

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of March 12, 2014

- Members Present:** Capi Wampler, Brendan Ross, Jo Stephenson, Patricia Cothran, William Eakins, J. Ray Elingburg, Woodard Farmer, Richard Fast, David Nutter, Tracey Rizzo
- Members Absent:** David Carpenter, Nan Chase
- Staff:** Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley
- Public:** Rich Mathews, Pamela Phillips, Rick Hessdorfer, Charles Krekelberg, John Cram, Rob Motley, Vanessa Byrd, Bridgett Putt Bounds, Mark Marshall, Jesse Pitt, Patricia Darcy, David Patterson, Bill Darcy
- Call to Order:** Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.
- Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Nutter moves to adopt the January 8, 2014 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Elingburg
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

1.
Owner/Applicant: Elzy Lindsey & Lauren Carlisle/Mark Marshall
Subject Property: 226 Flint Street
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-15591
Zoning District: RM-8

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – revised site/landscape plan (*submitted 1/23/14*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, as indicated by Exhibits B and C.
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 single off-street parking space located on southeast corner of lot. Remove 24" Black Walnut. Install landscaping per landscape plan. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The parking is located as far to the rear and side of the yard as possible due to the slope of the land.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

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

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

2.

Owner/Applicant: Vanessa Byrd
Subject Property: 125 Flint Street
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-4565
Zoning District: RM-8

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – five photos of house showing proposed changes; Exhibit C – closeup photo of existing window style; Exhibit D – eight photos showing damage to existing windows; Exhibit E – replacement sash specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the

26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, 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 replace damaged windows sashes with new wood sash in all 32" x 62" windows. **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 August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request..
 5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The window sashes are deteriorated beyond repair.
- A. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

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

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

3.

Owner/Applicant:	Jane and Rich Mathews
Subject Property:	12 The Circle
Hearing Date:	March 12, 2014
Historic District:	Albemarle Park
PIN:	9649.65-9367
Zoning District:	RS-4

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – six existing exterior views; Exhibit C – three photographs and site drawing showing adjacent cottages; Exhibit D – twelve photographs of existing additions and conditions (inc ludes

one 1987 photograph); Exhibit E – existing site plan; Exhibit F – existing basement, first floor, attic and roof plans; Exhibit G – existing south, east, north, and west elevations; Exhibit H – proposed site plan; Exhibit I – proposed main, basement, attic and roof plans; Exhibit J – proposed front (south), right side (east), rear (north) and left side (west) elevations; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, 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 demolish non-original rear basement stairway and non-original rear bathroom addition and construct new 670 sq. ft. addition, including a new shed dormer on west side of the existing roof, per the attached plans and specifications. Salvage three existing wood windows and rear door for reuse. New windows will be either salvaged to match existing or wood, double hung, SDL, nine over 1. Raise a window on northwest corner of basement to match existing header height and add terne metal shed roof over basement door on west elevation. Salvage existing shingles where possible and install new cedar shakes with 8” exposure to match existing. New window and door trim, porch decking, roofing and other details to match existing. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines Repair and Remodeling found on page 23, Façade Identification and map found on pages 24-25, Roof Forms found on page 26 and Additions found on page 33 in the Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards for Albemarle Park were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does/does not** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. All changes and additions are compatible with the existing conditions of the structure and the landscape.
 - b. The addition is on the rear of the structure which is a type 2 façade.
 - c. The addition requires the removal of two non-original additions with the overall effect of recapturing the original design style of the structure.
 - d. The roof alteration is in the form of a dormer that is in keeping with the design of the structure.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Albemarle Park Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

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

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Aviva & Jesse Pitt
Subject Property: 30 Rosewood Ave.
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639.93-1304
Zoning District: RS-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten says the applicant has revised plans to present, and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Early 20th century 1-story German sided ranch style dwelling. Before 1925 (S)</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Remove existing rear addition and add new two-story, 16' x 24' rear addition per attached plans and specifications. New addition will have brick veneer foundation wood lap siding, exposed rafter tails and window casings to match existing structure. Addition includes cedar shake siding on rear elevation and structural timber post columns painted white to match trim. Rebuild front porch to match existing in design and material. Convert sunroom to open porch and add door on east elevation. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. New windows should be wood to match existing.2. Window and door specifications should be provided.3. Provide revised drawings showing proposed changes to sunroom.4. Provide additional pictures of sunroom windows.5. Sunroom footprint looks too small on site plan. <p>The guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-74 and the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, 2010 and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation Staff recommends approval provided concerns are addressed for the following reasons.</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new addition is sited on the rear elevation, where it does not obscure any character defining features. 2. The new addition is inset from the existing structure and is compatible with the height, massing and roof form of the existing structure.
Applicant(s)	<p>Jesse Pitt, resident, offers to answer questions about the addition or the porch. He says they hope to return the sunporch to its original open configuration, but have been unable to find photographs showing this. He shows photographs of a neighborhood house with an open porch example. He shows photographs of the existing structure, and points out places where there are indications of change, mismatched siding and concrete steps that are not in use.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Wampler asks when the porch was changed (*unknown*), whether Mr. Pitt has plans for the windows that will be removed (*none*), and if he has window specifications (*did not think he had to have them*). Ms. Merten says they are necessary, that the windows should be wood, SDL, and that this could be a condition for staff review. She asks if he intends to put a door going onto the porch (*no, only an opening*).

Mr. Pitt says he intends to repair the front porch but not change it. He would like to wait until some windows have been removed from the porch before he decides if all should be removed. Commissioners discuss the age of the porch changes, and whether it has gained significance. There is concern about the windows, and whether they should be removed. Ms. Merten says there is no evidence they were there originally. Commissioner Stephenson thinks the porch is original, and asks if the entrance could be moved to the rear (*yes*). She thinks the windows should be removed facing the front. Commissioner Fast thinks they all should be removed, Commissioner Ross agrees that leaving some on one side of the porch would be problematic. Chair Wampler says the windows should be kept with the house. Commissioner Stephenson notes the addition width is 36', not 24'.

Atty. Ashley says the applicant should ask for an amendment to add an entrance to the porch on the South elevation instead of the front, Mr. Pitt asks for this.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – eight photos of existing structure; Exhibit C – existing and proposed site plan ; Exhibit D – main and second level floor plans; Exhibit E – back and side elevations ; Exhibit F – three perspective views; Exhibit G – seven photographs of existing structure and other district house with proposed porch style (*submitted 3/12/14*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, 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 existing rear addition and add new two-story, 16' x 36' rear addition per attached plans and specifications. New addition will have brick veneer foundation wood lap siding, exposed rafter tails and window casings to match existing structure. Addition includes cedar shake siding on rear elevation and structural timber post columns painted white to match trim. Rebuild front porch to match existing in design and material. Convert sunroom to open porch and add opening on south elevation. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-74 and the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, 2010 and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new addition is sited on the rear elevation, where it does not obscure any character defining features.
 - b. The new addition is inset from the existing structure and is compatible with the height, massing and roof form of the existing structure.
 - c. Plans to convert the sunroom to a porch are consistent with the guidelines.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Eakins

Vote for: ALL

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

With the following conditions:

- 1. Revised drawing showing entrance to porch in rear be submitted for staff review.**
- 2. Window specifications be submitted for staff review.**
- 3. Any windows removed shall be securely stored on premises.**

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Eakins

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Mark Marshall
Subject Property: 42 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.21-0881
Zoning District: RM-8

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel on Cumberland Ave.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two-story 2,600 Sq. ft. home with accessory apartment per attached plans and specifications. New structure will have concrete block foundation with stone and stucco veneer. Siding will be a combination of smooth sided wood lap Hardi-board with 6.5” reveal and cedar shake per drawings. Roof will have a 12/12 pitch with clipped gable and shed dormers, covered in <i>chestnut</i> composition asphalt shingles. Chimney will be stone. Windows will be wood, SDL, two over 1 with casements on 2nd level. Details include decorative eave brackets and window and door surrounds. Front porch will have 6” x 6” support columns with a wood T&G floor and ceiling. Front walk will be stone. Driveway will be gravel. Foundation and buffer area landscaping per attached landscape plan. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stone sample for foundation and chimney, and walkway 2. Window & Door specifications (aluminum clad/casements?) 3. Story board <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure is compatible with the district in terms of scale, texture and material
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Mark Marshall, Trio Construction, shows streetscape and explains it is a double lot. He points out the houses on either side and says they have situated the front of the house to split the difference between them.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
	David Patterson, whose property almost abuts at 33 Short Street, shows

	a GIS map that indicates a natural drainage ditch or creek bed runs through the back portion of the applicant's lot. He is concerned that if something is later planned for the back of the lot this could be an issue, and wants this on the record. Commissioner Nutter asks if the land drops in elevation from South to North (<i>yes</i>).
--	---

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners express their approval of changes made since the Preliminary hearing. Ms. Merten says window and door specifications, and stone samples for the foundation and walkway are still needed, and could be a condition for staff review.

Commissioner Eakins recuses himself, he was not present for the Preliminary Review.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – thirteen photographs of proposed plantings; Exhibit B – landscape plan; Exhibit C – south, front, north and rear elevations; Exhibit D – storyboard (*submitted 3/12/14*); Exhibit E – site plan showing drainage path (*submitted 3/12/14*); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, 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 new two-story 2,600 Sq. ft. home with accessory apartment per attached plans and specifications. New structure will have concrete block foundation with stone and stucco veneer. Siding will be a combination of smooth sided wood lap Hardi-board with 6.5" reveal and cedar shake per drawings. Roof will have a 12/12 pitch with clipped gable and shed dormers, covered in *chestnut* composition asphalt shingles. Chimney will be stone. Windows will be wood, SDL, two over 1 with casements on 2nd level. Details include decorative eave brackets and window and door surrounds. Front porch will have 6" x 6" support columns with a wood T&G floor and ceiling. Front walk will be stone. Driveway will be gravel. Foundation and buffer area landscaping per attached landscape plan. **All necessary 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 August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The structure is compatible with the district in terms of scale, texture and material.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL (except Eakins)

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

With the following condition:

1. **Window specifications, door specifications and stone sample be submitted for staff review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL (except Eakins)

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Robert Motley
Subject Property: 47 Short Street
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.11-8891
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel at corner of Short Street and Cumberland Place.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 1 ½ story, 1,553 sq. ft. single family structure with front porch and rear walk-out basement per attached plans and specifications. Foundation will be brushed stucco over concrete block. Siding will be smooth textured Hardie board with 6 1/2” reveal on 1st level and wood fishtail shingles in gable above. Roof will have a 12/12 primary pitch with gabled form and secondary 2/12 hipped porch and rear wing. Roof material will be () galvanized aluminum standing seam metal. Windows will be two over two, aluminum clad, SDL, double-hung. Doors will be wood. Details include frieze boards, 6” corner boards and 4-6” window and door surrounds. Front walk will be concrete. Parking area will be dark colored gravel.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are front step handrails needed? 2. Provide roof sample and color, stucco sample, window and door
-----------------------	---

	<p>specifications and storyboard for final review.</p> <p>The guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51, New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 and the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 in the Design guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the proposed project for the following reasons.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure is compatible with the district in scale, texture and material.
Applicant(s)	Robert Motley, contractor, shows a storyboard and offers to answer questions.

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Wampler says the storyboard makes the house look as though it had been there 100 years, and other Commissioners compliment the design.

Mr. Motley shows a photo of a West Asheville house with the color scheme he plans to use. Chair Wampler asks if his roof plan has changed from metal to asphalt, partner Gus Katsigiannis answers they are leaning in that direction. Mr. Motley shows photos from other houses that illustrate his plans for trim detail and eave returns. Chair Wampler commends his attention to detail. She asks about the front step handrail, Mr. Motley is not sure it will be needed, but will use it if the building code requires one.

Mr. Motley presents shingle, siding, and gravel samples.

Commissioner Eakins recuses himself, he was not present for the Preliminary Review.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction worksheet; Exhibit B – letter verifying non-conforming, but buildable lot; Exhibit C – flexible development application; Exhibit D – survey; Exhibit E – landscape plan; Exhibit F – foundation/basement, first and second level floor plans; Exhibit G – roof plan; Exhibit H – front, north, rear and south elevations; Exhibit I – revised site plan (*submitted 3/12/14*); Exhibit J – storyboard; Exhibit K – gravel sample (Nolichucky river stone); Exhibit L – Hardi-plank siding sample; Exhibit M – shingle sample; Exhibit N – five photographs showing details of neighboring homes; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, as indicated by Exhibits O and P.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Construct new 1 ½ story, 1,553 sq. ft. single family structure with front porch and rear walk-out basement per attached plans and specifications. Foundation will be brushed stucco over concrete block. Siding will be smooth textured Hardie board with 5” reveal on 1st level and wood fishtail shingles in gable above. Roof will have a 12/12 primary pitch with gabled form and secondary 2/12 hipped porch and rear wing. Roof material will be architectural asphalt shingles in dark grayish blue color. Windows will be two over two, aluminum clad, SDL, double-hung. Doors will be wood. Details include frieze boards, 6” corner boards and 4-6” window and door surrounds. Front walk will be concrete. Parking area will be dark colored gravel, Nolichucky river stone. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51, New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 and the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41 in the Design guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The structure is compatible with the district in scale, texture and material.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Farmer

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL (except Eakins)

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

With the following condition:

1. **Remove stair handrail if not required by City code.**

Motion by: Commissioner Farmer

Second by: Commissioner Stephenson

Vote for: ALL (except Eakins)

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Rick and Pam Hessdorfer/Mark Marshall
Subject Property: 5 Cullowhee Street
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-15591
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten explains this is a courtesy hearing, the HRC is not required to review a request for CA after the fact in this case. She shows a photograph of the trees in question after the foundation for the new house was installed, and reviews the following report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel, former site of 2 story dwelling.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Remove two maple trees at rear of lot. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>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 August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC not approve the request for tree removal after the fact. A fine of \$500.00 per tree has been assessed. The HRC staff has allowed this review as a courtesy to the applicant.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The HRC specifically asked the applicant to protect the trees during construction.2. The trees were removed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.3. No evidence has been presented regarding the health or condition of the trees prior to removal. <p>Commissioner Nutter asks for the reason for the hearing. Ms. Merten explains that while she understands that conditions may change during the construction process, the contractor should have submitted an application to remove the trees when the need arose. There have been previous cases where good reasons existed for tree removal and she wanted to give the applicant a chance to make his case. Commissioner Rizzo asks how quickly Ms. Merten would have responded. She replies she usually visits a site within a day if there is a problem. Attorney Ashley notes that only in an emergency situation would there be a right to circumvent the process.</p> <p>Ms. Merten reiterates that a hearing is not required. Atty. Ashley says since it is on the agenda, the Commission can issue a CA, resulting in a refund of the assessed fine. Commissioner Nutter thinks the review should go forward, others agree.</p>
-----------------------	---

Applicant(s)	Mark Marshall, Trio Construction, shows the original site plan and says one of the trees was diseased, and another would be touching the structure. He says his clients were also concerned with shade issues. He says there was an opportune time before the deck was built when the stump could be dug out. He says the trees should have been slated for removal in the original application. Ms. Merten notes that a request was made to the HRC for tree removal prior to Mr. Marshall's involvement with the project, but the request was not approved.
---------------------	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioner Farmer expresses concern for the neighbor, asks if the fine should be reduced and the applicant asked to plant two replacement trees. Ms. Merten says a landscape plan is still needed for the project. Commissioner Farmer withdraws his comment based on a future landscape plan.</p> <p>Chair Wampler says the concern should be with breach of process. Ms. Merten says the neighbor was also concerned about this, that there was no CA. Commissioner Ross agrees process and precedence should be the main concern.</p>

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description (*submitted 2/10/14*); Exhibit B – revised site plan (*submitted 3/4/14*); Exhibit C – photo of trees after foundation was installed (*submitted 3/12/14*); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 29th day of January, 2014, 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 remove two maple trees at rear of lot. **All necessary 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 August 2013, were used to evaluate this request..
5. This application **does not** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

a. The HRC specifically asked the applicant to protect the trees during construction.

b. The trees were removed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, in violation of Section 7.5.11 of the City code.

c. No evidence has been presented regarding the health or condition of the trees prior to removal.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are not** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

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

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

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

Commissioner Ray leaves 5:25 pm.

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: John Cram/Charles Krekelberg
Subject Property: 7 Boston Way
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9648.60-4076
Zoning District: CB-II
Other Permits: Sign

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report. She explains the application meets the Biltmore Village guidelines but there are underlying sign permit considerations. The project would still need to comply with DOT requirements, if any.</p> <p>Property Description: McGeachy Building - 2-story brick commercial building built between 1925-1930. Structure has simple concrete trim and art-deco decorative detail, is located in the Commercial core sub-area for signage in Biltmore Village. The two story brick addition to the McGeachy building constructed in 1999 is located in the Highway commercial sub-area.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Install new signs as follows: Hendersonville Road: 1) Replace existing awning signs with two new awning</p>
------------------------------	--

	<p>signs of 10 sq. ft. each. 2) Add new two-sided 10' 6" high, 56 sq. ft. free standing painted metal sign. Boston Way: 1) Replace existing awning signs with two new 10 sq. ft. each awning signs on New Morning Gallery. 2) Add one 20 sq. ft painted metal wall mounted sign for Bellagio. Plaza: 1) Replace existing awning signs with two new 10 sq. ft. awning signs. Flexible development approved to allow the following. 1) Setback of 7 ft. for the free standing sign on Hendersonville Road. 2) One additional awning sign on New Morning Gallery site. 3) One additional awning sign over door which is not used as an entrance on the Bellagio site. Signs will be externally illuminated. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>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 and the guidelines for Flexible Development found in Section 7-11-7(4) were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><i>Structures undergoing design review.</i> Structures or lots subject to design review pursuant to this chapter by any official design review board established in this chapter which are found to comply with the applicable design guidelines shall be exempt from the signage, open space, landscaping, off-street parking, setback, building height and building floor area, lot width, and lot area requirements of the underlying zoning district to the extent that those requirements conflict with the applicable design guidelines.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval for the following reasons.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The signage proposal meets the Biltmore Village guidelines. 2. The setback variance will allow the free standing sign to be centered in the planting area between the building and the sidewalk.
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Charles Krekelberg, Samsel Architects, shows photographs of existing signs and his proposed signs and offers to answer questions. He explains they need a setback variation to place the freestanding sign in the best place, their first proposed location obscured some of the building's architectural features.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners Nutter and Farmer express positive views of the proposal. Commissioner Stephenson agrees, and says the plans put the signs in the most logical places.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – flexible development application; Exhibit B – site survey; Exhibit C – fourteen photos showing existing and

proposed signage; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 February, 2014 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 install new signs as follows: Hendersonville Road: 1) Replace existing awning signs with two new awning signs of 10 sq. ft. each. 2) Add new two-sided 10' 6" high, 56 sq. ft. free standing painted metal sign. Boston Way: 1) Replace existing awning signs with two new 10 sq. ft. each awning signs on New Morning Gallery. 2) Add one 20 sq. ft. painted metal wall mounted sign for Bellagio. Plaza: 1) Replace existing awning signs with two new 10 sq. ft. awning signs. Flexible development approved to allow the following: 1) Setback of 7 ft. for the free standing sign on Hendersonville Road. 2) One additional awning sign on New Morning Gallery site. 3) One additional awning sign over door which is not used as an entrance on the Bellagio site. Signs will be externally illuminated. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That 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 and the guidelines for Flexible Development found in Section 7-11-7(4) were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The signage proposal meets the Biltmore Village guidelines.
 - b. The setback variance will allow the free standing sign to be centered in the planting area between the building and the sidewalk.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Eakins

Vote for: ALL

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

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Bridget Putt Bounds
Subject Property 97 Santee Street
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639-85-5135
Zoning District: RS-8

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel where driveway has recently been constructed.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two-story 20' x 22' residential structure with front porch and 12' x 16' accessory structure per attached plans and specifications. New primary structure will have concrete block foundation with smooth stucco finish. Siding will be horizontal Hardie plank with smooth textured finish and 5 1/2" reveal. Roof will be 5v crimp metal in green color with a gabled form and a hip style on front porch, Windows will be wood, double hung, SDL, with six over one sash. Detail include () window and door surround, corner boards, band boards. Porch will 6"x6" wrapped posts and balustrade will have 2" x 2" wood rails, () on center. Construct (stone?) walkway. Accessory structure will match main structure in detail and material. Remove five trees at top of hill to west of proposed primary structure. Install new landscaping per site plan.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Verify walkway material 2. Need distance between rails on front porch 3. Need width of window and door surrounds. 4. Detailing on new structure is very minimal. Consider shingles in the front gable end, corner boards and deeper roof overhangs. 5. Sample of roofing material, house colors, foundation and story-board are required for final <p>The guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Bridgett Putt-Bounds, property owner, shows material samples and offers to answer questions. She describes changes she has made since the Preliminary Review, including adding corner boards and extending the eaves. She shows a storyboard and says she is painting parts of her house</p>

	next door so they will look better together. She says she is removing the trees along the front walkway and has moved the house further back onto the lot. She will be using stone excavated during construction for the walkway.
--	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p><i>Commissioner Eakins recuses himself, he was not present for the Preliminary Review.</i></p> <p>Commissioner Nutter asks if the off-center design is consistent with Montford. Ms. Merten says multiple examples can be found. Ms. Bounds notes 315 Pearson and her house at 317 Pearson both are asymmetrical.</p> <p>Commissioners ask about the width of the surround trim (6”).</p> <p>Commissioner Stephenson asks what material is intended for use under the eaves (<i>nothing</i>). She suggests tongue and groove between the rafters. She asks about the underside of the porch ceiling (<i>plywood</i>). She suggest a vaulted or flat beadboard. Ms. Bounds says she likes these suggestions and will use them.</p>
--

Commission Action

<p>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction worksheet; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – rendering of proposed structures; Exhibit D – front, right, left, front cottage and back elevations; Exhibit E – first and second floor plans main house, and cottage floor plan; Exhibit F – specification sheets for windows, doors and siding; Exhibit G – stucco sample; Exhibit H – storyboard ; Exhibit I – metal roof sample; Exhibit J – siding sample; Exhibit K – photo of siding at 315 Pearson Drive; Exhibit L – three revised renderings of front, left and right elevations; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 February, 2014 as indicated by Exhibits M and N. 2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members. 3. That the application is to Construct new two-story 20’ x 22’ residential structure with front porch and 12’ x 16’ accessory structure per attached plans and specifications. New primary structure will have concrete block foundation with smooth stucco finish. Siding will be horizontal Hardie plank with smooth textured finish and 5 ½” reveal. Roof will be 5v crimp metal in green color with a gabled form and a hip style on front porch, Windows will be wood, double hung, SDL, with six over one sash. Detail include 6” window and door surround, corner boards, band boards. Porch will 8”x8” wrapped posts and balustrade will have 2” x 2” wood rails, 3” on center. Construct native stone
--

walkway. Accessory structure will match main structure in detail and material. Remove five trees at top of hill to west of proposed primary structure. Install new landscaping per site plan. Soffits and porch ceiling will be tongue and groove. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines Walkways Driveway and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The structure is compatible with the district in scale, texture and material.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL (except Eakins)

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

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL (except Eakins)

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Andrew Lawler
Subject Property 16 Courtland Ave.
Hearing Date: March 12, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649-11-3921
Zoning District: RS-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: 1 1/2 story vernacular shingle cottage.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Add new 41 sq. ft. addition to east side elevation. Install new wood, double hung, six over six, TDL windows. All siding, roofing and foundation materials to match existing. Add new wood</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>casement window on east elevation and relocate existing casement window. Add new French door with side lights, all trim to match existing on house. Reconfigure roof on north elevation to increase slope. Add new six over six double hung wood, TDL window on west elevation.</p> <p>Addition and alterations per attached approved plans and specifications. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need window and door specifications 2. Why replacing small front window <p>The guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 and 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 August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The addition is very small and in keeping with the proportions of the existing structure. 2. The addition is located on the side and does not change the character of the structure as viewed from the street. 3. New windows are installed on non-character defining façade of the building and are compatible with the overall design.
Applicant(s)	<p>Andrew Lawler, property owner, says the house is c.1920 and was originally the residence of the owner of the gas station next door (currently Tod's Tasties). He introduces Marni Graves, architect, and they offer to answer Commissioners' questions.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Wampler and Commissioner Rizzo ask if there are other possibilities for fixing the small window on the front, perhaps a new lock, refashioning or re-working. Mr. Lawler explains the window has deteriorated and can't be fixed. He says it blows open and can't be secured or sealed.

Commissioners ask about the need for the addition. Mr. Lawler says he hopes to have a more functional kitchen, with more space and light. Ms. Graves notes the existing bumpout in the same location was approved in 1999, and they will be keeping the same form. She notes the walk-in cooler addition at Tod's comes right to the property line, and obscures the proposed addition. Mr. Lawler also explains that the roof change on the enclosed porch is necessary to prevent leaks.

There is discussion about window placement on the addition. Commissioner Farmer and Chair Wampler praise the design, Commissioner Ross agrees and notes there is little visibility. Ms. Merten notes the window placement follows the rhythm of the original house design.

Commissioner Rizzo asks if the applicant intends to save the original windows, Mr. Lawler replies he is building them into an interior cabinet.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – site drawing; Exhibit B – 1st level floor plan; Exhibit C – renderings of existing and proposed south, east, north and west elevations, with photographs of existing conditions; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of February, 2014, 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 February, 2014 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 Add new 41 sq. ft. addition to east side elevation. Install new wood, double hung, six over six, TDL windows. All siding, roofing and foundation materials to match existing. Add new wood casement window on east elevation and relocate existing casement window. Add new French door with side lights, all trim to match existing on house. Reconfigure roof on north elevation to increase slope. Add new six over six double hung wood, TDL window on west elevation. Addition and alterations per attached approved plans and specifications. Replace small casement window on front elevation. **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 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 August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request..
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The addition is very small and in keeping with the proportions of the existing structure.
 - b. The addition is located on the side and does not change the character of the structure as viewed from the street.
 - c. New windows are installed on non-character defining façade of the building and are compatible with the overall design.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District

Motion by: Commissioner Cothran

Second by: Commissioner Stephenson

Vote for: ALL

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

Motion by: Commissioner Cothran
Second by: Commissioner Farmer
Vote for: ALL

Preliminary Review:
None

Other Business:

Preservation Plan update. Ms. Merten says the plan is moving in a good direction. Heritage Strategies will conduct the third public meeting about the plan on Thursday, March 20 at 5:30 in the Grand Bohemian Hotel ballroom. She encourages the Commissioners to attend.

Request for viewing, *Conquest of Canaan*. Ms. Merten received a request from the NC Museum of History to show clips of the silent film in an exhibit opening November of 2014 titled “Starring North Carolina!” which will focus on the history of filmmaking in the state.

Commissioner Nutter moves to grant permission
Second by: Commissioner Ross
Vote for: ALL

Ms. Merten asks the Commissioners to appoint a nominating committee that will submit names at the May meeting. Commissioners Nutter and Fast volunteer.

Ms. Merten mentions it is time to think of nominees for the Sondley Award. She is trying to reschedule the Commissioners Retreat (*possibly May 1*), and find a suitable venue. The Griffin Awards are scheduled for May 15.

Commissioner Cothran moves to adjourn the meeting.
Second by: Commissioner Nutter
Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 6:37 pm.