to preserve the root system of the sycamore tree. The applicant is proposing to screen the wall with landscaping and would like to use ivy to cover the retaining walls, which is already growing on site.

After looking at the alternative concrete stone material proposed for the retaining wall, Ms. Merten stated that it was more natural in appearance in her opinion. Mr. Nutter supported the alternative material for the wall.

Mr. Ferguson responded to Mr. Eakins when he asked what the rail system would look like. He explained the two options, one of which is a stainless steel option. He also stated that he was open to suggestions from the Commission.

In response to Mr. Farmer, Mr. Ferguson said that he can taper the driveway out further and extend the wall height 3 feet, which would eliminate the need for the railing system. Ms. Merten suggested the retaining wall not exceed 10.5 feet in height.

Mr. Carpenter acknowledged that the character of retaining walls in Montford varies but expressed concern about the material of the retaining wall solely based on saving the sycamore tree.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:19 p.m.

Ms. Shelley Galvin, adjoining property owner to the north, said that her site survey documentation indicated that the alley is 16 feet wide. The application for the project indicates it is 22.8 feet wide. She requested the applicant's documentation that the alley is 22.8 feet wide be made available for comparison with the metes and bounds descriptions of the adjacent properties to verify that no encroachment on adjacent private properties will be made. She also requested that any approval or issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness be postponed pending written verification by the Commission and the adjacent Montford property owners that no encroachment on their private properties will occur as the design is currently submitted.

In response to Mr. Carpenter, Ms. Galvin said that in addition to the encroachment issue, they would prefer the design be more consistent with their property and the Francis Apartment building to the south. She also expressed concern that a railing on top of the wall would allow headlights from cars turning into the driveway to shine into their bedroom windows.

Chair Ross closed the public hearing at 4:35 p.m.

There was considerable discussion regarding the width of the alley and if the issue should be postponed until more information could be provided. It was stated by staff that the Commission's review is solely based on the design guidelines, and that the width of the public alley and/or the applicant's right to use the public alley are legal issues which are not within the Commission's purview to resolve. Prior to the Certificate of Appropriateness being issued, all permits, variances or approvals as required by law must be obtained.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – site survey; Exhibit B – elevation drawings and site plan of proposed retaining wall (3 pages); Exhibit C – photographs of subject property (3 pages); Exhibit D – rendering of proposed retaining wall; Exhibit E – photographs of proposed materials; Exhibit F – site plan indicating trees to be removed (2 pages - received June 2, 2015); Exhibit G – additional photographs of proposed materials (2 pages – received June 2, 2015); Exhibit H - survey dated July 8, 2015; and Exhibit I - retaining wall design manual (received July 8, 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 24th day of June, 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 22nd day of June, 2015 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 for grading and construction of retaining wall to provide driveway access to residential lot. Retaining wall will not exceed 10.5 feet at its highest elevation and slope down over a 20' run to 2'. Driveway will have a concrete apron for first 10' then transition to brown pea gravel.

Wall will have a 2" stone veneer and be topped with a 16" wide stone cap. Remove 30" Box Elder, *Acer negundo* for construction of driveway apron. Wall will be landscaped with mountain laurel, rhododendron and ivy. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 and Walkways, Driveways 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 May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

   A. The driveway will be located so that a large mature sycamore tree is preserved.
   B. The driveway will be constructed of concrete and dark gravel.
   C. The wall will be in keeping with the historic character.

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 Ms. Warren 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. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 37 Rosewood Avenue - Replacement of Existing Garage Doors

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole showed site plan maps of the subject property and reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Michaela Alexander-Daniel
Subject Property:	37 Rosewood Avenue
Hearing Date:	July 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9639.93-2550
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: Early 20th century 2-story German sided vernacular dwelling with sweeping roof, recessed porch, some molded detail, brick chimney with ornamental design.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: To replace the existing 4-lite, paneled wood garage door and vertical wood wall with new 6-lite, 9' x 6'6" paneled wood automatic garage door with decorative metal hardware, per attached drawings and plans (received June 9, 2015). **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. Original doors that contribute to the overall character and form of the historic building, including functional and decorative features, should be retained and preserved.
2. Although staff has not been able to determine whether the existing door is original, staff considers the existing door to be contributing to the historic character of the building.

3. Staff has asked that the applicant submit any available historic documentation of the door opening to support replacing the existing door and wall with the proposed door.

The guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 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, provided that staff concerns are addressed: (1) Original door will be retained and preserved; and (2) Or, existing door and wall will be replaced with a new door matching the original in design and dimension of the original panels, detailing, and materials.

In response to Mr. Nutter, Ms. Cole said that the doors are unusual in that the hinges are in the middle and the doors push into the garage.

Ms. Michaela Alexander-Daniel, property owner, pointed out an existing cat door on the bottom of the paneled-wood garage door, and expressed that it was part of the reason for requesting to replace the doors. She stated that the left vertical wood wall is not original to the home, in her opinion. The applicant also stated that they are proposing a new roll-up automatic garage door partly because current grading of the driveway would make it difficult for doors to open outwardly. In addition, the adjacent stone wall next to driveway makes it difficult for a door to swing fully open. Since there is an extremely low ceiling in the basement, it will require special low headroom operating system designed specifically for roll-up doors. The elaborate operating system for a true Carriage garage doors are very expensive. Also true Carriage garage doors without the operating system would have to be opened and closed manually. They have contacted a reputable local door manufacturing company that will design the new roll-up garage door.

Mr. Farmer asked the applicant if the garage door company is capable of making an automatic roll-up garage door that would mimic the existing paneled-wood garage door. Ms. Alexander-Daniel said that they do custom woodwork and that they could likely design the door to match the existing.

Mr. Moffitt felt the paneled-wood garage door is probably not an original feature of the house and would support replacing those doors with new doors.

In response to Mr. Eakins, Ms. Merten said that a condition would be that the applicant submit a revised drawing of the automatic roll-up garage door that matches the existing paneled-wood garage door. If no revised drawing is received, then the applicant would need to reapply to the Commission.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:14 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 5:14 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A –project description; Exhibit B – drawing of proposed doors; Exhibit C – photographs of subject property; Exhibit D - applicant's representation that the doors will be made to mirror those on the right hand side but with a lifting system; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, Mr. Farmer 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 24th day of June, 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 22nd day of June, 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 replace the existing 4-lite, paneled wood garage door and vertical wood wall with new 8-lite, 9' x 6'6" paneled wood automatic garage doors with decorative metal hardware, per attached drawings and plans, modified to be consistent with the appearance of the right-hand doors **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 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.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

   A. Original door will be retained and preserved on the property.
   B. Existing door and wall will be replaced with a new door matching the original in design and dimension of the original panels, detailing, and materials.

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 FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Farmer moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the following conditions: (1) staff will approve the paint color consistent with the trim of the house; (2) staff will approve the re-design of the door panels consistent with the 4-lite panels on the right hand side; and (3) existing door will be retained and preserved on the property. This motion was seconded by Mr. Fast and carried unanimously.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 254 Flint Street - Construction of New Addition

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole showed site plan maps of the subject property and reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Andrew Runkle & Christie Posner/Sean Perry
Subject Property:	254 Flint Street
Hearing Date:	July 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.13-3726
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: Two-story Craftsman-style house with gable roof constructed in 2009.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: To construct a new one-story, 17' x 8'4" addition with hip roof along the north elevation. Two existing 4/1, double-hung windows will be reused and two new 4/1, double-hung, extruded aluminum-clad SDL windows matching existing will be installed on new addition. One new 4-lite extruded aluminum-clad SDL window will be installed on rear elevation of new addition. Addition will have smooth Hardie-plank siding and roof will be asphalt shingle, matching the existing in color and material. Foundation will be concrete block with stucco veneer, also matching existing, per attached drawings and plans (received June 11, 2015). **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 asked that the applicant screen the foundation wall with plantings.

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 May 2015, 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) The existing building will retain its compatibility in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings and other historic buildings in the district; (2) Materials and finishes will be similar to those typically found in the neighborhood; and (3) Location and size of window openings will be compatible in placement, orientation, spacing, proportion, size and scale with surrounding historic buildings.

Ms. Cole stated that staff was recommending approval with the stipulation that the applicant Install landscaping in front of the foundation wall along the façade side of the addition.

Mr. Sean Perry, representing the owners, said that currently there is a bump-out along the north elevation and they would like to simply extend it 6 feet. He also stated that the applicants are happy to screen the foundation wall with plantings per staff's request.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:22 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 5:22 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A –photographs of subject property (19 pages); Exhibit B – existing and proposed site plans; Exhibit C – existing and proposed floor plans (2 pages); Exhibit D – existing and proposed elevation drawings (4 pages); Exhibit E – section rendering; 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 24th day of June, 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 22nd day of June, 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 to construct a new one-story, 17' x 8'4" addition with hip roof along the north elevation. Two existing 4/1, double-hung windows will be reused and two new 4/1, double-hung, extruded aluminum-clad SDL windows matching existing will be installed on new addition. One new 4-lite extruded aluminum-clad SDL window will be installed on rear elevation of new addition. Addition will have smooth Hardie-plank siding and roof will be asphalt shingle, matching the existing in color and material. Foundation will be concrete block with stucco veneer, also matching existing, per attached drawings and plans (received June 11, 2015). **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 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.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

   A. The existing building will retain its compatibility in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings and other

historic buildings in the district.

B. Materials and finishes will be similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.

C. Location and size of window openings will be compatible in placement, orientation, spacing, proportion, size and scale with surrounding historic buildings.

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 Ms. Warren 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 landscape screening be added to the east elevation. This motion was seconded by Ms. Warren and carried unanimously.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness - 42 Soco Street - Construction of New Two-Story Residence

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole showed site plan maps of the subject property and reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Jason Weil
Subject Property:	42 Soco Street
Hearing Date:	July 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.03-6777
Zoning District:	RM-8/RS-8

Property Description: Vacant lot.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new single family home per attached plans and specifications. House will be two-story Craftsman style house over partially finished basement. Exterior materials will be concrete finished with pebble dash stucco along the foundation, fiber cement lap siding with 6" exposure along the first floor, and cedar shingles along the second floor. The house will have a gable roof constructed of architectural shingles with bracketed eaves. A single chimney will be constructed at the west elevation, consisting of pebble dash stucco with terra cotta chimney pot. Windows will be 6 over 1, double-hung. A large porch will extend from the front entryway around the north elevation. Lattice panels will be installed below porch to enclose. A 12 by 12 portion of the porch along the northwest corner of the house will be enclosed with screen. Existing stone wall and concrete steps along the perimeter of the property will be maintained as part of the new residence, per attached drawings and plans (received June 18, 2015). **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 the width of the proposed driveway that will extend from the existing gravel easement on the rear of the property.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to submit a landscape plan for staff review.
3. Staff has asked the applicant to submit a shingle sample.
4. Staff has asked the applicant to clarify the proposed walkway material.

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 May 2015, 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) New primary structure will be sited so that it is similar to the historic pattern in terms of orientation, setback, retention of green space and spacing between structures; (2) Design of new primary structure will allow for the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site to be maintained; (3) New primary structure will be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings and other historic buildings in the district; (4) New primary structure will be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district; and (5) Windows, doors, materials, and finishes in new primary building will be compatible in material, proportion, subdivision, pattern, and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.

Ms. Cole said that the applicant has agreed to narrow the width of the proposed driveway that will extend from the existing gravel easement on the rear of the property.

In response to Mr. Moffitt, Ms. Cole said that staff recommends approval with condition that the width of the driveway be reduced and that the applicant submit a landscape plan for staff review.

Mr. Nutter said that the stone wall and stone steps which lead up to the house are very beautiful but in need of repair. He hoped that the wall and steps will be rehabilitated as part of this project, including repointing existing mortar with dark colored mortar.

Mr. Jason Weil, designer of the house, said the existing gravel driveway is a shared driveway with the adjoining small house. They had planned to leave it as is. Regarding the pathway from the steps to the front porch, it is a concrete pathway.

Mr. Jeremy McCowan, builder, said that Mr. Nutter's request to rehabilitate the stone wall and stone steps will have to be discussed with the owner.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:34 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 5:34 p.m.

Ms. Merten stated that while she understood that the large gravel driveway is present, she suggested that the owner landscape a portion of the gravel area as the guidelines do call for retention of green space when new construction is being proposed. The site is relatively small in comparison to the footprint of the proposed house so green space should be preserved where possible.

When Mr. Moffitt said he felt comfortable with staff reviewing the landscaping plan, Ms. Merten advised the applicant that staff will be looking for a reduction in the width of the gravel driveway.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A –site plan; Exhibit B – streetscape rendering; Exhibit C – floor plans (3 pages); Exhibit D – roof plan; Exhibit E – elevation drawings (2 pages); Exhibit F –section details (2 pages); Exhibit G – Window, door and lighting specifications (17 pages – received June 30, 2015); Exhibit H – siding samples (received June 30, 2015); Exhibit I - shingle sample; 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 24th day of June, 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 22nd day of June, 2015 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 a new single family home per attached plans and specifications. House will be two-story Craftsman style house over partially finished basement. Exterior materials will be concrete finished with pebble dash stucco along the foundation, fiber cement lap siding with 6" exposure along the first floor, and cedar shingles along the second floor. The house will have a gable roof constructed of architectural shingles with bracketed eaves. A single chimney will be constructed at the west elevation, consisting of pebble dash stucco with terra cotta chimney pot. Windows will be 6 or 8 over 1, double-hung. A large porch will extend from the front entryway around the north elevation. Lattice panels will be installed below porch to enclose. A 12' by 12' portion of the porch along the northwest corner of the house will be enclosed with screen. Existing stone wall and concrete steps along the perimeter of the property will be maintained as part of the new residence, per attached drawings and plans (received June 18, 2015). **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 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.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

   A. New primary structure will be sited so that it is similar to the historic pattern in terms of orientation, setback, retention of green space and spacing between structures.

   B. Design of new primary structure will allow for the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site.

   C. New primary structure will be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings and other historic buildings in the district.

   D. New primary structure will be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the District.

   E. Windows, doors, materials, and finishes in new primary building will be compatible in material, proportion, subdivision, pattern, and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.

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. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the following condition: (1) a revised landscape plan showing the revised amount of impervious gravel area and landscape species and location be provided for staff review. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness - 9 All Souls Crescent - Variance Request to Allow Additional Free-Standing Sign

Due to a conflict of interest, Mr. Nutter moved to recuse Mr. Farmer from participating in this matter. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

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

Owner/Applicant:	Woody Farmer/Eric J. Davis
Subject Property:	9 All Souls Crescent
Hearing Date:	July 8, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9647.69-9644
Zoning District:	CB-I

Property Description: One-story brick commercial building. This is a non-contributing building to the Biltmore Village historic district.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: The request is to apply flexible development standards to allow a 2nd freestanding sign to be constructed for Willow Wellness and Recovery. The sign will be constructed of high density urethane. **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: The Biltmore Village guidelines are in agreement with the Unified Development Ordinance in that multiple occupancy signs are only allowed 1 free-standing sign.

The guidelines for Signs found in Book 1 General Design Guidelines and Policies, Chapter 6, pages 35-42 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines, adopted October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.

Flexible Development Standards found in section 7-11-7 (4) of the UDO was also used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend approval of the request for the following reason: (1) Multiple occupancy buildings are allowed only 1 free-standing sign. Staff suggests that the applicant work with the property owner to establish a single multiple occupancy sign that meets the guidelines.

Ms. Merten said that the applicant is requesting that the Commission vary the underlying zoning, which the Commission can do if there is a conflict with the historic guidelines. However, there is no conflict with the historic guidelines, as both the guidelines and the UDO allow for only one free-standing sign for a multi-tenant building. While staff is not recommending approval, Ms. Merten suggested that the property owner and the applicant might possibly work with the other tenant to install a single free-standing sign for both of the businesses. She suggested that either the applicant withdraw the application or that the Commission continue the hearing so that the applicant might have the opportunity to work with the other tenant. If the applicant is able to work with the other tenant in the building to redesign the existing free-standing sign, they could submit that as a minor work application which would be reviewed by staff.

Mr. Nutter said that one circumstance which might support a second free-standing sign on the site is that the building is long with multiple entrances. Ms. Merten said that does have merit; however, it is the general policy of the sign guidelines to reduce sign clutter as there multiple signs did not exist historically.

Ms. Merten stated that the applicant has submitted a photograph of a multi-tenant building also located on All Souls Crescent with more than one free-standing sign, but noted that the second sign on that site was not approved by staff so this adjacent site should not be used as an example to support the application.

Mr. Eric Davis, applicant, stated that the building is rather large and clients frequently are unable to locate their business. He showed a rendering of what their free-standing sign would look like, which he felt would meet the design guidelines of Biltmore Village. Regarding Ms. Merten's recommendation to work with

the other tenant in the building (BB&T Insurance), he stated that BB&T would be moving out within one year and he understands they will likely not work with them on a combined sign. However, the local BB&T insurance branch said they will put them in touch with their corporate headquarters. At present they have a small flush-mounted sign on the building.

Ms. Merten said Mr. Davis can replace the small sign on the building with a larger mounted sign in that location.

Ms. Rizzo suggested a continuance in order to allow the applicant to exhaust all his options, especially since a variance is requested.

Ms. Merten said that in addition to the attached sign, or the larger flush-mounted sign, the applicant could also have an A-frame sign on the property.

Mr. Nutter moved to continue this hearing. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously (Mr. Farmer did not participate due to his recusal).

Other Business

Albemarle Park Landscape and Architecture Guidelines

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten stated that this is the consideration of the adoption of the reformatted Albemarle Park architectural guidelines and new landscape guidelines for the Albemarle Park Local Historic District. The current architectural design guidelines for Albemarle Park have very little reference to landscape treatments. In the past decade most of the controversial issues in the district have revolved around landscape treatments that were difficult to resolve due to weak guidelines. A great deal of time and effort went into the preparation of these guidelines and the important significance of the Albemarle Park landscape should be recognized.

These guidelines are the result of a team effort that has been in the works for more than 15 years. The original draft of the guidelines was completed in 2001, and was a joint effort with input from both HRC staff and Albemarle Park residents, but the community was not ready to adopt the guidelines at that time. In an effort to move the project forward, the HRC presented a program to the community on the benefits of historic designation and of the importance of landscape and design guidelines in the fall of 2010 and held a public hearing at their regular meeting in January 2012. Staff continued to work with the community to amend the guidelines based on input received at the public hearing and also continued to take comment from the community. A letter was sent to all property owners in the district to notify them of this hearing, with a link to the guidelines on-line. Additionally an email was sent to all parties who attended the hearing in January 2012, specifically inviting questions and input, as was agreed to at that meeting.

Staff has continued to take feedback from the community on the guidelines since they were posted on the website and the following minor amendments were made to the guidelines based on public input, earlier this week.

Page 21- Replace 1st bullet with: Planting areas may include multiple plantings of a single species, but should also include plant groupings or individual specimens of an alternate species to serve as contrast.

Replace 2nd paragraph on Page 24 with: Informality ruled. Although there were instances where shrubs were planted in groupings, they were often mixed with trees to imitate the native landscape and there were no instances of uniform lines of hedges being planted. Overall the intention was to imitate the natural landscape as much as possible.

Page 25- Replace 3rd bullet with: Shrubs and bushes may be planted as individual accents or as informal masses of the same species. They may also be used in mixed groups of contrasting plants.

Staff is asking that the Historic Resources Commission adopt both sets of guidelines.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 6:01 p.m.

Mr. Richard Mathews encouraged everyone who does work in the district to be held to the same standards.

Chair Ross closed the public hearing at 6:02 p.m.

After appreciating the length of time it took for this to occur, Mr. Nutter was pleased to move the adoption of both the reformatted Albemarle Park guidelines and new landscape guidelines for the Albemarle Park Local Historic District. This motion was seconded by Mr. Carpenter and carried unanimously.

Landmark Committee Report - Castanea Building Update

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that the Landmark Committee reviewed the revised report on the Castanea Building and would be recommending to the full Commission that it not move forward. This matter will be discussed and voted on by the full Commission at the August 12, 2015 meeting.

Annual Retreat

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten asked the Commission to block out the date of September 2, 2015, for their annual retreat. The retreat is tentatively scheduled at the Governor's Residence from 1-5 p.m.

Comments from Commissioners, Public and Staff

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that she has been working with the Biltmore Village Merchants Association on an event to tie in with the WNC Historic Association's Exhibit on Bartram's Journey. Since HRC has been trying to implement some landscaping improvements in Biltmore Village, she suggested arranging a speaking event regarding the historic landscape of Biltmore Village with the English-style landscaping associated with Bartram's Journey.

Adjournment

At 6:08 p.m., Mr. Eakins moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.