

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting
Minutes of September 14, 2016
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall
4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, Craig Cline, William Eakins, Woodard Farmer (excused from meeting at 5:44 p.m.), Julie Hansbury, Bryan Moffitt, and Amanda Warren

Absent: Richard Fast, Leslie Klingner and Elias George Mathes

Administrative

- Mr. Eakins moved to approve the minutes of the August 10, 2016, meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hansbury and carried unanimously.
- Chair Ross said that the Certificate of Appropriateness request for 279 Cumberland Avenue has been withdrawn.
- After Chair Ross explained the public hearing rules, all those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

Consent Agenda - None

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 83 Starnes Avenue - Construction of 344 square foot rear addition

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

Owner/Applicant:	Elizabeth Gerson
Subject Property:	83 Starnes Avenue
Hearing Date:	September 14, 2016
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.22-3058
Zoning District:	RM-8

Property Description: Late 19th early 20th century 1-story vernacular Queen Anne cottage. Octagonal projection with octagonal roof, turned porch posts, plain spindle frieze. Constructed prior to 1907.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of new 344 square foot one-story addition on rear elevation. Addition will have wood siding matching existing and shed roof. Windows will be wood 1/1, double-hung; one half-lite wood door will be reused. A small wood landing will be constructed at side elevation of addition and will have asphalt shingle shed roof, per attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns about visual impact to the historic building based on proposed scale and size in conjunction with previous addition.
2. Staff has concerns as to whether the proposed addition is compatible with the historic character of the historic building.

The guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on May 13, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend approval of the proposal for the the same following reasons discussed at the August 10, 2016, meeting:

1. The design of the proposed addition is not compatible with the existing building in massing in that it proposes to almost double the length of the house, which was designed historically as a modest cottage-style dwelling.
2. The size of the proposed new addition, in combination with the existing addition, would bring the total of non-historic addition square footage to almost half of that of the historic building.
3. The historic character of the building would be highly impacted by the proposed addition based on massing, scale and size.

In response to Mr. Carpenter, Ms. Cole said that staff has no concerns about the overall site being impacted by the addition, but noted it will be very visible from Cumberland Avenue and would add significant length and mass to the existing historic house in conjunction with the previous addition. She said that the applicant had revised the roof form and pitch, based on suggestions made by the Commission at their August meeting.

Ms. Elizabeth Gerson, applicant, said that at the August meeting she understood that the roof form and pitch were concerns of the Commission and she was happy to make those revisions based on the suggestions given by the Commission. She said that while she understood staff had concerns regarding massing and impact to the historic building since beginning the review, she thought she understood from the Commission from the discussion in August that they did not necessarily share those concerns. She was under the impression that if she made suggested revisions that the project would necessarily meet the guidelines and be approved.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten noted that staff is making a recommendation based on their review of the guidelines. It is up to the Commission to interpret those guidelines.

Mr. Farmer stated that in his opinion the addition is a long, thin structure on the back of a cottage which isn't congruous with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Moffitt's concern is that the addition still feels disjointed from the original cottage in terms of the floor elevation and roof form. He noted that while there are some buildings in Montford with rambling rear sections, they are compatible with the historic character of the district.

Mr. Carpenter said that at the August meeting he thought the addition needed to be differentiated from the historic structure and he recalled that the Commission gave direction to the applicant to try to unify the addition, which they have now done. He stated that he didn't necessarily think the changes made were in conflict with the guidelines. He noted that the length of the lot and that the lot slopes slightly down from the street would make the addition less visible.

Ms. Merten said that staff still has the same concerns that were shared at the August meeting regarding massing and impact to the historic structure. She said that if the Commission doesn't share those concerns and can state reasons why it meets the guidelines, that's what the purpose of the hearing is for.

Mr. Cline said he didn't have a problem with the massing as it's fairly well hidden, but he did note his concern with the differing roof pitch because it looks too contemporary.

In response to Mr. Moffitt regarding the side entry porch, Ms. Gerson said that she would be amenable to not installing a roof over the steps.

When Ms. Merten asked if the applicant had given any thought to removing the existing addition and redesigning a new addition that would be more compatible, Ms. Gerson said that would be too expensive.

There was considerable discussion about how to proceed, as there seemed to be a question as to whether the Commission was entirely in support of the project. The Commission made suggestions on changing the roof pitch to better meet the guidelines. Ms. Merten noted that additional revised drawings would need to be submitted before the Commission could make a decision. Staff and the Commission reassured Ms. Gerson that they are trying to work through the challenges with the project. One option is for the applicant to request a continuance. The alternative is for the Commission would be to either approve or deny the application, if the applicant did not want to continue the application.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:38 p.m. and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:38 p.m.

Chair Ross suggested a design team made up of Commission members meet with Ms. Gerson for a site visit (if she is agreeable) to further discuss her plans and how the project can better meet the guidelines, noting that there is no guarantee that any revisions the applicant submits for the next meeting (if continued) would be approved or not.

If agreeable to Ms. Gerson, Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Cline and Ms. Hansbury volunteered to serve as the design team.

After Ms. Gerson asked for a continuance, Mr. Moffitt moved to continue this matter until the October 12, 2016, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Farmer and carried unanimously.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 57 Pearson Drive - Construction of deck and modification of two windows to convert to French doors

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

Owner/Applicant:	Carolyn Appen & Jill Van Auken/Steve Bennett
Subject Property:	57 Pearson Drive
Hearing Date:	September 14, 2016
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.02-5865
Zoning District:	RM-8

Property Description: Early 20th century 1-story weather-boarded bungalow.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Modification of two window openings on the rear elevation for installation of single-pane, wood French doors to be installed. Construction of 22' x 8' wood deck on rear elevation; (railing details). **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 that the applicant verify picket size and placement.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to verify railing style and size.

The guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 and Decks found on pages 38-39 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Windows being modified are not historic.
2. Opening being changed is on the rear elevation.
3. New doors being proposed are compatible with the overall design of the building.
4. New doors will be wood.
5. New deck will be located on the rear elevation and will be inset from the corners of the building by 12" on either side.
6. Deck railings will be compatible in material, color, scale and detail with the historic building.
7. Character defining features will not be damaged or obscured by the deck.

Ms. Cole said she had discussed with the applicant that the railing design proposed was too contemporary, and that it should be more compatible with the district. Staff has no other concerns. A condition should be included that the applicant provide a revised drawing of the railing details.

Mr. Moffitt understood that the Commission can't require the applicant to make improvements that aren't part of the application, but suggested that the portion of siding that had been previously modified might be fixed as part of the work. The contractor advised that the proposed scope of work does not include modification of siding.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:04 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 5:04 p.m.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - existing and proposed site plan (2 pages); Exhibit B – existing and proposed elevation drawings (2 pages); Exhibit C – photographs of subject property (6 pages); Exhibit D – door specifications (2 pages); 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 31st day of September, 2016, 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 30th day of September, 2016 as indicated by Exhibits (E) and (F).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to modify two window openings on the rear elevation for installation of single-pane, wood French doors to be installed. Construction of 22' x 8' wood deck on rear elevation; railing details 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 Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 and Decks found pages 38-39 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Windows being modified are not historic.
 - b. Opening being changed is on the rear elevation.
 - c. New doors being proposed are compatible with the overall design of the building.
 - d. New doors will be wood.
 - e. New deck will be located on the rear elevation and will be inset from the corners of the

- f. building by 12" on either side.
 - f. Deck railings will be compatible in material, color, scale and detail with the historic building.
 - g. Character defining features will not be damaged or obscured by the deck.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

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

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued, with the following condition that the applicant submit revised railing details to staff for approval prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 116 Flint Street - Construction of two-story rear addition; modification of one window opening and one door opening on front elevation

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

Owner/Applicant: Mandy Kjellstrom/Legerton Architecture
Subject Property: 116 Flint Street
Hearing Date: September 14, 2016
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-3251
Zoning District: RM-8

Property Description: Early 20th century 2 1/2 story vernacular dwelling. Shingles over weatherboards, bracketed eaves, Montford brackets, large dormer, brick foundation, wide porch. (R.S. Smith, architect?) Before 1917

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of non-original window installed within a door opening on front elevation with new wood half – lite door; replacement of door along south elevation; opening will be restored to match original window configuration and new wood window will be installed matching existing on that elevation; removal of existing non-historic shed addition on rear elevation and construction of new two story addition with open porch on first floor. Addition will have wood lap and cedar shake siding, matching existing house. Two existing 4/1, double-hung historic windows will be reused and five new wood 4/1, double-hung windows will be installed on addition. Two new wood _____ doors will be installed. Roof of addition will be asphalt shingle matching existing, 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 concerns regarding replacement of wood front porch stair with concrete, as it is not appropriate to replace wooden porch steps with concrete or brick.
2. Staff has concerns regarding design of proposed doors.
3. Staff has asked the applicant to clarify that new windows and doors will be wood rather than aluminum clad.
4. Staff has asked the applicant to confirm proposed material for patio.

The guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 and Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review

Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the project for the following reasons, provided concerns are addressed:

1. Replacement door and window are compatible with the original openings and the historic character of the building.
2. Addition will be sited on rear elevation where historic character defining features will not be damaged, destroyed or obscured.
3. Addition will be inset from rear building corners.
4. Design of addition is compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch.
5. The visual impact of the addition to the historic building will be limited.
6. Windows in the addition will be similar to those in the original building in proportion, spacing and materials.

Ms. Cole said that applicant has provided a revised door specification and that the applicant clarified that the new windows and doors will be wood, not aluminum clad. She asked the Commission to make it a condition of the Certificate of Appropriateness that the applicant submit materials for the patio. The one outstanding item that staff lists as a concern is that the applicant would like to replace the existing wood front porch stairs with concrete.

Mr. Curtis Walk, of Legerton Architecture, provided the Commission with photographs of other houses in the Montford area that have concrete stairs. He also provided 12 pages of a precedent study that illustrated examples of neighborhood houses with masonry side cheeks that have predominately concrete stairs between. He stated that wood front porch stairs are not a sustainable solution and that concrete or brick is a more permanent material. He thought that while the guidelines are commendable in trying to retain original materials, the Commission should also look at what would be the appropriate material for a given situation. His opinion is that concrete or brick material would be an appropriate choice in this case.

When Mr. Moffitt asked the applicant if he had any historical evidence (like pictures or perhaps something underneath the existing stairs) that indicated the original material had been masonry, Mr. Walk replied that he did not.

Mr. Moffitt made a couple of technical suggestions that might address rotting of the wood stairs by providing ventilation.

Mr. Carpenter felt that it would be possible to install wood stairs that last longer if they were constructed and designed properly.

Ms. Mandy Kjellstrom, owner of the house, said that because of mold and wetness, the wood stairs deteriorated within two years. She said that walking the neighborhood, she observed over 72% of the historic houses had concrete stairs.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 5:28 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 5:28 p.m.

Mr. Cline appreciated the applicant's survey; however, the Commission must adhere to their guidelines.

There was a brief discussion of the options available to the applicant since there was no historical data that the house had anything other than wood stairs and the Commission was bound by the guidelines. Mr. Walk then agreed to amend the application to withdraw the replacement of the wood front stairs with concrete stairs.

Even though the Commission could not support the replacement of the wood stairs with concrete, Commission members were pleased with the overall construction of the new two-story rear addition, as well as the modification of the one window opening and one door opening on the front elevation.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - cover sheet; Exhibit B – site survey and site plan (2 pages); Exhibit C – floor plans (2 pages); Exhibit D – demolition plans (2 pages); Exhibit E – proposed elevation drawings (2 pages); Exhibit F – photographs of subject property (2 pages); Exhibit G – streetscape; Exhibit H - revised door specifications; Exhibit I - precedent photos (2 pages submitted on 9-14-16); and Exhibit J - precedent study (12 pages submitted on 9-14-16); 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 31st day of September, 2016, 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 30th day of September, 2016 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 replace non-original window installed within a door opening on front elevation with new wood half – lite door; replacement of door along south elevation; opening will be restored to match original window configuration and new wood window will be installed matching existing on that elevation; removal of existing non-historic shed addition on rear elevation and construction of new two story addition with open porch on first floor. Addition will have wood lap and cedar shake siding, matching existing house. Seven new wood 4/1, double-hung windows will be installed on addition. Two new wood half - lite doors will be installed. Roof of addition will be asphalt shingle matching existing, 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 Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, and Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Replacement door and window are compatible with the original openings and the historic character of the building.
 - b. Addition will be sited on rear elevation where historic character defining features will not be damaged, destroyed or obscured.
 - c. Addition will be inset from rear building corners.
 - d. Design of addition is compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch.
 - e. The visual impact of the addition to the historic building will be limited.
 - f. Windows in the addition will be similar to those in the original building in proportion, spacing and materials.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins 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 present the material lay-out and configuration of the patio to staff for approval; and (2) the existing windows be stored safely on site. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

At this time, Mr. Moffitt moved to excuse Mr. Farmer from the remainder of the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Carpenter and carried unanimously.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness - 51 Starnes Avenue - Modification of front porch railing to raise height from 30" to 36"

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

Owner/Applicant:	Brian Astle
Subject Property:	51 Starnes Avenue
Hearing Date:	September 14, 2016
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.22-7215
Zoning District:	RM-8

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing front 30" tall wood front porch railing with new 36" tall front porch railing, per attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding replacement of the historic railing as it is a character defining feature of the building.
2. Staff has suggested alternatives for providing for life safety requirements that would preserve the historic character.

The guidelines for Porches, Entrances, and Balconies found on pages 72-73 and Accessibility and Life Safety Modifications found on pages 54-55 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend approval of the proposal, based on the following concerns:

1. All architectural features that are character defining elements of porches, including piers, columns, pilasters, balustrades, rails, steps, brackets, soffits and trim should be retained and preserved.
2. Wooden elements should be repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated sections.
3. If replacement of a porch element or detail is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail.
4. Accessibility and life-safety building code requirements should be met in such a way that the historic site and its character-defining features are preserved.
5. HRC staff has suggested alternative methods of equal effectiveness in meeting safety code requirements so as to preserve historic features - one of which is a cable above the existing historic railing that could easily be removed and since it blends in, it does not change the character-defining feature of the house. That

feature has been vetted with the Building Safety staff and they are amenable to that solution to meet the Building Code requirement.

Mr. Brian Astle, applicant, said that the existing wood railing is in such poor condition, they must replace it. Since they must replace it, they would like to raise the wood railing to 36" in order to meet the Building Code. There would only be a small change to the appearance of the house which top of railing would now be 6" above the bottom of the window ledge to the left of the railing. He felt that would not significantly alter the appearance of the front of the house.

Mr. Moffitt offered several simple solutions that will meet the Building Code requirements to reach the 36" requirement, in order to not alter the appearance of the front of the house.

Mr. Carpenter felt that having a steel cable or something other type of alternate method to reach the 36" would make the railing unattractive. He did understand though that the Commission is tasked with enforcing the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District.

Historic Resources Specialist Alex Cole said that not only does staff look at the Design Review Guidelines, but also the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Design Review Guidelines require that Building Code requirements be met in an historically appropriate manner. She reminded the Commission that this is staff's recommendation only and if the Commission has good reasons to deviate from the guidelines or interprets them differently, then a motion to approve would be appropriate.

Ms. Gail Astle said that they are in the process of restoring this beautiful home and they must remove the existing handrail due to its condition. They would like to have their contractor build a 36" railing matching the details of the historic railing. If required to add a cable or a bar on top of the 30" new railing, the character of the house will be ruined in her opinion.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. David Patterson, resident on Short Street, spoke in support of the applicant rebuilding the railing to 36" and storing the existing railing on-site.

Chair Ross closed the public hearing at 6:14 p.m.

Ms. Warren stated that in her opinion the railing height is a character defining feature and thought that the applicant does have an opportunity to come up with something creative to adhere to the Building Code. She did not think that all options had been explored.

Ms. Merten emphasized that the primary guidelines that needs to be met are those relating to Accessibility and Life Safety Modifications.

There was further discussion on this issue, with some Commissioners suggesting that they could support the change since the railing needed to be entirely replaced due to deterioration.

Chair Ross said that only because this is a relatively small piece of railing, she could support the request.

ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - project description (2 pages); Exhibit B – photograph and rendering of subject property; Exhibit C - sketch of handrail; Exhibit D – NPS Preservation Brief #45 – Preserving Historic Porches; 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 31st day of September, 2016, 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 30th day of September, 2016 as indicated by Exhibits (E) and (F).
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to amend CA 15-13815PZ to replace existing front 30" tall wood front porch railing with new 36" tall front porch railing, 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 Porches, Entrances, and Balconies found pages 72-73 and Accessibility and Life Safety Modifications found on pages 54-55 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August 14, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed replacement rail retains the general configuration of the porch. That the proposed rail retains the detailing, the picket size and spacing of the existing rail. That the proposed porch rail will be in compliance with North Carolina State Building Code including Chapter 11 of the Accessibility Code and will be more congruous than other options that might meet the requirement.
 - b. That it is congruous with the Guideline No. 6 on Page 73. That the replacement or reconstruction is a new design compatible with the historic character of the building in material, texture, scale and detail (excluding height).
 - c. That the bulk of the railing is located on the side elevation and does not greatly impact the façade.
 - d. That the original 30" railing can be easily restored without affecting adjacent building elements to match the current configuration at a future time.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the amended application of CA 15-13815PZ before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness for are congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried on a 6-1 vote, with Ms. Warren voting "no."

Based upon the foregoing FINDING OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Mr. Moffitt moved that Certificate of Appropriateness 15-13815PZ be amended and issued, with the following condition that the applicant both document and, as much as possible, preserve sections of the railing for future restoration, including photographs, dimension drawings and actual samples of the railings to be stored on site. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried on a 6-1 vote, with Ms. Warren voting "no."

Other Business

Princess Anne Hotel Local Landmark Pre-Application

Historic Preservation Specialist Alex Cole said that the Landmark Subcommittee, along with staff, is recommending that the applicant for the Princess Anne Hotel move forward with their application for local landmark designation.

Mr. Moffitt moved that staff send a letter to the applicant suggesting that they move forward with their application to pursue local landmark status and encourage them to research the special significance within the context of medical history in the community. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

Montford Guidelines Amendment Update

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten said that David Patterson, MNA Chair, had informed her that the proposed amendments would be on their October agenda, and encouraged Commission members to attend the meeting if possible. She will send the Commission the details of the October meeting.

Thomas Wolfe Cabin Update

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten briefly updated the Commission on the Thomas Wolfe Cabin stabilization, noting that the process is continuing to move forward.

Adjournment

At 6:53 p.m., Mr. Moffitt moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.