

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting  
Minutes of June 10, 2015  
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall  
4:00 p.m.

**Present:** Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, William Eakins, Woodard Farmer, Bryan Moffitt, Rachel Sudnik, and Tracey Rizzo (arrived in meeting at 4:19 p.m.).

**Absent:** Richard Fast, David Nutter, Joanne Stephenson and Amanda Warren

**Administrative**

- Mr. Eakins moved to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2015, meeting, with minor amendments. This motion was seconded by Mr. Farmer and carried unanimously.
- All those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.
- Mr. Moffitt moved to continue the Certificate of Appropriateness for 339 Cumberland Avenue to the July 8, 2015, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.
- Chair Ross announced that Ms. Nan Chase has resigned from the Commission due to her workload and thanked her for her service.

**Consent Agenda**

**1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 1 Swann Street - Replacement of 5 Windows**

**Owner/Applicant:** Wes Reinhardt, Altamus, LLC/2 Swann LLC  
**Subject Property:** 1 Swann Street  
**Hearing Date:** June 10, 2015  
**Historic District:** Biltmore Village  
**PIN:** 9647.79-0985  
**Zoning District:** CB-I

**Property Description:** Two-story pebble-dash cottage with shed dormers and gambrel roof, designed by R.S. Smith.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Request:** That the application is to replace five existing plate glass windows with 8/1, wood, double-hung windows to match existing windows, 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:** Staff had no concerns.

That the General Rehabilitation Guidelines found on pages 5-10 of Chapter 2, Book 2, the Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of "Cottage Type" Structures found on pages 17-20 of Chapter 4, Book 2 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Biltmore Village Historic District, adopted on October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request was used to evaluate this request.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons. (1) Replacement windows are based on accurate duplication of original historic windows; and (2) Historic window proportions are being maintained.

**ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – photographs of subject property (4 pages); and Exhibit B – window specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection

and review of subject property 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 27th day of May, 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 26th day of May, 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 to replace five existing plate glass windows with 8/1 double-hung wood windows to match existing windows, per attached drawings and plans. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the General Rehabilitation Guidelines found on pages 5-10 of Chapter 2, Book 2, the Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of "Cottage Type" Structures found on pages 17-20 of Chapter 4, Book 2 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Biltmore Village Historic District, adopted on October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons: (a) Replacement windows are based on accurate duplication of original historic windows; and (b) Historic window proportions are being maintained.
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. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

As there was no objection to the 1 Swann Street Certificate of Appropriateness being placed on the Consent Agenda, the FINDINGS OF FACT were adopted and Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

### **Public Hearings**

#### **1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 20 St. Dunstan's Circle - Modification of Existing Side Porch**

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Marobeth Ruegg
<b>Subject Property:</b>	20 Saint Dunstan's Circle
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	June 10, 2015
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9648.51-1408
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RS-8

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

**Property Description:** One-story Italianate stucco house with side porch and stone terrace along front façade.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Request:** That the application is to modify a small existing open landing along north elevation by removing the existing front-facing wall to be an open porch with wood posts and railing, 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:** Staff has asked the applicant to submit drawings of revised porch posts for review.

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 was used to evaluate this request.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons: (1) An historic porch is being retained and is being modified to be more congruent with the historic character of the house than the existing porch; and (2) The new porch design is compatible with the historic character of the building in height, proportion, roof shape, material, texture, scale, detail, and color.

At the suggestion of Mr. Eakins, Ms. Marobeth Ruegg stated that she would agree to store the existing window which will be removed from the front facing wall.

In response to Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Terry Meeks, architect, said that the balusters were needed to satisfy building code requirements. He stated that the design of the railing with the additional lower rail is intended to give the illusion of the overall height of the railing being lowered. Mr. Meek also noted that he had encountered a similar issue with a different project, in which case the property owner was denied homeowner's insurance based on not meeting the building code requirement for having a railing when the drop-off from a porch or landing is 36" or more.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:17 p.m. and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:17 p.m.

Mr. Farmer felt the modification is artfully done.

#### **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – photographs of subject property and surrounding neighborhood; Exhibit D – existing and proposed elevation drawings (4 pages); Exhibit E – photographs of subject property; Exhibit F - revised drawings of the modified structure (2 pages – received June 10, 2015); Exhibit G - additional photographs (received June 10, 2015); 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 27th day of May, 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 26th day of May, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (H) and (I).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to modify a small existing open landing along north elevation by removing the existing front-facing wall to be an open porch with wood posts and railing, 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 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 was used to evaluate this request were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons: (a) An historic porch is being retained and is being modified to be more congruent with the historic character of the house than the existing porch; and (b) The new porch design is compatible with the historic character of the building in height, proportion, roof shape, material, texture, scale, detail, and color.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the St. Dunstan's Historic District.

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

**2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 37 Courtland Avenue - Removal of 6 Trees and Shifting of Alley**

**Owner/Applicant:** Doug & Traci Burke  
**Subject Property:** 37 Courtland Avenue  
**Hearing Date:** June 10, 2015  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.11-0821  
**Zoning District:** RS-8

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

**Property Description:** Courtland Terrace is an early 20th century 3-story German sided apartment house. Handsome porch posts, ornamental entry, bracketed cornice, molded window trim.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Request:** That the application is to remove 2 Ailanthus altissima trees, 1 Paulownia tree (both of which are listed as a non-native invasive in southern forests by USDA), 2 Walnut trees and a Spruce tree which are encroaching in the 10' alley between 23 and 37 Courtland Ave. Relocate gravel drive 3' to the northwest, closer to 37 Courtland Ave and centered in the 10' alley, 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) Tree species are not correctly identified on the site plan; and (2) Replacement trees should be planted in the vicinity of the trees removed. Staff suggests at least two large maturing (2.5" caliper at time of planting) and 2 small maturing trees (1.5" caliper at time of planting) to replace the trees being removed.

That the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons: (1) Three of the six trees to be removed are invasive species; (2) Removal of the trees will allow the restoration of the driveway to its intended location, ensuring adequate

access to adjacent properties; and (3) New trees will be planted to replace the trees being removed.

After discussion, Mr. Moffitt confirmed that Ms. Merten is recommending the removal of 5 trees, but retaining one non-invasive Walnut tree near the front of the property that will not be affected the driveway relocation. Ms. Merten also confirmed that staff is recommending that two large maturing (2.5" caliper at time of planting) and 2 small maturing trees (1.5" caliper at time of planting) be planted to replace the five trees being removed.

Ms. Merten said that staff will work with the applicant regarding proposed species and location of new trees.

Mr. Doug Burke, property owner, stated that they need to relocate the driveway to create more of a buffer for the renovation of the neighboring property at 23 Courtland Avenue.

When Mr. Moffitt asked if Mr. Burke was amenable to leaving the one Walnut tree and replanting the four additional trees, Mr. Burke said that he would prefer to leave that decision in the hands of his contractor, Mr. Patrick McCarthy. Mr. McCarthy responded that he felt staff's recommendation to leave the one Walnut tree and replant the additional four trees was reasonable, but it would be ideal to get rid of all six trees as the leaves are intertwined with the power poles and removal of all six would allow him to straighten the driveway more.

Mr. McCarthy agreed to replace the five trees removed with two large maturing and 2 small maturing trees, per the Landscaping and Tree guidelines, with the species and locations to be reviewed and approved by staff.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:43 p.m. and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:43 p.m.

#### **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – description of proposed work; Exhibit B – photographs of subject property (6 pages); Exhibit C – existing site plan; Exhibit D – proposed site plan; Exhibit E – site survey (received June 5, 2015) Exhibit F - additional photographs of subject property submitted by the applicant (3 pages received June 5, 2015); Exhibit G - additional photographs of subject property taken by staff (June 9, 2015); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members; Mr. Moffitt moved that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 27th day of May, 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 26th day of May, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (H) and (I).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to remove 2 Ailanthus altissima trees, 1 Paulownia tree (both of which listed as a non-native invasive in southern forests by USDA), 1 Walnut tree and a Spruce tree which are encroaching in the 10' alley between 23 and 37 Courtland Ave. Relocate gravel drive 3' to the northwest, closer to 37 Courtland Ave and centered in the 10' alley, 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 Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons: (a) Three of the five trees to be removed are invasive species; (b) Removal of the Spruce and Walnut will allow the restoration of the driveway to its intended location, ensuring adequate access to adjoining properties; and (c) New trees will be planted subject to condition below.
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 conditions: (1) that the applicant replace the five trees removed with two large maturing and 2 small maturing trees, per the Landscaping and Tree guidelines, with the species and locations to be reviewed and approved by staff. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 133 Montford Avenue - Construction of New Two-Story Rear Addition and Deck**

**Owner/Applicant:** Derek Allen/Dan Thurman  
**Subject Property:** 133 Montford Avenue  
**Hearing Date:** June 10, 2015  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.12-3337  
**Zoning District:** RM-8

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

**Property Description:** The A.H. Cobb House is a late 19<sup>th</sup>- to early 20<sup>th</sup>- century, one-and-a-half-story, highly irregular Queen Anne style dwelling, featuring angled porch with turned posts, sawn brackets, shingles over weatherboards, bay windows, tower effect.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Request:** That the application is to construct a two-story, 919 square foot addition with wood exterior, 1/1 double-hung and single-lite casement wood windows, and French doors matching existing historic building in material and detail along rear elevation. Removal of existing rear entry porch and expansion of existing wood deck 180 square feet, also along rear elevation, 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:** Staff had no concerns.

That the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89, the guidelines for Decks found on pages 38-39 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) Proposed addition will be constructed along the rear elevation and will be inset at least 12 inches to be distinguishable from the original house; (2) Proposed addition is

congruous with the existing building in massing, roof form, detail, and materials, and is limited in scale and size so as not to interrupt the fabric of the historic building; (3) Windows in proposed addition are similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing, and materials; (4) Deck expansion is compatible in material, color, scale and detail with the historic building and existing deck; and (5) Character defining features of the historic building are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed by the deck expansion.

Mr. Carpenter questioned the proposed angle of the stairs on the new deck. Ms. Cole stated that the angle of the deck stairs mimics the angle of the stairs on the front of the house.

Mr. Dan Thurman, contractor for the project, thanked the Commission for their guidance and asked for their support.

In response to Mr. Farmer's question regarding a ladder on the interior of the house, Mr. Thurman stated that the ladder leading up to the tower is still there.

Mr. Farmer was pleased with the revised plan for the addition to the existing house.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:59 p.m. and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:59 p.m.

#### **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – site plan; Exhibit B – existing and proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor plans; Exhibit C – existing and proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> floor plans; Exhibit D – existing and proposed elevation drawings; Exhibit E – photographs of subject property and surrounding neighborhood (15 pages); Exhibit F – window specifications (4 pages); Exhibit G – lighting specifications (2 pages); Exhibit H – revised existing and proposed floor plans (2 pages); Exhibit I – roof plan; Exhibit J – revised existing and proposed elevation drawings (6 pages dated June 9, 2015), and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members; Mr. Moffitt moved that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 27th day of May, 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 26th day of May, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (K) and (L).
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 two-story, 919 square foot addition with wood exterior, 1/1 double-hung and single-lite casement wood windows, and French doors matching existing historic building in material and detail along rear elevation. Removal of existing rear entry porch and expansion of existing wood deck 180 square feet, also along rear elevation, 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 Additions found on pages 88-89, the guidelines for Decks found on pages 38-39 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) Proposed addition will be constructed along the rear elevation and will be inset 1' 11" and will be distinguishable from the original house; (b) Proposed addition is congruous with the existing building in massing, roof form, detail, and materials, and is limited in scale and size so as not

to interrupt the fabric of the historic building; (c) Windows in proposed addition are similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing, and materials; (d) Deck expansion is compatible in material, color, scale and detail with the historic building and existing deck; (e) Character defining features of the historic building are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed by the deck expansion; and (f) the addition can be easily removed in the future and restored to its original condition.

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

#### 4. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 30 Magnolia Avenue - Removal of Existing Rear Patio and Construction of Rear Porch**

**Owner/Applicant:** Anne Fitten Glenn/Jason Holtsclaw  
**Subject Property:** 30 Magnolia Avenue  
**Hearing Date:** June 10, 2015  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.23-1457  
**Zoning District:** RS-8

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

**Property Description:** Two-story Craftsman house constructed in 1997.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Request:** That the application is to remove an existing stone patio at the rear of the house and to construct a 16' x 18' wood porch with a green seamed metal roof and wire mesh screening throughout and goat fence below railing, 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:** Staff has asked that the applicant confirm that the new porch will be inset from the existing building.

That the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 and the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 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 was used to evaluate this request.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons: (1) New porch will be located on the rear elevation; and (2) New porch will be compatible with the existing building in terms of roof form, scale, details, material and color.

In response to Mr. Moffitt, Ms. Cole said that staff has no issue with the proposed screening as it blends with the mesh screening and will not be visible from the street.

Mr. Jason Holtsclaw, general contractor, showed the Commission the screen wire sample he proposed to use.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:08 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 5:08 p.m.

At the suggestion of Mr. Moffitt, Mr. Holtsclaw amended his application to install asphalt shingles on the roof (instead of a metal roof) to match the existing building.

#### **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – site plan; Exhibit B – floor plan; Exhibit C – porch elevation drawing; Exhibit D – footing detail; Exhibit E – photographs of subject property (7 pages); Exhibit F - Screen Wire Sample; and Exhibit G - amended site plan; 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 27th day of May, 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 26th day of May, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (H) and (I).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to remove an existing stone patio at the rear of the house and to construct a 16' x 18' wood porch with wire mesh screening throughout and goat fence below railing and asphalt shingle roof to match that of existing building, 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 Additions found on pages 88-89 and the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 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: (1) New porch will be located on the rear elevation; and (2) New porch will be compatible with existing building in terms of roof form, scale, details, material and color.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

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

#### **Other Business**

##### **Seven Oaks National Register of Historic Places Nomination**

After all Commission members voiced their support of the nomination of Seven Oaks, Mr. Farmer moved to authorize Chair Ross to sign the nomination form finding that Seven Oaks meets the criteria for

listing in the National Register of Historic Places and recommends that the property be submitted for listing on the National Register. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

### **Annual Retreat**

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that she is trying to coordinate the Commissioner's schedules to attend their annual retreat. At this time Wednesday, September 2 could be a tentative date. Tentative time is 1-5 p.m. and location is the Governor's Western Residence.

Chair Ross noted that Buncombe County has agreed to fund the Historic Resources Commission with the same level of funding as last year - \$4,500. She noted that Chairman Gantt said that he had not been aware that the County is technically supposed to be participating in the funding of the HRC per the ordinance establishing the Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County. However, there was no additional funding granted for the county-wide survey for historic resources in Buncombe County. Chairman Gantt will be invited to attend the retreat as he stated that he would like to talk with the Commission and, in turn, the commissioners expressed interest in being able to communicate with Chairman Gantt regarding HRC goals. Even though the County is not granting the funds to complete the survey, staff will continue to look for other sources.

### **Education Committee Report**

Historic Resources Commission Director, Stacy Merten, said that the Commission is making an effort to participate in the WNC Historic Association Exhibit on Bartram's Journey; however, she noted that since Bartram did not travel through Buncombe County specifically, creating an event focused around his work might be challenging. The exhibit will run through October, so she will continue to look for a connection that might perhaps lend to a specific event. If she cannot find a connection, she suggested that the Commission might be open to doing an event perhaps in conjunction with the Preservation Society.

The Education Commission also talked about working with an identified person in the Communication and Public Engagement Division for improvements to their website.

### **Comments from Commissioners, Public and Staff**

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten updated the Commission on the following items: (1) Albemarle Park Landscape Guidelines will be presented to the Commission in July or August; (2) Historic Preservation Master Plan is being presented before the City Council Planning & Economic Development Committee on June 16 and suggested Chair Ross attend, if possible; (3) Senate Bill 27 (zoning and aesthetic design bill) passed which would limit the Commission from creating conservation overlay districts; (4) a meeting will be set up with City staff and Commission members at the end of June to review the City's plans for the Thomas Wolfe House property; (5) a bill which is a whole re-write of the planning statutes, which has been sent to Study Committee; and (6) update on the Corner Kitchen violation.

Ms. Merten said that she would forward Mr. Eakins an e-mail regarding input into the time capsule.

There were brief conversations from the Commission members regarding various topics of interest.

### **Adjournment**

At 5:40 p.m., Mr. Farmer moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.