

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of November 13, 2013

- Members Present:** Capi Wampler, Brendan Ross, Nan Chase, Brian Cook, Jo Stephenson, David Carpenter, Patricia Cothran, J. Ray Elingburg, Woodard Farmer, David Nutter, Tracey Rizzo
- Members Absent:** –
- Staff:** Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley
- Public:** Mark Marshall, Kevin Kerr, Valeria M. Carrizo Wyda, Steve Wyda
- Call to Order:** Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:01 pm with a quorum present.
- Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Carpenter moves to adopt the October 9, 2013 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

None

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

- Owner/Applicant:** Set Sail Development
Subject Property 8 Short Street
Hearing Date: November 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.21-0374
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, where condemned historic structure was removed in early 2013.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 1,650, two-story, single family residence with front porch, per approved attached plans. Structure will have pebbledash foundation, smooth sided Hardie-board horizontal siding with 7” reveal with cedar shake shingles in gables. Roof will be gable-style with a primary pitch of 10/12 and covered with “Weathered Wood” asphalt shingles. Windows will be aluminum clad, SDL, double-hung, 2 over 1 in singles and pairs. Front door will be wood three light. Details include 5” corner-boards and 4 ½” window and door surrounds. Porch will have T & G wooden decking, 2” x 2”</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>turned posts, 4” on center, stone piers (stone type) and wooden lattice underpinning Two off-street parking spaces will be located on west side of lot to the rear of the structure. Remove trees ? Landscaping per attached 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. Siding should have smooth side exposed 2. Confirm driveway material 3. Need more legible site plan/confirm walkway material 4. Need sample stone and other materials 5. Will trees be removed? 6. Gable pitches should be consistent <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>Recommendation: Staff recommends approval provided that concerns are addressed.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
Applicant(s)	<p>Kevin Kerr, Set Sail Development, addresses some of Ms. Merten’s concerns and offers to answer questions. He shows a sample of Nolichucky stone that he wants to use for the driveway, instead of concrete. He would like to use Hooper’s Creek stone for the front walkway, which will be used for the stone columns. If not approved, he would use concrete (<i>preferred</i>). He notes he had previously shifted from a shed style roof on the front elevation, and can go back to it.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
David Patterson	Mr. Patterson, neighbor at 33 Short Street, asks for the square footage of the house that was torn down. Kevin Kerr says 1320. Mr. Patterson asks if that is total, or footprint. Ms. Merten is not sure, and offers to find out.

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioners Nutter, Stephenson, Chase and Carpenter discuss pitch differences in the gables, and whether a shed dormer would be more appropriate. Ms. Merten passes around a photo of a similar home with shed gable. Mr. Kerr does not think a shed dormer would look good on the back of the house. Commissioner Stephenson says the front dormer is an issue because of the two gables. Mr. Kerr asks if it would help if the back pitch could be 10/12 (<i>yes</i>). Commissioner Rizzo asks if these are aesthetic judgments, or historical. Ms. Merten says it is about inconsistency with the style of the house, normally the gables would match. Commissioner Cook says the basic form</p>
--

is late Victorian, and the gable brings in Craftsman style. Mr. Kerr says he can make the suggested changes, using a shed dormer on the front, and the rear roof pitch 10/12.

Commissioner Nutter asks about parking issues, and the trees in that area. Mr. Kerr submits four photos of the area, showing the trees. He wants to remove two of four trees. Commissioner Nutter says one of the two is a special tree. Mr. Kerr explains it has been losing limbs and his neighbor at Hunter Banks would like it removed. He shows some close-ups of problem areas. He notes this is also necessary to be able to get any off-street parking. Other options are discussed with aim to preserve the trees, including whether two could be driven between. It is determined these would not be viable options. Mr. Kerr says his proposal keeps the roots of the remaining trees safest and gives a buffer to the edge of the property. He says he is willing to plant replacements. Ms. Merten notes that though the guidelines try to preserve trees, they are allowed to be removed for new construction. She notes there will be new landscaping.

Commissioner Ross describes the parking plan as thoughtful, and Commissioner Stephenson adds it would be unreasonable to ask the applicant to route cars between the trees. Ms. Merten says a revised landscape plan should be submitted, that shows replacements.

Commissioner Cook questions the band board on the right bumpout, 1st level of front elevation. He says this and the one on the rear should continue to the sides or be removed. Mr. Kerr agrees to do this.

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 – door and window specifications; Exhibit C – east, west, south and north elevations; Exhibit D – roof overview; Exhibit E – 1st and 2nd floor plans ; Exhibit F – five renderings of front, rear and side façades; Exhibit G –storyboard; Exhibit H – rendering of front façade with material specifications; Exhibit I – site plan; Exhibit J – Nolichucky gravel; Exhibit K – Hooper’s Creek stone; Exhibit L – three photographs of tree in question; Exhibit M – digital image of shed dormer; 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 30th day of October, 2013, 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 October, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits N and O.
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 1,650 SF, two-story, single family residence with front porch, per approved attached plans. Structure will have pebbledash foundation, smooth sided Hardie-board horizontal siding with 7” reveal with cedar shake shingles in gables. Roof will be gable-style with a primary pitch of 10/12 and covered with “Weathered Wood” asphalt shingles. Windows will be aluminum clad, SDL, double-hung, 2 over 1 in singles and pairs. Front door will be wood three light. Details include 5”corner-boards and 4 ½” window and door surrounds. Porch will have T & G wooden decking, 2” x 2” turned posts, 4” on center, stone piers (Hooper’s Creek) and wooden lattice

underpinning. Two off-street parking spaces will be located on west side of lot to the rear of the structure of Nolichucky gravel. Front walkway will be concrete. Landscaping per attached revised plan. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
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 Cook

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 elevations showing 1st floor band board deleted, front shed dormer and 10/12 pitch on rear porch roof be submitted for staff review.**
2. **Revised landscape plan showing two large deciduous tree replantings and concrete sidewalk be submitted for staff review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Elzy Lindsey & Lauren Carlisle/Mark Marshall
Subject Property: 226 Flint Street
Hearing Date: November 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-15591
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report. Property Description: Vacant parcel, former site of 2 story dwelling.
-----------------------	---

	<p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 2,400, two-story, single family residence with front porch, per approved attached plans. Structure will have smooth stucco foundation, smooth sided Hardie-board horizontal siding with 8” reveal on lower level and wooden shingles on second story. Roof will be hip-style with a primary pitch of 10/12 and covered with “Pewter Gray” asphalt shingles. Windows will be wood, SDL, double-hung, 2 over 1 in singles and pairs; and some 4 light wooden casements. Details include brackets, frieze-board, 5 ¼”corner-boards and 3 1/2” window and door surrounds. Porch will have T&G wooden decking, 2” x 2” turned posts, 4” on center, with wood columns on stucco base. Front doors will be wood, ¾ light. Chimney will be stucco. A single off-street parking space will be located on southeast corner of lot. Remove 24” Black Walnut. 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. Window and door specifications required (aluminum clad?) 2. Casement windows should be more uniform in design. 3. Foundation plantings, parking buffers and yard trees are required 4. Confirm there will be walkway to street and material. <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 provided that concerns are addressed.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Mark Marshall, Trio Construction, offers to answer questions. Ms. Merten asks about the rear door drawing. Commissioner Nutter expresses concern that there is no site or landscaping plan, and says the site and topography were an issue discussed in the preliminary review. Mr. Marshall says he is still working on a landscape plan, and would be able to present it at the next hearing. He goes over other changes he has made based on Commissioners’ comments. He has modified the driveway, which will be in the SE corner of the lot, with a shrubbery break at the end to give a visual break from the street.</p> <p>He has changed the front porch overhang to be more in keeping with Montford style, with the roof extending over all. He says the windows will be wood, double-hung, 2 over 1 in singles and pairs. He would like to use some 4 light wooden casements in the rear.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Chase compliments the changes to the front porch, others agree the design is greatly improved. Commissioner Rizzo asks about the 24” walnut removal request, without a landscape plan. Mr. Marshall asks to remove this from his request. He says a walkway will be shown on the landscape plan. Commissioner Carpenter asks if any retaining walls will be required. Mr. Marshall says he will note any if needed, and thinks the slope can be maintained at 2 to1. Commissioner Cook asks what is proposed under the porches. Mr. Marshall says they could use square lattice.

Atty. Ashley says a landscape plan is a large part of new construction, she suggests it be presented at the next meeting. Commissioner Chase asks if the project could be tabled, Mr. Marshall says it would help if his clients could start the permitting process. Mr. Marshall says they will not need to address the walnut tree at this time. He says he has followed this procedure on previous projects. Atty. Ashley says a condition about the landscape and site plan could be allowed, but it should be a Major review process.

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 – conceptual rendering of front façade ; Exhibit C – architectural drawings showing typical interior pier, 6x6 post foundation, basement plan, foundation plan, window, door, wall, deck, screen, stairs, pickets and rails, rear porch section and wall section; Exhibit D – 1st and 2nd floor plans; Exhibit E – front, right, left and rear elevations and bay window detail; Exhibit F – 1st and 2nd floor electrical plans; Exhibit G – material specifications; Exhibit H – site plan; Exhibit I – storyboard; 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 30th day of October, 2013, 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 October, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits J and K.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct new 2,400, two-story, single family residence with front porch, per approved attached plans. Structure will have smooth stucco foundation, smooth sided Hardie-board horizontal siding with 8” reveal on lower level and wooden shingles on second story. Roof will be hip-style with a primary pitch of 10/12 and covered with “Pewter Gray” asphalt shingles. Windows will be wood, SDL, double-hung, 2 over 1 in singles and pairs; and some 4 light wooden casements. Details include brackets, frieze-board, 5 ¼” corner-boards and 3 1/2” window and door surrounds.

Porch will have T&G wooden decking, 2" x 2" turned posts, 4" on center, with wood columns on stucco base. Front doors will be wood, ¾ light. Chimney will be stucco. A single off-street parking space will be located on southeast corner of lot. Remove 24" Black Walnut. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
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 Carpenter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

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. **Landscape d site plan be submitted for the December HRC meeting.**
2. **Revised drawing showing opening bebw porch screened with square lattice be submitted for staff review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Carpenter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Preliminary Review:

Owner/Applicant: Andrea Lahti/Jody Kuhne
Subject Property 78 Flint Street
Hearing Date: November 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.21-5940
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten reports an official address has not been assigned, it may not be #76. She says the applicant is in the process of subdividing the L-shaped property, and the parcel under review has never had a structure. There is an existing house, which fronts on Starnes Avenue, with some accessory
-----------------------	--

	<p>structures. She shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel,</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two-story structure with front porch per attached 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. Massing is good and style is appropriate 2. Mix of materials and detailing seem out of character with district 3. Prairie-style windows seem out of proportion for the double-hung configuration <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 the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	Andrea Lahti, property owner, says they have lived in the existing house for eight years. She offers to answer questions.

Commission Comments/Discussion

There is discussion about the mix of materials. Ms. Merten says a stone or stucco foundation is more traditional than brick for this style. Commissioner Carpenter notes the proposed porch supports, does not think they are traditional. He says tapered supports are not usually shingled to the top. Ms. Lahti says they will think about changing the supports.

Commissioner Carpenter notes the CAD drawing does not show all of the details of the window trim; Ms. Merten tells the applicants this level of detail should be on their final drawings. Commissioner Stephenson points out some discrepancies from the floor plan and the exterior drawings; Ms. Merten says they should match.

Ms. Lahti asks if 4/1 or 6/1 windows would be more appropriate than the proposed Prairie-style ones (*yes*). Discussion follows about window placement and style, whether the Prairie style casement ones could be used with double hungs. Commissioner Cook says the Prairie style windows do not match the style of the house.

The Commission agrees that the large expanse of metal roofing in the front is inconsistent with other detailing and style of house. Commissioner Carpenter suggests they present good photographs of standing seam metal roofs in the district on shingle style houses.

There is discussion of making the foundation concrete block, to have a simplified look. Ms. Lahti says they have seen examples of this in Montford, and they would like to consider it. Ms. Merten asks if this would be acceptable to the Commission. Commissioner Cook thinks it would have been scored stucco that she saw, not block. Commissioner Carpenter suggests a solid stucco would not be too expensive, and would improve the design.

Chair Wampler asks about material for the stairs (*concrete*). Commissioner Carpenter expresses concern over an opening in the brick on the lower level which appears to open to a parking or open area. Ms. Lahti says these were designed to let light into the lower level. Commissioners do not think this is traditional, they would need to see examples in Montford.

Commissioner Nutter says there seem to be three clear areas of concern in order for the project to meet the guidelines: 1) another foundation material is needed; 2) the horizontality of the upper sash on the 2nd floor is jarring and should be remedied; and 3) the tapered porch columns should not be shingled to the top and should have a square base.

Ms. Lahti asks if the Prairie style casement windows would go with 4/1 or 6/1. Commissioner Carpenter says if she can show other examples of that combination in Montford, perhaps, but it may fit the shingle style better to go with only double hungs.

Commissioner Nutter leaves, 5:43 pm.

Owner/Applicant: Valeria M. Carrizo Wyda
Subject Property 166 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date: November 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.02-9547
Zoning District: RM-8

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel, where condemned historic structure was removed in early 2013.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two story structure with front porch per attached plans and specifications.</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. Consider carrying the brick foundation around to the back of the structure. 2. Provide example from neighborhood for transom style window configuration on north side. <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 the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Property owners Valeria and Steve Wyda discuss the changes they have made since their Preliminary Review. Mr. Wyda says the house’s siting has remained similar, and the hope is to retain as many existing trees as possible. In the back of the lot there will be some clearing of brush and</p>

smaller trees, to provide a lawn area. He describes the retaining wall and planter, using evergreens to screen the deck from W. Chestnut St.
--

Commission Comments/Discussion

There is discussion about continuing the brick treatment for the foundation around the back of the structure. The Wydas say there are other examples in the district where the stucco continues to the ground, the Commissioners ask them to provide photographs. Commissioner Chase notes that foundation plantings could break up the expanse.

Commissioner Chase asks about the double windows over the stairwell, and others agree the combination of two styles does not work. Commissioner Wampler suggests the lower windows be full pane, to match the windows to the right. Commissioner Stephenson suggests three 6/6 windows, and notes an example on Watauga Street of stacking grids. Commissioner Carpenter is concerned about the windows resting on the band board, and would like to see other examples. He notes this window is a dominant feature of this elevation.

Commissioner Stephenson asks about the rear door, saying sidelights would be more traditional. Mr. Wyda is open to this suggestion.

The fence placement is discussed. Mr. Wyda notes the lot is triangular and they have tried to use the intent of the guidelines to determine where the rear yard is, and thus where the fence should be. Commissioner Cook thinks they reached the appropriate determination. Mr. Wyda says they have chosen the style with an open top lattice portion, to address some of the guideline concerns. Commissioner Chase asks if the acute corner could be squared off, the Wydas will consider it.

Commissioner Carpenter compliments the changes made since the Preliminary, noting the style is much more traditional for the district. Several others agree.

The applicants are reminded to provide material samples, and a storyboard for the final review.

Other Business:

Update on Preservation Plan. Commissioner Ross, chair of the Steering Committee, reports that the Selection Committee chose Heritage Strategies, LLC of Pennsylvania. Commissioner Rizzo asks for details. Ms. Merten says eleven proposals were submitted, and the committee chose three to interview. She says the firm chosen, Heritage Strategies, had the most experience, best presentation skills and a team of three, necessary to complete the plan in a short time frame. She said they have done similar work around the country. Commissioner Stephenson says there definitely was consensus, and that Heritage Strategies' proposal and presentation skills were outstanding.

Commissioner Carpenter asks if the formation of historic districts will be on the agenda, Ms. Merten says that may come in the form of a recommendation. She said the emphasis is to find broader ways to do preservation, since local districts are not very popular. Commissioner Ross outlines events during the week of November 18, when Heritage Specialists will be visiting. These include a public presentation on November 20 at St. Lawrence Basilica.

Process question. Commissioner Rizzo asks if the identified project concerns in the staff reports could be distributed after the Executive Meeting, as a heads up for the other Commissioners. Commissioner Wampler says it is important that each member form their own opinions and concerns by reviewing the applications and the site visits. Ms. Merten and Atty. Ashley say it is

important that opinions are not formed before the presentations. Ms. Merten says the Executive Committee's job is to set the agenda and see if there are materials that will need to be presented at the meeting. She stresses that the Executive Committee does not make decisions. Commissioner Carpenter says he prefers to come to the meeting and make a decision, not knowing what the Executive Committee has discussed.

Other. Commissioner Rizzo announces that Commissioner Chase will be the guest speaker at UNCA's Honor Society induction ceremony on November 19, and invites all to attend.

Richard Fast is welcomed as a new Commissioner.

Commissioner Chase moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 6:16 pm.