Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County

Meeting Minutes of June 10, 2026

1st Floor North Conference Room

City Hall (70 Court Plaza) at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Will Hornaday, Vice-Chair Sioux Oliva, Celesta Gorman, Hans Skouby, Amy Moxley, Cecil Holt, Jenny Bowen, Leslie Humphrey, Robert Mays, Shannon Watkins

Absent: None

Staff: Alex Cole, Aspen Johnston, Jannice Ashley, Matt Holloway

Administrative

- It was noted that the commission members had not had an opportunity to review the May meeting minutes, so Chair Hornaday made a motion to review and approve them at the July meeting. This motion was seconded by ____, and carried unanimously.
- After Chair Hornaday explained the public hearing rules, all those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

Public Hearings

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 570 Walton Street - Walton St Park (PIN 9648122845) - Adaptive reuse of pool structure and upfit of pool house and site. Applicant: Progressive Companies; Eric R. Howell/City of Asheville**

Historic Resources Planner Alex Cole presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Owner/Applicant: CITY OF ASHEVILLE/Progressive Companies

Subject Property: 570 Walton Street

Hearing Date: May 13, 2026

Historic District: Local Landmark

PIN: 9648122845

Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 4.37 acre park containing the Walton Street pool and poolhouse (both are contributing resources to the site, an asphalt parking area, basketball court, covered picnic shelter, playground equipment, and a walking track.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Alterations to existing poolhouse structure, including replacement of existing _____ windows with new _____ Pella fiberglass windows, removal of existing entry doors and modification of door openings on west elevation, construction of new entryway and installation of new _____ doors on north elevation, removal of existing entry doors on east elevation, replacement of all other pedestrian doors with _____, removal of existing concrete ramp and handrail on west elevation and construction of new concrete entry landing, replacement of existing membrane and asphalt shingle roofing with _____ and installation of eight (8) 36" x 72" skylights on roof. Site work, including construction of new concrete walkways around pool and poolhouse, construction of a multi-purpose paved skating area adjacent to south elevation of poolhouse, installation of exercise equipment area adjacent to northeast elevation of poolhouse; installation of landscaping, construction of new concrete ramp and walls, astroturf surfaced area, public art, and _____ 26' x 18' covered _____ stage within existing pool space; existing pool steps and diving board will be retained and preserved. Demolition of existing pool pump house. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved 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 Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding proposed replacement of existing windows.
2. Staff has concerns regarding proposed removal of existing doors and modifications to existing openings.
3. Staff has concerns regarding the proposed new door openings on the north elevation.
4. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:
    a. Revised project description listing out all items included for HRC review
    b. Additional information on existing windows and doors (i.e. existing materials, conditions assessment/need for replacement)
    c. Additional information on proposed parapet wall cap (i.e. dimension and visibility)
    d. Manufacturer specifications for new windows, doors, skylights and roofing

e. Drawing and material information for stage, kitchen area and other miscellaneous site furniture/features

f. Landscaping plan

The standards for Roofs, Windows, Doors, Entrances and Porches, Building Site, and Setting found in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. Existing windows are damaged beyond repair; design, dimension and material of new windows will match existing as closely as possible

2. Existing door openings are being preserved.

3. Existing rectangular swimming pool shape and dimensions will be retained and preserved; existing diving board and steps will be retained and preserved.

4. New door opening will be on a secondary, less-visible elevation, and new doors will be compatible with the building.

5. New site features have been designed so as to retain the historic relationship between the buildings and the landscape, and are compatible with the historic character of the property.

Ms. Cole recapped the scope of the project, noting the proposed breezeway within the pool house. She explained that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had provided feedback, and they did not have an issue with the doors being removed. However, Ms. Cole said she would recommend that the door openings remain unaltered. The new doorway proposed on the north elevation was a point of concern for both Ms. Cole and SHPO staff. SHPO staff and City staff concurred that perhaps a single door farther back on that elevation might be a better, less visible solution.

Ms. Cole then shared a three dimensional rendering submitted by the applicant that showed the proposed swimming pool features. She noted that the drawing was intended to reassure the commission that the boundary of the pool would still be evident even with the new features within it. The historic steps and diving board would also be retained.

Acknowledging that the design was still being refined and materials for certain components are unknown, Ms. Cole wondered if the commission might be okay with staff level approval for these outstanding details.

Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Cole if the original window glass was present, and she said she wasn't sure and would defer to the applicant.

Ms. Josi Ward, the preservation consultant on the project team, addressed the commission.. Ms. Ward confirmed that the plan was to leave the door openings on the west elevation as they are, even once the doors are removed. The transom windows will need to be replaced due to multiple missing windows. Ms. Ward noted that the double doors on the north elevation would be flush to the wall, rather than recessed like the original door openings. Chair Hornaday asked whether he understood correctly that SHPO suggested placing the door on the south elevation, and Ms. Ward responded that they had suggested placing the opening on the south elevation or the alternative of a single-leaf glazed or metal door off-center on the north elevation. She added that the city's Parks Department had been very clear that the outdoor kitchen programming needed to be on a visible elevation for safety reasons, and adding a door on the north side would allow programming to more easily flow from inside out.

Ms. Bowen asked whether moving the door and subsequently the bathroom on the interior would be possible. Ms. Ward wondered if it would matter if the door were on one end of the north elevation or the other.

Chair Hornaday asked the applicant what the material of the original windows were, and Ms. Ward responded that they believe the windows were originally casement windows with mesh metal currently on the exterior.

Ms. Ward confirmed that the design SHPO saw was for a double leaf door in the center of the north elevation. Should a single leaf door be preferred, that can be placed where the double leaf door is proposed or can be relocated to the west side of the elevation.

Ms. Cole read from the SHPO letter which suggested that a single leaf door shifted to the east end of the north elevation could allow the northwest corner of the building to read as unaltered. Ms. Ward shared her understanding from the letter that they were providing an example, and shifting it to either side of the elevation would allow the majority of the elevation to appear unaltered.

Ms. Cole asked whether there was a code requirement that all bathrooms have exterior doors. She wondered if one of the openings within the breezeway could provide access to the bathroom from the exterior. Ms. Ward cited concerns from the hearing in May 2026 that an open breezeway would create safety issues, thus did not want to put the only entrances to the restrooms in the breezeway in case it ever became locked.

Ms. Ward passed out plans that showed the north elevation in greater detail. Ms. Ward wants to provide access to the interior from the north elevation. She notes that while the north elevation does not currently have door openings, the face is still interrupted by non-historic utility connections.

Ms. Humphrey added that the proposal made sense to her, especially if the door was a single leaf door that wasn't centered. Ms. Bowen asked whether Ms. Humphrey cared that these changes were taking place on the most visible elevation, to which Ms. Humphrey responded she did not feel that the changes made much of a difference, adding that perspective was relative. Ms. Watkins added that she supported the plan that kept them from having to rearrange plumbing in hopes it would keep costs down.

Ms. Ward confirmed that the doors to the proposed breezeway were being removed but no masonry would be altered. Ms. Bowen asked whether the mural on the north elevation was original, to which Ms. Ward responded that it was not, and altering it would not affect the landmark designation.

Rebecca Cipriano, project manager, approached the commission to speak. She added that the Parks Department had done a fantastic job working with the community on this project. Ms. Cipriano highlighted the importance of the connection created by the door on the north elevation, which would provide greater access to the amenities provided.

Chair Hornaday asked about the outdoor kitchen off of the north elevation, to which Ms. Cipriano clarified that the outdoor elements will not include a kitchen, rather it will be an outdoor dining area. She added that there would be a community table in the area, several standing height tables, and grills located nearby.

Ms. Cole asked Ms. Cipriano if they had a timeline in mind, sharing that depending on the scope the commission could potentially approve parts of the plan today, with other elements getting approved later. Ms. Cipriano estimated a 3-5 month timeline. Ms. Cole asked whether the commission would be comfortable with staff level approval for elements such as site furnishings.

Chair Hornaday expressed concern about not following SHPO’s recommendation to reconfigure the north elevation, adding that blocking the north elevation with furniture, grills, and trees would impact the character, though he noted the trees may help lessen the impact. Ms. Cipriano said the furniture the designers were considering would be very minimal, allowing visitors to almost see through the furnishings. Mr. Mays added that the layout was strange, and that the least attractive side of the building was historically the most visible. Ms. Cipriano agreed, sharing that the intent of the design was to draw visitors' eyes to the end of the pool and diving board, highlighting the historic uses of the site.

Mr. Skouby wondered how SHPO staff might view the proposal if the plans showed opposite from what they have recommended on the north elevation. Ms. Cole said that the commission could go with an alternative that deviated from the SHPO feedback if they felt it would be appropriate.

In response to Vice-Chair Oliva, Ms. Cipriano said the mural/artwork would be selected by the community. Ms. Cole confirmed that the commission would review it.

Mr. Skouby asked Ms. Cipriano the main points they needed clearer feedback on to move forwward. Ms. Cipriano asked for clarification and guidance around the door opening on the north elevation, the pool landscaping, and the breezeway.

Tracy Wyman with the city's Parks and Recreation Department addressed the commission and stated that what they need for the pool was feedback on the hardscaping and layout, not landscaping.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:52 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

The commission discussed the door on the north elevation. Chair Hornaday said he thought a solid door would be blend in more easily. Ms. Watkins said that to her a double door would mirror the entrance on the east elevation well, especially if solid with a mural covering them. Ms. Bowen agreed with SHPO's recommendation for a single door, but favored Chair Hornaday's suggestion that it be a solid door. Ms. Humphrey noted that she preferred the double doors for safety, adding greater visibility. She felt if the elevation were being altered regardless, having double doors may not make much of a difference. Ms. Bowen asked whether fire codes were something the board needed to be concerned about, with Chair Hornaday responding that it was not under HRC purview to consider that. Chair Hornaday noted that he was in favor of the plan that keeps the northern elevation as unchanged as possible. After the discussion there was consensus that a single solid door painted to match the building would be ok towards the western end of the north elevation.

Chair Hornaday then addressed the design of the pool, with commission members clarifying that the original footprint of the pool would remain the same, with the angled space being recessed within the original rectangle footprint. With that being clarified, the commission had no further comments on the pool.

Ms. Cole clarified that for the breezeway, the original openings will remain the same, just without doors.

Chair Hornaday noted that he still had concerns with the outdoor furniture, asking whether they could return the commission for approval in the future. Ms. Cipriano officially requested an amendment to the application, removing the exterior dining space and furniture adjacent to the north elevation from their current application.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE/DENY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application, owner's affidavit, and project description (6 pages); Exhibit B - site and building plans (7 pages); Exhibit C - photos (2 pages); Exhibit D - SHPO technical advice letter (2 pages - received May 12, 2026); Exhibit E - revised plans (6 pages - received May 27, 2026); Exhibit F - updated application checklist (2 pages - received May 29, 2026) Exhibit G - alternative north

elevation drawings (received June 10, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the following:

1. That the application is for alterations to existing poolhouse structure, including replacement of existing metal windows with new TBD Pella fiberglass windows, removal of existing entry doors on west elevation, construction of new entryway and installation of new solid painted door on north elevation, removal of existing entry doors on east elevation, replacement of all other pedestrian doors (material TBD), removal of existing concrete ramp and handrail on west elevation and construction of new concrete entry landing, replacement of existing membrane and asphalt shingle roofing with material TBD and installation of eight (8) 36" x 72" skylights on roof. Site work, including construction of new concrete walkways around pool and poolhouse, construction of a multi-purpose paved skating area adjacent to south elevation; installation of landscaping, construction of new concrete ramp and walls, astroturf surfaced area, public art, and 26' x 18' covered stage (material TBD) within existing pool space; existing pool steps and diving board will be retained and preserved. Demolition of existing pool pump house. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for Roofs, Windows, Doors, Entrances and Porches, Building Site, and Setting found in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, were used to evaluate this request.

3. This application **does** not meet the design standards for the following reasons:

    a. Existing windows are damaged beyond repair; design, dimension and material of new windows will match existing as closely as possible

    b. Existing door openings are being preserved.

    c. Existing rectangular swimming pool shape and dimensions will be retained and preserved; existing diving board and steps will be retained and preserved.

    d. New door opening will be on a secondary, less-visible elevation, and new doors will be compatible with the building.

    e. New site features have been designed so as to retain the historic relationship between the buildings and the landscape, and are compatible with the historic character of the property.

4. 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 Local Landmark Historic District.

Motion by: Ms. Gorman

Second by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

With the following conditions:

1. Revised north and west elevation drawings will be submitted for staff review and approval.

2. Window, door, skylight and roofing specifications will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Ms. Gorman

Second by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

A copy of the written decision approving the Certificate of Appropriateness is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 70 Cherokee Road (PIN 9649740774) - Installation of new metal handrail along patio wall adjacent to front elevation. Applicant: Jessica VanRegenmorter

Chair Hornaday requested a vote to move 70 Cherokee Road ahead of 3 Angle Street in this meeting's agenda, which was approved unanimously.

Historic Resources Planner Alex Cole presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Owner/Applicant: VANREGENMORTER CHRISTINA J;VANREGENMORTER JESSICA C/ Jessica VanRegenmorter

Subject Property: 70 Cherokee Road

Hearing Date: June 10, 2026

Historic District: Albemarle Park

PIN: 9649740774

Zoning District: RS4

Property Description: 0.38 acre parcel containing Brown Bear - a two-and-a-half-story shingle house of pseudo-colonial style built on a stone foundation set on a stone terrace constructed in 1940.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Installation of new 1.5" diameter custom metal handrail along patio adjacent to front elevation. Repair/replace/repaint minor amounts of existing damaged wood siding and trim. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved 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 Standards & Submittal Requirements:

Staff has no concerns.

The standards for Paths and Handrails found on page 32 of the Albemarle Park Local Historic District Landscape Design Standards, adopted July 8, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Handrail is required per NC building code, and handrail will be constructed of dark colored metal.

Ms. Cole said that the applicant had considered a standard metal picket railing, but had opted for a custom metal design that would be more in keeping with the character of the landscape in the district.

The owner, Jessica VanRegenmorter approached the commission for questions, when there were none she returned to her seat.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:10 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE/DENY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and project description (4 pages); Exhibit B - site plan (1 page); Exhibit C - rendering (1 page); Exhibit D - photos (2 pages); Exhibit E - floor plan (1 page - received June 1, 2026); Exhibit F -material image (1 page - received June 1, 2026); Exhibit G - siding repair quote (1 page - received June 1, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission approve the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the following:

1. That the application is for the installation of new 1.5" diameter custom metal handrail along patio adjacent to front elevation. Repair/replace/repaint minor amounts of existing damaged wood siding and trim. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for Paths and Handrails found on page 32 of the Albemarle Park Local Historic District Landscape Design Standards, adopted July 8, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

3. This application **does** meet the design standards for the following reasons:

    a. Handrail is required per NC building code, and handrail will be constructed of dark colored metal.

4. 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 Albemarle Park Historic District.

Motion by: Mr. Skouby

Second by: Ms. Gorman

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

Motion by: Mr. Skouby

Second by: Mr. Mays

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

A copy of the written decision approving the Certificate of Appropriateness is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 3 Angle Street (PIN 9647696594) - Modification of front entry porch, including raising floor height, shortening of columns and vestibule, and construction of new ADA ramp; modification of windows and doors; site work, including construction of new brick free-standing walls and installation of new mechanical/electrical equipment. Applicant: Lucy Moore/Beyer Blinder Belle**

Historic Resources Planner Alex Cole presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Owner/Applicant: ALL SOULS EPISCOPAL AKA THE CATHEDRAL OF ALL SOULS/Lucy Moore/Beyer Blinder Bellet

Subject Property: 3 Angle Street

Hearing Date: June 10, 2026

Historic District: Biltmore Village

PIN: 9647696594

Zoning District: Institutional

Property Description: 1.39 acre parcel containing All Souls Episcopal Church and Parish House - Designed by Richard Morris Hunt, All Souls Church is a Romanesque Revival-style brick, pebbledash, and wood trim building with an expansive tile roof constructed in 1896. The cruciform plan building includes a massive center tower. The interior displays pointed arches outlined with brick frames, a tongue-and groove ceiling, and round-arch stained-glass windows. Built of the same materials as the church, the one-and-a-half-story parish house has a hipped roof with wide eaves, dormers, and trefoil trim. In 1954, a one-story classroom wing was built to join the church and parish house.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Modification of existing structure, including infill of basement-level window openings with brick, installation of new ____ gasketed entry door at basement-level on north elevation, construction of new limestone and brick ADA ramp and painted steel handrail adjacent to south elevation of front entry porch, elevation of existing porch floor by 9" to align with interior sanctuary floor level, removal of existing historic vestibule at front entry, resetting of brick herringbone porch flooring, removal of non-original handrails at front steps, construction of additional stone step around porch and shortening, installation of new painted steel handrails at steps, removal of existing ramp within vestibule, removal and storing of existing limestone base and cheekwall at front porch; modifications to north and east walls of

library wing, including removal of multi-lite window and construction of new door opening, widening of two existing door openings; new doors will be _____; building repair, including restoration of damaged leaded glass in ambulatory, refinishing wood windows, doors and trim, cleaning and repointing masonry, and repairing and cleaning of damaged stucco and stone; installation of deployable flood protection system at garth and door openings. Site work, including construction of 34' x 16' x 4' tall brick flood wall enclosure adjacent to west elevation containing mechanical and electrical equipment; installation of two mechanical units mounted on _____ platforms within interior courtyard; installation of generator and mechanical unit within new __x__x 4' tall concrete flood wall enclosure adjacent to south elevation; repair as needed of existing brick walkways. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved 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 Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding the proposed front porch modifications; avoid removing or altering any historic material or significant architectural features (Book 2 - #3, p. 6).

2. Staff has concerns regarding removal of the vestibule within the porch; preserve older alterations that have themselves achieved historic significance (Book 2 - #12, p. 8).

3. Staff has concerns regarding the proposed flood wall enclosure adjacent to the north elevation; locate equipment in the rear of the building (Book 2 - #17, p. 10); locate utility cabinets and service areas away from the view of the primary facade (Book 2 - #48, p. 23).

    a. Manufacturer specifications for new doors

    b. Number/size/location of gaskets to be installed for flood protection and information on any other related visual exterior change proposed

    c. Brick sample

    d. Mechanical unit platform material

    e. Additional information on proposed van accessible parking

The General Rehabilitation Standards found on p. 5-10 of Book 2, the standards for Rehabilitation of Landmark Buildings on p. 23-24 of Book 2, and the standards for Site Design on p. 23-34 of Book 1 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted October 1, 1988, as well as the standards for Accessibility found in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff recommends the commission provide feedback to the applicant.

Ms. Cole said the application was for post-Helene building and site rehabilitation. She gave an overview of the scope of work, infilling basement-level window openings with brick, installation of a new basement-level metal entry door, and deployable flood wall protection. While Ms. Cole supported the flood protection, she felt more information was needed to understand the impacts of the flood wall system to the building.

Ms. Cole then noted the proposed mechanical and electrical area on the north side of the church. She expressed her concerns regarding how large the area was and the proposed permanent flood wall, noting that it would almost reach the sidewalk next to Hendersonville Road.

Ms. Cole then showed the commission the proposed plans for the front entry porch, which included raising the floor height of the porch, adding an additional step, removal of the existing vestibule, and construction of a new ADA ramp. Ms. Cole noted her concerns regarding these proposed changes, as they would greatly alter the primary facade of the building. She noted that the vestibule was historic, and was designed by Richard Morris Hunt's son. Ms. Cole also noted that the church was the only remaining church Hunt designed. She explained that best practices in historic preservation indicated that accessible entries should be located on non-character defining facades, and there was an existing ADA entrance on the side of the church.

Ms. Cole said she did not have any concerns regarding the mechanical units proposed on the northeast corner of the building and within the courtyard, though more information on the proposed platforms was needed for review.

Ms. Cole then presented the proposed accessible restroom entries in the library wing, noting no concerns since the changes would not be highly visible.

Mr. Mays asked for more information about the screening for the mechanical units. Ms. Cole showed the commission an elevation drawing where the mechanical units would be placed, extending out sixteen (16) feet from the building. The applicant provided a non-preferred, less detailed option where the mechanical units were somewhat more dispersed on the site; however, it would still require a large area for the equipment to be located on the north elevation.

Ms. Jennie Gwin, architect with Beyer Blinder Belle, introduced herself. She began by addressing the flood mitigation concerns. Ms. Gwin detailed the mechanical and sprinkler equipment requirements, adding that the placement along Hendersonville Road was necessary due to the location of the incoming water line. She noted that the congregation was composed of volunteers, so they needed a passive form of flood protection that would not require staff in order to implement the protective measures. One measure being taken was the installation of deployable flood walls that would need gaskets installed into the walls and floors at several locations on the building. Ms. Gwin added that these walls would come with a maintenance agreement for a team to come and install the walls when there was threat of flooding.

Chair Hornaday asked how many gaskets would need to be installed vertically on the building, and Ms. Gwin responded that it would only take 3-4 with the same spacing as those in the ground. The gaskets would be approximately three-eighths (⅜) inches in diameter, spaced eighteen (18) inches apart. The gaskets were all that would be visible on a typical day, installed in contextually sensitive areas of the stonework. Ms. Gwin added that this project would be completed in phases, with the education wing and parish hall not being in the current proposed scope of work. Ms. Gwin clarified that the flood line they were referring to was where the water reached during Tropical Storm Helene.

Chair Hornaday questioned why they needed to raise the porch if they were planning to install the deployable flood walls, and the applicant responded that the National Park Service guidelines call for flood mitigation that does not assume no drop of water will get through, encouraging steps being taken to provide additional barriers. Ms. Gwin also noted that raising the porch wasn't specifically for flood mitigation, rather to provide greater access. The porch steps were not up to code. Due to the cost of work, the project triggered level three alterations, which required the entire building to be brought up to ADA compliance. The original plans called for an open porch and no exterior vestibule, with Mr. Vanderbilt requesting something be done about the draft he felt in the church, which was how the vestibule came to be added. The proposal included removing the vestibule and storing it securely on site. Ms. Gwin clarified that the limestone on the wall would also be removed and stored on site to accommodate the new floor height of the porch.

Mr. Mays questioned whether the ramp could be installed without raising the porch. Ms. Gwin confirmed that it was possible and they looked at those options, but felt that their proposed plan was the most inconspicuous option, as not raising the porch would require a longer ramp onto the porch, and three individual ramps with railings leading into the sanctuary. Ms. Gwin reiterated the importance of universal access at the front entry for the entire congregation and their guests.

Ms. Gwin noted that following Helene, all interior fixtures below five (5) feet had to be removed. Prior to the flooding, there were ADA compliant restrooms and are now proposing renovations to reconfigure and install multiuser restrooms in a central location. This would be in the 1950s addition in the library wing. The space would also be subdivided to provide offices. They planned to convert selected windows into doors, and widening others to meet ADA requirements. One door would need to be widened by three (3) inches in order to comply with ADA standards, Ms. Gwin referenced eight (8) other doors in the existing library wing where this treatment had been applied previously. For the multiuser restrooms, a new door would need to be added and was being proposed on an inconspicuous facade. Interior storm windows are proposed to be installed in the library wing for energy efficiency and greater climate control. These changes would not be visible from the exterior.

Ms. Gwin then addressed the proposed backflow preventer equipment. She said they felt that consolidating this with the mechanical equipment would be the least disruptive to the historic character as opposed to disbursing the equipment in multiple locations on the site. She

said the flood wall will not be attached to the exterior cathedral wall, allowing the application to be completely reversible if needed. She said the backflow preventer cannot be placed in the basement due to city code. Due to the historic nature of the roof configuration and material, placing the mechanical equipment on the roof.

Ms. Gwin addressed the alternative mechanical plan, and pointed to the minimal difference in the size of enclosure around the backflow preventer whether the mechanical units were spread throughout the site or not, due to code requirements for spacing around units. Ms. Cole wondered if the units were not all placed in one location if they could be screened with vegetation instead of flood walls. Ms. Gwin did not think that would work, as the applicant wanted all of the mechanical units to be protected from flooding.

Mr. Mays asked about previous floods and what level of damage the mechanical equipment incurred. Ms. Gwin said she believed previous major flooding events brought water as high as the porch, and reiterated the point that the congregation did not want to risk losing the ability to operate due to mechanical failure regardless of prior storms.

Ms. Watkins asked how tall the previous condensers were compared to the proposed wall, and Ms. Gwin said that the condensers were approximately three (3) feet tall and the proposed wall was four (4) feet tall; she felt that the visual impact may not be radically different from before.

Deputy City Attorney Jannice Ashley asked whether backflow preventers were required by code, noting that in some cases variances could be applied for. Ms. Gwin stated that they could not apply for a variance. Mr. Mays asked whether a variance could be sought for ADA compliance for a historic building, and if all of the proposed changes to the porch and ramp were being done specifically for ADA compliance or for preference. Ms. Gwin said that all three front entry doors were often used. If they chose to only improve one door, it would require an extra ramp with a railing on the porch which would be visually disruptive. The applicant cannot retain the vestibule’s ramp because it wasn't possible to retrofit it with an ADA compliant ramp.

Ms. Cole advocated for building safety staff to come and speak at the next hearing for this case, since they know best where the code meets design requirements. Ms. Gwin reiterated that regardless of code, the congregation desires an accessible entry to the front door ,through the front porch.

Ms. Humphrey asked how removing the vestibule may affect the interior climate, considering it was added to address a draft. Ms. Gwin replied that they were currently exploring an interior vestibule, which would be based on original designs found in Hunt’s collection of drawings in the Library of Congress.

Ms. Gwin said she understood that the commission may not be able to approve the application at the meeting, but requested guidance on moving forward as they look towards applying for permits in September 2026. Chair Hornaday asked whether seeking technical advice from the SHPO would be beneficial. Ms. Cole said the commission could elect to do that;

however, she said that she didn't think it would be necessary given that the commission had local district standards to apply to this application versus just the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Mays asked what the procedure was for standards that directly conflict with safety regulations, to which Ms. Cole reiterated the importance of bringing building safety professionals to the next hearing.

Sarah Hurlburt, dean of the Cathedral of All Souls, approached the commission and advocated for the aquafence installation, noting a hospital in Florida weathered two major storms without taking on water. She then pivoted to the ADA improvements and porch changes and her feeling that it was a beautifully integrated feature that was unobtrusive, and referenced the ADA additions made to the Biltmore Estate. Ms. Hurlburt added that the changes proposed to the front porch were much more congruous to the district and structure than what was installed at the estate. Ms. Hurlburt concluded by explaining the role the church has played in prior disasters, serving as a community hub and shelter, reiterating the desire to build back with flood resiliency.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 6:21 p.m., and Mr. Benjamin Mitchell approached the commission to provide comment. Mr. Mitchell expressed the urgency around moving this project along in order to re-activate this corridor.

When there was no one else to speak, Chair Hornaday closed the floor for public comment.

Chair Hornaday asked whether the commission wanted to recommend that the applicants seek further guidance from building safety staff, to which Mr. Mays commented that the only thing giving him heartburn was the front porch.

Mr. Holt asked whether the plans would need to be approved by building safety staff, and Ms. Cole confirmed, but noted that it would be best if the review were more integrated with HRC review in this case.

Vice-Chair Oliva noted that she did not feel ready to vote on the application until she had more information. This led Chair Hornaday to ask the applicant for a motion to continue the hearing until the July 8, 2026 meeting, requesting additional city staff attend to provide testimony. Ms. Gwin asked whether there were any specific things the commission would like to see when they return for the July meeting, and Chair Hornaday suggested they bring different options for the front porch.

There was no further discussion on the application.

Mr. Mays made a motion to continue the hearing until the July 8, 2026 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and approved unanimously.

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 7 Montford Park Place (PIN 9649051128) - Subdivision of existing 0.23 acre parcel into one (1) 0.111 acre parcel and one (1) 0.1105 acre parcel. Applicant: Vicki Koons**

Historic Resources Planner Alex Cole presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Owner/Applicant: 7 MPP LLC/Vicki Koons

Subject Property: 7 Montford Park Place

Hearing Date: June 10, 2026

Historic District: Montford

PIN: 9649051128

Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.23 acre parcel containing an early 20th century one-and-a-half story vernacular cottage with Montford brackets, aluminum siding, turned balusters and simple details, and a two bay carport.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Subdivision of existing 0.23 acre parcel into one (1) 0.111 acre parcel and one (1) 0.1105 acre parcel.

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. The existing carport must be removed prior to final subdivision approval; a separate minor work certificate of appropriateness is required for this scope of work.

The standards for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended May 13, 2026, and the standards for Subdivisions found in Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Ch. 7-15-1 (i)(11), were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Subdivision of lots would allow for new development features, at a minimum, to be built in a manner that is congruous with the special character of the historic district as it relates to building setbacks, orientation and consistency with the historic development pattern.

2. New lot with existing structure will retain its congruency with the historic pattern in terms of building orientation, setback, retention of green space and spacing between structures.

Ms. Cole noted that per the City's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) subdivisions within historic districts and landmarks require review by the HRC. She said the existing carport on the site would need to be removed prior to the subdivision plat being approved by zoning staff. She explained that the application would need only a minor work CA to remove the carport.

Ms. Vicki Koons, owner and applicant. approached the commission but there were no questions regarding the application.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 6:49 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION REQUEST

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and staff comment letter (6 pages); Exhibit B - proposed plat (1 page); Exhibit C - parcel map (1 page - added by staff June 1, 2026); Exhibit D - photo (1 page - added by staff June 1, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission **approve** the Preliminary Subdivision Approval based on the following:

1. That the application is for the subdivision of existing 0.23 acre parcel into one (1) 0.111 acre parcel and one (1) 0.1105 acre parcel. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended December 11, 2019, and the standards for Subdivisions found in Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Ch. 7-15-1 (i)(11), were used to evaluate this request.

3. This application **does** meet the design standards for the following reasons:

    a. Subdivision of lots would allow for new development features, at a minimum, to be built in a manner that is congruous with the special character of the historic district as it relates to building setbacks, orientation and consistency with the historic development pattern.

    b. New lot with existing structure will retain its congruency with the historic pattern in terms of building orientation, setback, retention of green space and spacing between structures.

4. 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.

Motion by: Ms. Gorman

Second by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

Motion by: Ms. Gorman

Second by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

A copy of the written decision approving the Preliminary Subdivision Approval is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness - 207 Pearson Drive (PIN 9639943018) - Amendment to Major Work CA 26-01053PZ for construction of a new two-story addition. Applicant: Sarah Brown & Bryan Clift

Historic Resources Planner Alex Cole presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Owner/Applicant: BROWN RICHARD A;EGGERTON SUSAN/Sarah Brown & Bryan Clift

Subject Property: 207 Pearson Drive

Hearing Date: June 10, 2026

Historic District: Montford

PIN: 9639943018

Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: Galliard S. Tennent House. Early 20th century 1 1/2-2 story vernacular stucco dwelling. Recessed porch, slate roof, bay window, clipped dormer, simple details. (R. S. Smith architect?) 1903-1907

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Amendment to major work CA #26-01053PZ for removal of existing deck and addition on rear elevation and construction of a ~~~450~~ 525 square foot two-story addition with pebbledash siding, wood brackets and asphalt shingle roof matching existing; five (5) existing wood windows will be reused replaced with new Jeld-wen wood TDL 6/1 double-hung windows, and two (2) new wood diamond lite window will be installed on addition; one (1) pair of Pella Lifestyle wood single-lite doors will be installed on rear of addition; construction of 13' 5" x 19' 8" deck and stair with KDAT flooring and painted wood railing with 1" square pickets spaced 4" on center on rear elevation. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and 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 Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. New windows should be wood with true divided lites to match existing historic windows; design new window units to be compatible with the overall design of the building (#6, p.85).

The standards for Additions found on pages 88-89, Decks on pages 38-39 and Windows and Doors on pages 84-85 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended May 13, 2026, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. Addition will not impact an existing porch, entryway, exterior chimney or other character-defining features, the proposed addition is clearly subordinate to the existing building and sufficiently set back from the front/primary building plane, and a sufficiently sized side yard exists.

2. Existing wood windows being replaced will be retained and preserved on site.

Ms. Cole explained that the application was for amending a previously issued CA following the adoption of the new design standards for additions to include a bump out on the rear corner of the structure. Ms. Cole said that they planned to install new windows versus reusing existing windows, as previously approved. She noted that staff had requested specifications for true divided lite windows.

Ms. Sarah Howell, architect, explained the reasoning behind their choice of windows, noting that from a cost standpoint, simulated divided lite windows would be more cost effective and energy efficient than true divided lite due to a lack of easily available insulated glass in true divided lite windows. Ms. Howell added that refurbishing the existing windows would cost

around one thousand ($1,000) dollars per window. Ms. Howell hoped that since the windows were being proposed on side and rear elevations that the originals could be removed and stored on site. She added that they will be reusing the diamond pattern window and replicating the diamond pattern for a new window on another facade.

In response to Mr. Mays, Ms. Howell explained the existing siding materials and configuration.

Ms. Humphrey asked for more detail regarding the windows, and Ms. Howell said they would request true divided lite windows if that was required by the commission. She said she thought the owners would be open to reusing the windows as well if that was preferred.

Chair Hornaday reminded the commission that they cannot consider finances when making decisions. Ms. Humphrey noted that she didn't believe the cost for reglazing was accurate, and felt restoring the windows would be more cost efficient.

Ms. Howell said that the same size windows would be used even though they'll be placed in a different location. She believed the rear windows may or may not be true divided lite. Chair Hornaday said he thought the commission would have required true divided lite windows to be added when the existing addition was approved in 2000.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 7:05 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Ms. Humphrey began to make a motion that the applicant restore the windows rather than replace them, but after some discussion, Chair Hornaday asked for a straw poll to gauge commission members thoughts on the windows. It was agreed that the applicant reuse the original windows, and replicate one diamond pattern window.

Chair Hornaday then asked the applicant to amend the application to reuse existing historic windows. The applicant agreed to the amendment to reuse existing historic windows.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application, project description, and owner's affidavit (5 pages); Exhibit B - site and floor plans (7 pages); Exhibit C - elevation drawings and renderings (4 pages); Exhibit D - window specifications (79 pages); Exhibit E - photos (3 pages); Exhibit F - previously approved plans (9 pages - added by staff June 1, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the following:

1. That the application is for the amendment to major work CA #26-01053PZ for removal of existing deck and addition on rear elevation and construction of a ~450 525 square foot two-story addition with pebbledash siding, wood brackets and asphalt shingle roof matching existing; four (4) existing wood windows will be reused and one (1) existing wood diamond lite window will be installed on addition; one (1) pair of Pella Lifestyle wood single-lite doors will be installed on rear of addition; construction of 13' 5" x 19' 8" deck and stair with KDAT flooring and painted wood railing with 1" square pickets spaced 4" on center on rear elevation. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for Additions found on pages 88-89, Decks on pages 38-39 and Windows and Doors on pages 84-85 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended May 13, 2026, were used to evaluate this request.

3. This application **does** meet the design standards for the following reasons:

    a. Addition will not impact an existing porch, entryway, exterior chimney or other character-defining features, the proposed addition is clearly subordinate to the existing building and sufficiently set back from the front/primary building plane, and a sufficiently sized side yard exists.

    b. Existing wood windows are being retained and used on new addition.

4. 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.

Motion by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Second by: Ms. Gorman

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

With the following conditions:

1. Revised window specifications will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Second by: Ms. Gorman

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

A copy of the written decision approving the Certificate of Appropriateness is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness - 112 Pearson Drive (PIN 9649031309) - Construction of new screened porch on the rear elevation. Applicant: Tony Wolfe

Historic Resources Planner Alex Cole presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Owner/Applicant: ANTHONY WOLFF LIVING TRUST;JOHANNE RATELLE LIVING TRUST/Tony Wolff

Subject Property: 112 Pearson Drive

Hearing Date: June 10, 2026

Historic District: Montford

PIN: 9649031309

Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.33 acre parcel containing a one-story brick ranch-style house.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of a 188 square foot porch on rear elevation; porch will have ___ reveal white smooth fiber cement lap siding, _____ painted trim, dark colored screening, two (2) ____ and screen doors, painted wood steps, Trex composite flooring and asphalt shingle roof matching existing; two (2) ___ x ___ Velux skylights will be installed on roof of porch. Removal of seven (7) dead or deteriorated Eastern white pine (Pinus strobus) trees; trees of same or similar species from the Montford Recommended Species List will be planted prior to the end of the Fall 2026 planting season. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved 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 Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Exterior steps should be painted; alterations and additions to non-contributing buildings shall be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment (#3, p. 69).

2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional items for review:
    a. Reveal dimension for siding
    b. Screen door material information
    c. Trim material information
    d. Skylight dimensions

The standards for Non-Contributing Structures found on pages 68-69 and Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended May 13, 2026, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. Every effort has been made to maintain the architectural integrity of the structure.
2. Alterations and additions to the structure will be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment.
3. Trees to be removed are dead or deteriorated; replacement trees will be same or similar species from the Montford Recommended Species List.

Ms. Cole explained that the application was for construction of a new porch on the rear elevation. She said staff had requested some additional information from the application, including the reveal of the existing siding and skylight specifications. Staff did not have any concerns regarding the proposal.

Mr. Tony Wolfe, property owner and applicant, approached the commission to answer any questions. When there were no questions, Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 7:16 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and project description (6 pages); Exhibit B - site and floor plans (4 pages); Exhibit C - renderings and elevation drawings (5 pages); Exhibit D - material specifications (6 pages); Exhibit E - photos (7 pages); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the following:

1. That the application is for the Construction of a 188 square foot porch on rear elevation; porch will have TBD reveal white smooth fiber cement lap siding, painted wood trim, dark colored screening, two (2) screen doors, painted wood steps, Trex composite flooring and asphalt shingle roof matching existing; two (2) dimensions TBD Velux skylights will be installed on roof of porch. Removal of seven (7) dead or deteriorated Eastern white pine (Pinus strobus) trees; trees of same or similar species from the Montford Recommended Species List will be planted prior to the end of the Fall 2026 planting season. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for Non-Contributing Structures found on pages 68-69 and Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended December 11, 2019, were used to evaluate this request.

3. This application **does** meet the design standards for the following reasons:

    a. Every effort has been made to maintain the architectural integrity of the structure.

    b. Alterations and additions to the structure will be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment.

    c. Trees to be removed are dead or deteriorated; replacement trees will be same or similar species from the Montford Recommended Species List.

4. 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.

Motion by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Second by: Mr. Holt

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

Motion by: Vice-Chair Oliva

Second by: Ms. Gorman

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

A copy of the written decision approving the Certificate of Appropriateness is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

Ms. Cole and Mr. Holloway acknowledged a discrepancy in the motion template, that the Montford amendments need to state they were last amended on May 13, 2026. Chair Hornaday followed legal's council on next steps and confirmed the validity of the CA's issued today

Other Business

Ms. Cole said that several commission members had visited the sites being considered for landmark designation. She said that the next step was for the commission to make a recommendation as to whether or not the applicant should pursue full landmark reports.

Mr. Holt made a motion to recommend that the preliminary landmark applications for the E.W. Grove Park and the Feldman House move on to the next phase of application review. This motion was seconded by Ms. Bowen and carried unanimously.

Ms. Cole then reminded the commission about the education event on June 12, 2026 at the YMI.

Adjournment

At 7:26 p.m., Vice-Chair Oliva moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.