

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting
Minutes of November 11, 2015
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall
4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, William Eakins (arrived at 4:22 p.m.), Woodard Farmer, Richard Fast, Julie Hansbury, Bryan Moffitt and Rachel Sudnik

Absent: David Nutter, Joanne Stephenson and Amanda Warren

Administrative

- Mr. Moffitt moved to approve the minutes of the October 14, 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.
- Mr. Moffitt moved to continue the Certificate of Appropriateness request for 70 Magnolia Avenue to the December, 11, 2015, meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hansbury and carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 51 Starnes Avenue - Rehabilitation of existing building; construction of rear addition and small accessory building

Owner/Applicant: Brian Astle
Subject Property: 51 Starnes Avenue
Hearing Date: November 11, 2015
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-7215
Zoning District: RM-8

Property Description: Late 19th early 20th century 2-story vernacular shingle dwelling. Shingles over weatherboards, clipped gables. Before 1913 (S)

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is to rehabilitate the existing building, including repair or replacement as needed wood lap siding and shake siding, repair of original wood windows with replacement of parts as needed, and repair/repointing of original brick foundation. Existing concrete walkway in front yard will be replaced matching existing. One wood, 6/1, double-hung window on second floor of rear elevation will be moved to construct rear addition. Non-original porch along east elevation will be removed and existing door opening will be modified to a window opening with wood, 6/1, double-hung window inserted. Front porch railing and pickets will be reconstructed of wood matching remaining original railing. A 275 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear of the building with brick foundation offset from existing. Siding will be wood matching existing building. Windows will be wood, 6/1, double-hung and 9 or 12 lite wood casement. One 6-lite, wood door and one wood paneled door will be constructed on rear elevation of addition. A landing and stair will be constructed on rear addition, with railings and pickets matching those on existing front porch. Two 30 1/16" x 37 7/8" Velux skylights, model FS, will be installed on the roof of addition. A 189 square foot accessory structure will be constructed in rear yard. Accessory structure will have smooth, fiber-cement lap siding, 1/1, double-hung wood windows, wood paneled doors, and asphalt shingle hip roof. A 6' wood gate will be installed between accessory structure and neighboring property, 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 no concerns.

The guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89, the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-89, the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, the guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51, the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, the guidelines for Materials: Wood found on pages 66-67, and the guidelines for Materials: Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65 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) Addition will be located on the rear elevation and will be compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch; (2) Windows in addition will be similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing and materials; (3) Exterior siding and details of addition will be compatible with the existing building in material, texture, color and character; (4) Details and materials of accessory structure will be compatible with existing building and it will be constructed in the same location as original accessory structure; (5) Proportion of accessory structure will be compatible with the primary structure in terms of height, footprint and massing; and (6) Materials on existing building are being repaired. If replacement is necessary, new materials will match original in design, detailing, and material.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Flexible Development Application; Exhibit B – existing conditions description and photographs (3 pages); Exhibit C – existing and proposed site plans (2 pages); Exhibit D – existing and proposed floor plans (6 pages); Exhibit E – existing and proposed elevation drawings (6 pages); Exhibit F – existing and proposed roof plans (2 pages); Exhibit G – accessory structure elevation drawings (2 pages); Exhibit H – window specifications (5 pages); Exhibit I – description of proposed work (5 pages); Exhibit J – revised floor plans and elevation drawing (4 pages – received November 5, 2015); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members, Mr. Fast 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 28th day of November, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of November, 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 the application is to rehabilitate the existing building, including repair or replacement as needed wood lap siding and shake siding, repair of original wood windows with replacement of parts as needed, and repair/repointing of original brick foundation. Existing concrete walkway in front yard will be replaced matching existing. One wood, 6/1, double-hung window on second floor of rear elevation will be moved to construct rear addition. Non-original porch along east elevation will be removed and existing door opening will be modified to a window opening with wood, 6/1, double-hung window inserted. Front porch railing and pickets will be reconstructed of wood matching remaining original railing. A 275 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear of the building with brick foundation offset from existing. Siding will be wood matching existing building. Windows will be wood, 6/1, double-hung and 9 or 12 lite wood casement. One 6-lite, wood door and one wood paneled door will be constructed on rear elevation of addition. A landing and stair will be constructed on rear addition, with railings and pickets matching those on existing front porch. Two 30

1/16" x 37 7/8" Velux skylights, model FS, will be installed on the roof of addition. A 189 square foot accessory structure will be constructed in rear yard. Accessory structure will have smooth, fiber-cement lap siding, 1/1, double-hung wood windows, wood paneled doors, and asphalt shingle hip roof. A 6' wood gate will be installed between accessory structure and neighboring property. A Flexible Development application has been approved as part of this request to allow 2' side setback and 1' 4" rear setback, 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 guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89, the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-89, the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, the guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51, the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, the guidelines for Materials: Wood found on pages 66-67, and the guidelines for Materials: Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65 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. Addition will be located on the rear elevation and will be compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch.
 - b. Windows in addition will be similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing and materials.
 - c. Exterior siding and details of addition will be compatible with the existing building in material, texture, color and character.
 - d. Details and materials of accessory structure will be compatible with the existing building and it will be constructed in the same location as original accessory structure.
 - e. Proportion of accessory structure will be compatible with the primary structure in terms of height, footprint and massing.
 - f. Materials on existing building are being repaired. If replacement is necessary, new materials will match original in design, detailing and material.
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.

As there was no objection to 51 Starnes Avenue Certificate of Appropriateness being placed on the Consent Agenda, the FINDINGS OF FACT were adopted and the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 9999 St. Dunstan's Circle - Construction of new one-and-a-half story primary structure

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

Owner/Applicant:	Hal Schuelke
Subject Property:	99999 St. Dunstan's Circle
Hearing Date:	November 11, 2015
Historic District:	St. Dunstan's
PIN:	9648.41-9414
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: .22 acre vacant lot.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: That the application is to construct a one-and-a-half story, 3,300 square foot primary structure with stucco foundation and CertainTeed Weatherboards smooth fiber cement lap siding with 5/8" thickness, 7 ¼" reveal, and 6" corner boards. Roof will be cross-gable with StainGuard asphalt shingles in weathered wood color with decorative wood brackets under eaves. Windows will be aluminum-clad, SDL, 2/1, double-hung or casement and doors will be half-lite wood paneled or single pane wood. Front entry porch will have stucco and wood posts under shed roof. Porch floors and stairs will be 2"x 4" wood decking boards. Rear porch will be 39' x 12' and will be partially covered with asphalt shingle gable roof; pickets will be 2"x 4" with 2" x 6" capped railing. An 18' 5" x 12' concrete patio will be installed underneath rear porch. Concrete walkway will be installed at front of property from street to front entry stair. Small and medium shrubs from recommended species list will be planted in front yard. One 46" white oak tree will be removed to accommodate construction. Gravel driveway with two parking spaces and a concrete walkway will be installed in rear yard, 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. Staff has asked the applicant to submit a story board illustrating the proposed structure and the surrounding neighborhood context.
2. Staff has asked that the applicant submit door and window specifications.

The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 84-85 and the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 34-35 in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan's Historic District adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.

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

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. New primary structure is designed so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained.
3. Design of new primary structure is compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings.
4. Window and door openings are located so as to be compatible in placement, orientation, spacing, proportion, size and scale with the surrounding historic buildings.
5. Detailing of new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
6. Materials and finishes are typical of those found in the neighborhood and are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail, and color to historic materials found in the district.

Mr. Hal Schuelke, applicant, said that he was available to answer questions, noting that he has provided to staff revised drawings and the story board.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:07 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:07.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - site plan; Exhibit B – floor plans; Exhibit C – elevation drawings (2 pages); Exhibit D – photographs of subject property (3 pages);

Exhibit E - revised cover sheet with story board (received November 11, 2015); Exhibit F - revised floor plans and elevation drawings (received November 11, 2015); Exhibit G – CertainTeed Weatherboard smooth lap siding sample; Exhibit H – Timberline asphalt 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 28th day of November, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of November, 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 construct a one-and-a-half story, 3,300 square foot primary structure with stucco foundation and CertainTeed Weatherboards smooth fiber cement lap siding with 5/8" thickness, 7 ¼" reveal, and 6" corner boards. Roof will be cross-gable with StainGuard asphalt shingles in weathered wood color with decorative wood brackets under eaves. Windows will be aluminum-clad, SDL, 3/1, double-hung or casement and doors will be half-lite wood paneled or single pane wood. Front entry porch will have stucco and wood posts under shed roof. Porch floors and stairs will be 2"x 4" wood decking boards. Rear porch will be 39' x 12' and will be partially covered with asphalt shingle gable roof; pickets will be 2"x 4" with 2" x 6" capped railing. An 18' 5" x 12' concrete patio will be installed underneath rear porch. Concrete walkway will be installed at front of property from street to front entry stair. Small and medium shrubs from recommended species list will be planted in front yard. One 46" white oak tree will be removed to accommodate construction. Gravel driveway with two parking spaces and a concrete walkway will be installed in rear yard, 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 guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 84-85 and the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 34-35 in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan's Historic District adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. 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. New primary structure is designed so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained.
 - c. Design of new primary structure is compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings.
 - d. Window and door openings are located so as to be compatible in placement, orientation, spacing, proportion, size and scale with the surrounding historic buildings.
 - e. Detailing of new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
 - f. Materials and finishes are typical of those found in the neighborhood and are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail, and color to historic materials found in the district.
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. Carpenter and carried unanimously.

At Mr. Schuelke's typographical clarification, Mr. Farmer moved to amend the motion to note the windows will be aluminum-clad, SDL, 2/1, double-hung or casement and doors will be half-lite wood paneled or single pane wood. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued, with the condition that the applicant submit window specifications for staff review. This motion was seconded by Mr. Farmer and carried unanimously.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 34 Pearson Drive - Rehabilitation of facility, including removal of 13 mature trees, construction of new retaining wall, sidewalk, fencing and signage; installation of new surface parking

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten used site plans while she reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	City of Asheville
Subject Property:	34 Pearson Drive – Montford Center
Hearing Date:	November 11, 2015
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.02-0506
Zoning District:	RS-8

Property Description: The Montford Recreation Center is a 17 acre complex constructed in the late 1970's, which is located between Riverside Cemetery and Pearson Drive in the Montford neighborhood. Just over an acre of the site is located within the boundaries of the Montford Area Local Historic District, being that portion of the Center, which fronts on Pearson Drive.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: The application is to make improvement to the facility per the attached drawings and plans. Work within the historic district includes the following: 1) remove 8 white pines and existing concrete sidewalk along Pearson and replace with new concrete sidewalk and four new large maturing deciduous trees; 2) remove existing tennis court and existing 27 space asphalt parking area adjacent to Pearson Drive to create a new (asphalt) parking area with 57 parking spaces; 3) remove existing stairs from Pearson Drive, entrance sidewalk and entrance plaza and create new entrance plaza with sandblasted concrete panels, seatwall planters faced with architectural block and precast concrete cap and aluminum trellis structure; 4) screen trash and recycling area with painted wood (color) panel screen; 5) remove existing entrance sign and install new entry sign with stone base, ground faced architectural block, pre-cast concrete cap and oil rubbed bronze lettering; 6) install 3.5" high aluminum/steel entry gate with stone columns; 7) remove three large oaks, two walnuts and 1 cherry tree, remove existing timber wall along street in front of Montford Center and replace with new 4' tan stone wall and construct new 6' concrete sidewalk and install 5 new large maturing trees along the sidewalk and yard area. **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. Asphalt parking areas are prohibited.
2. New sidewalks should be located so that mature trees are maintained.
3. HRC should make the findings of special circumstances for the larger sign.
4. Explore moving lighting fixtures farther back on site.
5. Provide stone samples for wall and posts.

The guidelines for Sidewalks, Streets and Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47, Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, Walkways Driveways and Off-street Parking

found on pages 50-51, Signage found on pages 48-49, Lighting found on pages 42-43, Utilities and Mechanical Systems found on pages 82-83 and Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends in favor of the improvements with the following concerns: (1) The proposed sign is in keeping with the character of the Montford Historic District and is appropriately sized for the large institutional character of the facility; (2) The unsightly trash receptacles will be screened appropriately; (3) The new retaining wall will be congruous with the character of other historic retaining walls within the Montford Historic District; (4) The white pines have been damaged and no longer perform their intended function as street trees; and (5) New sidewalks will match existing historic sidewalks in color, edging and groove pattern.

Ms. Merten noted that only a small portion of the area comprising the Montford Complex Master Plan is within the historic district boundary. The plan includes making improvements to the entire facility, but the application before the Commission only includes modifying the area within the district boundary. Impacts in the historic district area involve removing the tennis courts and existing asphalt parking, and replacing that area with a larger asphalt parking area; removal of a row of mature white pine trees to accommodate new sidewalk south of the facility entrance; modification of facility entrance from Pearson Drive; removal of three mature white oak trees, two walnut trees, and one cherry tree to allow for installation of new sidewalk north of the entrance; installation of new stone and concrete retaining wall and sign; screening in front of the existing dumpsters; removal of existing walkway and sign and installation of concrete plaza. Based on the guidelines, Ms. Merten explained the following concerns: (1) Asphalt parking areas are prohibited. She noted that while there are other institutional-type uses in the district that have asphalt parking, these parking areas were likely installed before the district and accompanying guidelines were established; (2) New sidewalks should be located so that mature trees are maintained; (3) The guidelines allow the HRC to make findings of special circumstances for a larger sign; (4) Explore moving lighting fixtures farther back on site; and (5) Provide stone samples for wall and posts.

Mr. Carpenter stated that the parking lot does not contribute to the historic character of the district. After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission that because the area of proposed parking includes an existing asphalt parking area and other non-contributing paved surfaces, it would not be inappropriate a new asphalt parking area to be located in the same area.

Mr. Moffitt questioned the proposed free-standing sign. After a brief discussion about the location of the proposed free-standing sign, it was the consensus of the Commission that there were other places on site that would be more appropriate locations for the sign. The Commission suggested that a sign placed along the proposed retaining wall at the entrance would be more visible and appropriate for the site. It was also suggested that a second free-standing sign could potentially be installed at the corner of Pearson and Gay Streets near the location of an existing wooden monument sign that will be removed.

In response to Mr. Carpenter's concern about the proposed stone retaining wall, Mr. Pete Wall, the City's landscape architect for the project, summarized the plan for the Montford Complex and discussed the specific phases of the project. He stated that Phase I of the project included the area within the Montford Historic District being reviewed by the Commission. Phase II involves improvements along Gay Street, including converting it from a one-way into a two-way street with a sidewalk connection to the intersection at Chestnut Street. The retaining wall, along with the sidewalk connection slated as part of Phase I, will be continued along Gay Street as part of Phase II improvements.

Mr. Farmer asked the applicant whether the City planned to continue sidewalk improvements beyond this proposal south to the intersection with Courtland Avenue. He expressed his concern, noting that the intersection is hazardous for pedestrian traffic as there currently is no sidewalk. In response to Mr. Farmer, Mr. Wall said that the intersection was out of the scope of the Montford Complex plan. He did note, however, that they have brought that to the Transportation Department's attention, and they do have a note on their plans for the City to improve that intersection as part of general infrastructure improvements.

In response to Mr. Farmer, Mr. Jason Gilliland, landscape consultant with Site Design Studio, explained why some of the trees would have to be removed to accommodate the sidewalks. The trees will be replaced with a larger than minimum caliper tree (but less than 6-inches).

In response to Mr. Moffitt, Mr. Gilliland said that they do intend to screen the mechanical equipment with plant material.

In response to Mr. Farmer, Mr. Gilliland said that it is the intent of the design that the color of the trash receptacle screening be compatible with the existing architecture, while also being compatible with the historic district.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:52 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:52 p.m.

In response to Ms. Merten, Mr. Gilliland said that moving the lighting fixture farther back on site would be agreeable.

Mr. Gilliland said that the critical parts of the plan needing guidance and/or approval of at this point are the parking area, tree removal and sidewalk in order to continue with their design and construction documentation. Everything else is material sections, and not as critical at this point. Therefore, it was agreed that the Certificate of Appropriateness application could be approved at this time. The Commission agreed that the proposed signage should be removed from this application, and suggested the applicant submit information for a revised sign proposal at a later date, and that it could be an amendment to the CA being issued at this hearing. The applicant was also asked to submit a stone sample for staff review and approval.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - summary of Montford Center Master Plan (5 pages); Exhibit B – existing park facilities inventory and analysis; Exhibit C – preferred Master Plan description (2 pages); Exhibit D – existing conditions site plan; Exhibit E – photographs of subject property (2 pages); Exhibit F – existing survey and Phase I demolition plan; Exhibit G – Montford Complex Park Master Plan; Exhibit H – Phase I site plan; Exhibit I – Phase I site lighting plan; Exhibit J – Pearson Drive streetscape; Exhibit K – Phase I sketches and details (2 pages); Exhibit L – Phase I Character Imagery (2 pages); Exhibit M – lighting specifications (2 pages); Exhibit N – Montford Historic District map indicating existing non-residential asphalt parking; 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 28th day of November, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of November, 2015 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 make improvement to the facility per the attached drawings and plans. Work within the historic district includes the following: 1) remove 8 white pines and existing concrete sidewalk along Pearson and replace with new concrete sidewalk and four new large maturing deciduous trees; 2) remove existing tennis court and existing 27 space asphalt parking area adjacent to Pearson Drive to create a new (asphalt) parking area with 57 parking spaces; 3) remove existing stairs from Pearson Drive, entrance sidewalk and entrance plaza and create new entrance plaza with sandblasted concrete panels, seatwall planters faced with architectural block and precast concrete cap and aluminum trellis structure; 4) screen trash and recycling area with painted wood (color)

panel screen; 5) install 3.5' high aluminum/steel entry gate with stone columns; 6) remove three large oaks, two walnuts and 1 cherry tree, remove existing timber wall along street in front of Montford Center and replace with new 4' stone wall (color to be determined) and construct new 6' concrete sidewalk and install 5 new large maturing trees, (minimal caliper 4") along the sidewalk and yard area. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Sidewalks, Streets and Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47, Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, Walkways Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51, Signage found on pages 48-49, Lighting found on pages 42-43, Utilities and Mechanical Systems found on pages 82-83 and Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended May 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The unsightly trash receptacles will be screened appropriately.
 - b. The new retaining wall will be congruous with the character of other historic retaining walls within the Montford Historic District.
 - c. New sidewalks will match existing historic sidewalks in color, edging and groove pattern.
 - d. The existing tennis courts and parking area are non-character defining historic walkways, driveways or other off-street parking areas and are currently asphalt paving; therefore, the proposed reconfiguration of that existing asphalt is not diminishing the historic character of the district.
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. Farmer and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued, with the following conditions: (1) the specific type, size and configuration of the stone wall be presented to the HRC for approval; (2) the applicant present an application to amend this Certificate of Appropriateness for revised sign location and configuration; (3) Second by Ms. Sudnik; and (4) a revised lighting plan indicating the light proposed adjacent to the street removed from the plan or moved to a different location presented to staff for approval. This motion was seconded by Ms. Sudnik and carried unanimously.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 95 Charlotte Street (Patton-Parker House) - Construction of new, two-story accessory building

Mr. Moffitt moved to recuse Mr. Carpenter due to a conflict of interest as he serves as a board member for The Preservation Society of Asheville & Buncombe County. This motion was seconded by Ms. Sudnik and carried unanimously.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten used site plans while she reviewed the following staff report:

Owner/Applicant:	Preservation Society of Asheville & Buncombe County/95 Charlotte, LLC
Subject Property:	95 Charlotte Street
Hearing Date:	November 11, 2015
Historic District:	Local Landmark
PIN:	9649.63-1039
Zoning District:	Office - CZ

Property Description: The Patton Parker House is a vernacular Victorian era dwelling built in 1868 by Thomas Walton Patton and two African-American carpenters during the economic depression of the Reconstruction era. The Patton-Parker House pre-dates the majority of houses in the Chestnut-Liberty historic district and its 1.23 acres are the only tangible reminders of a residential estate along the Chestnut and Charlotte Street corridors. The site was also the location of a Civil War encampment and drill grounds used by both Confederate and Union Forces.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: The application is to construct a two story duplex of 2,238 sq. feet, per attached drawings and plans. The new structure will be of frame construction with a concrete block foundation covered with a brick veneer. The horizontally oriented siding will be of a smooth hardie board with a 4" reveal. Roof material will be weathered wood asphalt shingle in a hipped form with a 5/12 pitch, boxed cornice, and applied gutters. Details include a two-level front porch with 1" x 2" railings, 2.5" on center, and a lattice ceiling, 8" x 8" support columns. Windows will be aluminum clad, SDL, double-hung in cottage style in triples and singles. Door will be metal clad. Shutters will be wood. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:

1. The applicant should explain how the design of the new construction is visually compatible with the historic character of the site and setting.

The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were used to evaluate this request with specific reference to Building Site and Setting.

1. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
2. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends in favor of the proposed new construction provided the applicant can explain how the design of the new structure is visibly compatible with the historic character of the site and setting.

Mr. Jack Thomson, Executive Director of The Preservation Society of Asheville & Buncombe County, provided the Commission with samples of the materials and colors proposed for the project. Taking into account all the comments heard from the various public hearings, he presented the Commission with revised drawings, photographic examples of roof forms from the existing house and the surrounding district, window examples, photographs of the decorative porch ceiling, brick samples (to match as closely as possible to the main house), etc. explaining why the proposed accessory structure meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

There was considerable discussion on the different architectural features of the proposed accessory building. The Commission was asked to give very specific design direction regarding specific features the Commission had questions about, primarily the porch railing, fenestration of the west elevation, the chimney on the north elevation, and proposed color palette. In order to not give the appearance of a four-plex, it was suggested by the Commission that the fenestration on the west elevation be broken up, reflecting the varied fenestration style of the existing house. Mr. Siemens noted that they would like to bring the height of the chimney shoulder up higher than what is indicated on the plan to allow for a firebox in the second story unit.

There was discussion of proposed color palette, with Mr. Fast suggesting that black might be a more appropriate choice for the shutters and would tie in with the existing house better.

Following that discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission that in order to find the structure compatible, the applicant should (1) space the 1" x 2" railings 3.5" on center; (2) reconfigure the west elevation window size, grouping and detail as discussed and shown on the revised site plan to be submitted as an exhibit; (3) reconfigure the main entrance door with side lights; (4) modify the bedroom door transom to have simulated divided lights; (4) modify the shoulders of the chimney to accommodate the fireplace on the second floor; and (5) choose either green or black, and they should use one color from the existing house in the overall color palette to link the two.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 6:10 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - rendering of accessory building; Exhibit B - site plan; Exhibit C - rendering of accessory building and floor plan; Exhibit D - foundation plan; Exhibit E - elevation drawings (4 pages); Exhibit F - contextual rendering; Exhibit G - window specifications (5 pages); Exhibit H - siding specifications (2 pages); Exhibit I - shingle specifications; Exhibit J - ceiling detail (2 pages); Exhibit K - photographs of glass expanse (4 pages); Exhibit L - photographs of window examples (7 pages); Exhibit M - contextual roof examples (15 pages); Exhibit N - previous submittal (2 pages); Exhibit O - shingle sample; Exhibit P - brick sample; Exhibit Q - window sample; Exhibit R - proposed paint color samples; Exhibit S - revised east and north elevation sketches; 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 28th day of November, 2015, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of November, 2015 as indicated by Exhibits (T) and (U).
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 duplex of 2,238 sq. feet, per attached drawings and plans. The new structure will be of frame construction with a concrete block foundation covered with a brick veneer. The horizontally oriented siding will be of a smooth hardie board with a 4" reveal. Roof material will be weathered wood asphalt shingle in a hipped form with a 5/12 pitch, boxed cornice, and applied gutters. Details include a two-level front porch with 1" x 2" railings, 3.5" on center, and a lattice ceiling, 8" x 8" support columns. Windows will be aluminum clad, SDL, double-hung in cottage style in triples, doubles and singles. Doors will be aluminum clad. Shutters will be wood, 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 Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were used to evaluate this request with specific reference to Building Site and Setting.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The massing of the building is compatible with the massing of the existing house.
 - b. The siting of the building is compatible with the overall site plan of the property and is close to the previously known historic location of an accessory building.
 - c. The materials and detailing of the proposed design are overall compatible with the materials and detailing of the existing house.

- d. The window size, grouping and details are compatible with the fenestration found on the existing house.
 - e. The shape and pitch of the proposed roof is compatible with the shape and pitch of existing hip roofs on the existing house and in context with the neighborhood.
 - f. The location of the upper story windows to the eve of the house is consistent with windows of the existing house.
 - g. The proposed siting of the accessory building will maintain an existing large specimen tree.
 - h. The proposed design is compatible with the existing house yet differentiated in terms of detailing and massing and is congruous with the existing house without detracting from the historic integrity of the property.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

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

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued , with the following conditions: (1) that the applicant revise the west and north elevation per Exhibit "S" specifically to eliminate certain windows, add side lights to the main door, modify the bedroom door such that the bedroom door transom has simulated divided lights, the two windows that lead into the dining room will be centered between the porch columns; and modify the chimney design on the north elevation to allow for an interior firebox on the 2nd story; (2) that the brick samples would match the existing house as closely as possible to be approved by staff; (3) the applicant provide final window sash and shutter colors to be Jeld Wen Hartford green or black, submitted and approved by staff; (4) that the applicant's final color scheme, including body color, trim color and window color be such that the colors would be compatible and will incorporate at least one color that links it to the final color scheme of the existing house; and (5) the final site and landscape plan should include the tree being preserved and screening for utilities to be approved by staff. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Other Business

Policy Recommendations for City Council

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten reminded the Commission to that City Council has asked all boards and commissions to present up to three policy recommendations so that they can include them in their January retreat discussion for possible inclusion in their Strategic Operating Plan. She asked that the Commission send her any suggested policy recommendations and she would have a document prepared for the Commission's November meeting to discuss.

Committee Reports

Landmark Committee

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole said that they have received two pre-applications, both of which seem to have some potential.

Education Committee

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that the Education Committee will meet the first Wednesday in December at which time she will have an outline which will focus on the website.

Announcements

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that she and Chair Ross will be meeting with the County's Planning Director, along with the City's Planning Director on November 17, 2015, to talk about the Historic Preservation Plan and next steps.

Adjournment

At 6:30 p.m., Mr. Eakins moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.