Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County

Meeting Minutes of July 8, 2026

1st Floor North Conference Room

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

Present: Chair Celesta Gorman, Vice-Chair Amy Moxley, Sioux Oliva, Cecil Holt, Jenny Bowen, Robert Mays, Jane Mathews, Leslie Humphrey, Richard Mattson

Absent: Hans Skouby

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

Administrative

- Mr. Mays moved to approve the minutes and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the May 13, 2026 meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Oliva and carried unanimously.
- Mr. Mays moved to approve the minutes and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the June 10, 2026 meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Oliva and carried unanimously.
- After Chair Gorman explained the public hearing rules, all those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.
- Montford Design Standards - Fence Standard Amendments
    - At 4:04 p.m. Chair Gorman opened the floor to public comment.
    - Mr. Bill Eakins, Montford resident and president of Montford Neighborhood Association (MNA), approached the commission to speak, making it clear that he was not representing the MNA, nor was he speaking on behalf of the Preservation Society. He said that while he did not have issues with the proposed amendments, he referenced article 7 of the rules of procedure. Mr. Eakins wanted to acknowledge that the process followed for reviewing and assessing the amendments was consistent with previous processes for amending the

standards when he was on the board. He added that in 2016 there had been even less public input.

- Ms. Susan Loftis, Montford resident, approached the commission and requested to share documents with the commission. Chair Gorman declined, stating that the commission would not be considering additional information at this time. Ms. Loftis discussed her experience with previous amendments. She noted that Charlotte's standards for fences identify them as landscape features. Ms. Loftis said she thought the recently approved amendments for additions would have a greater impact on the district than fences in front yards.

  Ms. Loftis then read aloud part of the National Register nomination: "Complementing the architecture of the neighborhood is the high quality of landscaping, mostly informal in keeping with the relatively rugged nature of the terrain. Yards feature terraces or slopes and irregular planting of trees, flowers, and shrubs, and native plants. Many of the yards also feature notable fences of cast-iron, posts of stone, and handsome retaining walls." She added that the nomination form noted that there are vistas down straight roads, not where roads are curved.

  Ms. Loftis said she preferred the idea of having fences that were appropriate to the architecture, whereas hedges may hide a front facade. She referenced 139 Montford, which she said had been the project that initially sparked the effort to amend the standards. She emphasized the need for safety and said she thought the setback for fencing should be two feet.

- Mr. Rhett Mays, Montford resident, addressed the commission and said that he thought it had been his fence that sparked the 2016 amendments. Mr. Mays commented on his profession as a pediatrician, sharing the safety risks posed by dangerous drivers on Montford Avenue. He concluded that front yard fences should be allowed for safety reasons.

- Ms. Kathleen Patton, Montford resident, approached the commission to speak. Ms. Patton thanked Mr. Mays for the research he had done on the amendments. Ms. Patton explained a bit about her property, and how the topography had impacted her ability to utilize her backyard. Ms. Patton said she felt that front yard fences should be allowed for safety.

- Ms. Susan Eggerton, Montford resident and amendment proposer, addressed the commission and said she thought fences should be reviewed via minor work application. She thought major work review was too cumbersome for something impermanent like a fence. She said she thought the fencing setback standard was awkward, with four feet seeming too far back. She said she thought it should be changed to two feet.

At 4:24 p.m., when there was no one else to speak, Chair Gorman closed the floor for public comment, turning to the commission to hear their thoughts, giving each member three (3) minutes to offer .

Ms. Mathews asked Ms. Ashley who had jurisdiction over fencing setbacks. Ms. Ashley explained that the HRC had the ability to be more restrictive than the Planning and Zoning Commission as far as setbacks were concerned if necessary to maintain historic congruency.

Mr. Mays said he thought Asheville wasn't consistent with other NC cities, which only require minor work review for fencing. He noted that he had submitted alternative amendments and additional materials but the Executive Committee declined to take them up. Mr. Mays disagreed with legal staff's feedback that only the Executive Committee could draft and introduce amendments to the standards.

Ms. Bowen referenced the two work sessions, and said she felt they had been awkward. She did not feel like they had the chance to work through the process as a board. Ms. Bowen felt it was the commission's job to adapt the standards to liveability needs. She said while the board needed to listen to staff because they know what they're talking about, members of the commission also wanted to have a say. Ms. Bowen said she felt as though she hadn't gotten a chance to speak and added that she felt it was the commission's duty to change the standards to accurately reflect the historic district. Lastly, she said she thought the Executive Committee's process and feedback had been skewed, and more work needed to be done.

Mr. Holt said he politely agreed with what had been said in previous comments. He added that he had had discussions with neighbors in Montford who were not interested in attending the commission meeting, but felt there should be some revisions to what was proposed.

Ms. Oliva pointed to her tenure as a member of the Executive Committee, and noted the work that had been put in towards these amendments over several years. She said she felt the proposed amendments were the best way of preserving the character of the neighborhood. Ms. Oliva said she respectfully disagreed with her colleagues and said that she did not think redoing the process was necessary.

Vice-Chair Moxley stated that she was in favor of the draft amendments as written.

Mr. Mattson shared that most developments from this time period did have fences, adding that 'strongly discouraged' was not the correct way to phrase things. He said review on a case-by-case basis would have been more appropriate.

Mr. Mays clarified that the four foot setback requirement was previously required only when fences were placed on top of a retaining wall, calling out the amendment to paragraph 9, which to him created more confusion. Mr. Mays felt paragraph 7 should have also been changed. He said he did not recall this being discussed in any Executive Committee meetings.

Mr. Mays reiterated his disagreement with the procedural feedback from staff. Ms. Ashley and Chair Gorman restated that the proper procedures had been followed for these amendments. Ms. Bowen felt it was their right as fellow commission members to know what was happening with the Executive Committee, to which Chair Gorman reiterated they are always welcome to attend the meetings; non-members are just not allowed to vote. Mr. Mays stated that he offered information in February which was not taken into consideration. Ms. Bowen reiterated her desire to reconsider the draft language for fencing.

At 4:40 p.m. Mr. Mays said he wanted to make his own motion to approve the amendment, making a motion that the entire commission vote to overrule the Chair procedurally, allowing amendments to be offered to this proposal. Mr. Holloway stated that the Chair was in the process of making a motion and has the authority to rule on points of order and procedure. These rulings stand, however the commission can direct the chair otherwise, and someone can ask that the Chair's decision be directed otherwise. At 4:46 p.m. Vice-Chair Moxley made a motion to approve the proposed amendment. Ms. Oliva seconded. The motion was approved by Ms. Oliva, Vice-Chair Moxley, Chair Gorman, Ms. Mathews, and Mr. Mattson. The motion was opposed by Mr. Holt, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Mays, and Ms. Humphrey. The motion passed.

Public Hearings

1. **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 Bellet**

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

Project Location and Contacts:

- 3 Angle Street - Cathedral of All Souls (PIN 9647696594)
- Owner: ALL SOULS EPISCOPAL AKA THE CATHEDRAL OF ALL SOULS
- Applicant: Lucy Moore/Beyer Blinder Bellet
- Historic District: Biltmore Village
- Zoning: 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 metal 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 Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding the proposed front porch and entry 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).

4. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    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

5. 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 does not recommend approval of the application for the following reasons:

    1. There is an existing ADA entrance on a non-character defining facade of the building; the front porch and entryway are significant character defining features, and alteration of these features would be greatly detrimental to the historic character of the primary facades.

    2. Proposed equipment enclosure would be greatly detrimental to the historic character of both the building and the site; equipment should be located to the rear of the building; utility cabinets and service areas should be located away from the view of a primary facade.

Ms. Cole refreshed the commission on the project scope, and highlighted photos of the front porch and vestibule showing the sinking floor. She reminded the commission that raising the floor height of the porch would necessitate removing the limestone banding from the front wall. She explained that there was an existing ADA entryway on the side elevation, and so long as it wasn't altered, it could remain even though it wasn't up to current ADA standards. If they do any work to the front porch, then the front entry would need to be updated to meet current ADA standards. Ms. Cole then showed an alternative drawing the applicant submitted showing what it would look like to alter the vestibule at the front entry versus removing it entirely. Ms. Cole reiterated her concerns regarding the proposed alterations to the porch.

Ms. Cole then detailed the proposed mechanical unit enclosures adjacent to the north elevation of the church, showing a revised plan with the backflow preventer located adjacent to the south elevation. This option helped to reduce the size of the enclosure on the north elevation. Ms. Cole was able to connect with the water department to understand different options for placement at this location. This mechanical area would have a four (4) foot tall flood wall enclosure, which would not be typical for screening in the district. Fencing and/or landscaping was the norm. Ms. Cole also shared an additional option provided by the applicant that showed the mechanical units on raised platforms and screened with landscaping.

Lastly, Ms. Cole said the applicants were proposing to fill the basement level window openings with brick, install deployable flood walls, alter several window and door openings, and add mechanical units to the interior courtyard. Staff did not have any concerns with the rest of the work proposed as it would all be confined to areas on the building that were not highly visible..

Mr. Mattson asked whether the basement currently had windows and Ms. Cole said yes but noted the windows were not original to the building. Ms. Mathews confirmed that if the flood walls were installed around mechanical units, they would still be screened by vegetation. Mr. Mays asked what the size difference was of the mechanical unit area that existed prior to Helene and the proposed screening. Ms. Cole said she would defer to the architect, but noted that both the original proposal and revised plans would be significantly more visible than what previously existed on site. Ms. Mathews asked if Ms. Cole would prefer the platforms, and Ms. Cole said they were not beautiful but they would take up less space.

Ms. Jennie Gwin, project architect for Beyer Blinder Belle, approached the commission to speak. She wanted to clarify that there were no new changes proposed to the front porch, rather they just submitted additional plans to show options they were not pursuing. Ms. Gwin then showed existing and new porch sections, showing the level to which the porch had sunk, indicating that the restoration was urgent. They were still proposing to remove the vestibule at the front entry, as it had been added two to four years after the building was originally constructed. She said that the Biltmore Village Standards had different treatments for landmark buildings; they are guided to return them to their original state.

Mr. Mays asked about the requirements for ADA ramps and why they needed to be constructed. Ms. Gwin clarified that it was in the best interest of the project to bring the ADA access up to current code. Ms. Gwin explained that current code requires that there must be, at minimum, a four (4) foot by four (4) foot flat landing whenever there is an egress door. Ms. Gwin then showed multiple design studies for the landings.

Ms. Bowen asked how many square feet the vestibule took up, Ms. Gwin said the vestibule was approximately one hundred and forty (140) square feet of the eight hundred (800) square foot covered porch. Ms. Bowen felt that she couldn't support the vestibule being removed, and asked what the alternative might be if the commission required the vestibule be retained. Ms. Gwin responded that they would need to modify the vestibule in order to accommodate ADA requirements and raise the porch. She added that this option was less reversible, as the original proposal would remove the vestibule and store it safely where it could be reinstalled at a later date.

Mr. Mattson asked about the sinking of the porch floor. Ms. Gwin further detailed the porch conditions, and added that raising the porch was also a flood mitigation strategy.

Ms. Humphrey requested clarification on the reasoning behind adding a step, and Ms. Gwin responded they were adding a step in part to raise the porch floor height to be the same as the interior floor height.

Ms. Mathews asked for Ms. Gwin to speak to staff's concerns about the ramp being placed along the front elevation. Ms. Gwin stated that they designed this in order to minimize impact on the facade, and the ramp had been placed on the side of the porch to minimize visual disturbance.

Mr. Mattson stated that he supported adding a stair and raising the porch, though he said he was struggling with removing the vestibule since it was historically significant. Ms. Gwin responded that removing the vestibule seemed to bring the porch back to its original design as an open porch.

Ms. Bowen asked Ms. Gwin to speak on the mechanical equipment placement and screening options. Ms. Gwin shared that the new mechanical unit area along Hendersonville Road had been reduced to twelve (12) feet deep, and nine feet, eight inches (9’8”) away from the sidewalk. Ms. Gwin noted that the flood wall would allow the pebble-dash siding to still be seen, unlike raising the units. Ms. Mathews asked whether Ms. Gwin had considered applying pebble-dash to the floodwall instead of brick to reduce the visual impact. Ms. Gwin went into more detail on the backflow preventor, sharing that the cover would be six feet, one inch (6’1”) tall. Ms. Mathews asked whether the covers could be painted, to which Ms. Gwin responded that they can be painted and/or have scrims applied.

Mr. Mattson asked where they planned to store the vestibule if removed, and Ms. Gwin believed it could be stored in the attic above the porch, noting that storing on site would be best.

Mr. Mays asked how they planned to address the draft on the interior of the building that may return if the vestibule were removed, and Ms. Gwin said they were exploring interior vestibules. Moving the exterior vestibule inside may or may not be possible.

Ms. Bowen asked what the level of historical flooding of this property had been, and wondered if this was the first time the interior of the church had flooded. If it was the first time the interior flooded, she wondered if there was a need to be so preventative with their flood strategies. Ms. Gwin shared that regardless of the historical levels of flooding, the congregation did not want to be displaced from their church again.

Sarah Hurlbert, dean of the Cathedral of All Souls addressed the commission and noted that the church had been used in the past as a site for housing, resiliency, and recovery during disasters. They wanted to be resilient in the future for refugees as needed, including those without housing during the colder months. Ms. Hurlbert shared a story about a parishioner who was a veteran in a wheelchair who was very excited about the thought of being able to enter the church through the front door.

Ms. Bowen asked if the applicants knew why the flooding was higher in 2024 than 1916. Ms. Hurlbert said she believed it had to do with the volume of landslides that entered the river.

Chair Gorman opened the floor for public comment at 5:35 p.m.

Mr. Glenn Stach, preservation landscape architect, addressed the commission and noted that individual features of the landscape were contributing elements. Mr. Stach felt that the view of the front of the church was one of the most sacred views in Asheville. Mr. Stach said he did not support the front elevation being altered, and felt it would be detrimental to the building's historic character. He disclosed that he was the original landscape architect for the screening of the previously existing mechanical equipment. Mr. Stach recommended further investigation into alternative solutions for the mechanical equipment screening along Hendersonville Road.

Mr. Sam Beck, Building Plan Review Supervisor with the City of Asheville Development Services Department, addressed the commission and offered to answer any questions related to building safety and/or ADA compliance. Mr. Mays asked which of the changes would be required to meet current code. Mr. Beck replied that it depended on many conditions and cited chapter 12 of existing building code would allow them to repair the porch to its original condition, even if not ADA compliant. Mr. Beck added that if the applicant decided to do more than restore to pre-storm conditions, it would then have to meet current accessibility standards. Chair Gorman asked if a ramp were to be added to the porch without raising the floor, would an additional ramp need to be added from the porch into the building. Mr. Beck said it depended on many factors. If the scope of work was just porch repair, no. If anything were to be modified beyond that, those elements would need to be brought into compliance.

Mr. Jeff Bryant, Backflow Inspector for the City of Asheville Water Department, addressed the commission and offered to answer questions. Ms. Bowen asked if he knew why the flooding was so much worse in this storm than 1916, to which he responded he believed the volume of water primarily caused the extra damage, along with the introduction of significantly more buildings and paved surfaces in the region. Ms. Bowen was trying to specifically ask whether there were external circumstances that caused flooding this extreme, to which he responded there was no specific system that broke or failed to cause an increase in extreme flooding.

Ms. Nancy Watford, Stormwater Plan Review Supervisor for the City of Asheville Development Services Department addressed the commission, and noted that this property is within a 500-year flood plain, which was subject to change and actively being reassessed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Ms. Watford stated that there were few things that could be done locally to prevent severe flooding from coming to this location again. She said greater watershed action needed to be taken involving multiple jurisdictions. Ms. Watford added that the soil in the region was already waterlogged before the storm. This led to soil liquifying and coming downhill in the form of landslides. Ms. Watford shared that flood models were being worked on by North Carolina’s emergency management staff to estimate different floodplain scenarios, including two (2)-year storms, five hundred (500)-year storms, and

one thousand (1,000)-year storms. These early models are showing approximately a one (1) foot gain in the Swannanoa River, which could put the church in the flood plain.

At 5:52 p.m. when no one else spoke, Chair Gorman closed the floor for public comment.

Chair Gorman asked the commission about their thoughts on removing the vestibule. Mr. Mattson stated his reservations about removing the vestibule, while Ms. Mathews remarked that allowing these changes could prevent further damage to the building. Ms. Humphrey said she supported removing the vestibule.

Mr. Mays said he did not have an issue with the mechanical equipment screening, and noted that the architecture of the building draws your eye up the tower in a way that pulls focus from the mechanical equipment screening. He said he didn't think that raising the porch floor height or removing the vestibule would drastically change the building and he didn't have any concerns.

Ms. Bowen said she thought the floor height of the porch needed to be raised, and that including an additional step while removing limestone would not be a substantial impact. However, she acknowledged the significance of the view of the front of the church from the train depot, and noted that the vestibule was considered part of the original design even though it was added several years after construction. Ms. Bowen referenced the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Review Standards: Book two (2), page two (2) - “Determine its state of "intactness." If most original elements remain intact, a more pure preservation approach will be appropriate.” Ms. Bowen felt that it was the commission's job to preserve intact elements, and noted that there was an existing accessible entrance.

Mr. Holt felt there were many good points made by the commission members. He said if the church members wanted to remove the vestibule, he wanted to support their wishes.

Chair Gorman said she could see both sides but agreed with Ms. Bowen about restoring to the original state. She then questioned if raising the porch would mitigate flood damage if the majority of the water came in through the basement. She said she wasn't supportive of raising the porch floor, but was supportive of removing the vestibule.

Vice-Chair Moxley said she wasn't in support of altering the porch floor, but would be open to a compromise such as storing the vestibule in a safe location.

Ms. Oliva agreed with Mr. Mays about the tower being the dominant feature of the building, but agreed with Ms. Bowen that the historic character of the building needed to be respected.

Chair Gorman asked the commission whether they had questions or concerns about the flood walls. Ms. Bowen said she had concerns about the walls, and that she agreed with staff that a newly constructed wall should be aligned with the original architecture.

Ms. Gwin then showed a rendering of the elevated mechanical unit platforms along Hendersonville Road. Ms. Cole agreed with Ms. Mathews that requiring the wall material to be pebbledash would be more contextually appropriate. Ms. Cole reiterated that mechanical units in the village were typically screened with fences or lattice. Ms. Cole then asked Ms. Gwin about the space between the wall and the building. Ms. Gwin explained that they have designed a 'bathtub', enclosed on all sides, with drain holes for rainwater, adding that the electrical will be mounted to the flood wall rather than on the building.

Ms. Bowen then shared her concern that storing the vestibule in the attic may not preserve it due to the current state of deterioration. Ms. Gwin noted that the vestibule was currently exposed to all of the elements, and storing it in a climate controlled space could lead to shrinkage and other types of deterioration. She reiterated that raising the porch floor height was a priority, so attempting to retain the vestibule would be a challenge due to it not being in compliance.

There was discussion on how many commissioners supported approving the application without changes, and it was clear the majority was not in support of approval as-is. Ms. Gwin asked if the commission would approve the raising of the porch floor separately from the vestibule. Ms. Cole said that the floor height couldn't be divorced from the vestibule because raising the porch floor height would necessitate alteration or removal of the vestibule.

Mr. Holloway clarified that Mr. Mattson's vote would count as a vote in favor either way since he had been present but left early.

Ms. Ashley asked the applicant if there were any alternatives to raising the porch that made it appear as though it had not been raised. Chair Gorman shared there was an alternative, but there was concern about the ratio of the limestone band being modified if the alternative options were pursued.

Ms. Gwin showed different porch options involving longer switchback ramps, and another featuring a continuous landing. Ms. Gwin noted the tripping hazard present with the current conditions, and strongly opposed any alternative that exacerbated any existing tripping hazards.

Chair Gorman noted that if commissioners were in favor of raising the porch, they would need a standard to apply this scope of work. Ms. Gwin cited the accessibility standards provided by the Secretary of Interior. Ms. Bowen commented on the intertwined nature of the vestibule and raising of the porch, and stated that she wouldn't be in favor of raising the porch if it calls for removal of the vestibule. Chair Gorman then suggested the applicant separate the porch and vestibule from the rest of the application in order to approve the remaining scope of work.

Ms. Gwin then requested approval for all of the modifications except for the vestibule, with the intent to return to the commission with proposals for a modified vestibule that would meet accessibility and code requirements. Chair Gorman noted that the porch and vestibule would need to be reviewed and voted on together, though they could move forward with the

mechanical features. Ms. Gwin then asked whether the commission would be in favor of raising the porch floor height and modifying the vestibule. Ms. Gwin sought a poll to understand whether these modifications may be acceptable by the commission before presenting any additional plans to the congregation, and added that there were no other ways to make the porch accessible without raising the porch or adding ramps that have a negative impact on the character. Ms. Cole reiterated Ms. Gwin's point, and reminded the commission that there were few alternatives to return with, feeling there was no point in continuing these conversations to further meetings. Ms. Bowen stated that she would be okay with raising the porch and altering the vestibule if it would just be removing a few inches from the base.

Ms. Cole requested clarity on the design, and wondered if the porch was being raised why they would need to remove the vestibule. Ms. Gwin replied that it was not compliant due to the distances of the two doors on the vestibule. Ms. Hurlbert approached the commission and shared that the church would be accepting of any non-compliant design should there be any emergencies.

Chair Gorman re-opened the floor to public comment from Mr. Beck at 6:31 p.m. to clarify accessibility standards. He stated that if any modifications were made they must conform to today's code. The vestibule would need to be expanded to comply with the standards if any portion were modified. Ms. Bowen confirmed with Mr. Beck that if they were to alter the vestibule, the square footage would need to be expanded in order to meet current code.

Ms. Gwin asked the commission approval for raising the porch floor height, allowing the applicant to return with modifications needed for the vestibule. Ms. Cole and Chair Gorman agreed that they could separate the porch and vestibule from the rest of the application, but felt they could not approve the porch without knowing the design of the vestibule modifications.

Chair Gorman then conducted a straw poll to gauge interest on raising the porch and revising the vestibule design, or who would approve the application as currently presented. The commission reiterated that a vote cannot be made that separates the porch being raised from the vestibule removal/alteration. Ms. Humphrey suggested that the applicant may be able to reuse the vestibule elsewhere on the property. Ms. Bowen urged the commission to approve something for them, and noted that this was one of their only options that allowed them to get back on their feet.

Ms. Cole reframed the question for the commission, sharing the two options fit into two buckets, one being the porch being raised and brought into full ADA compliance, or leaving the porch as-is and repairing to a pre-Helene standard. Ms. Cole referenced the standards that say to preserve older alterations that have themselves achieved historic significance, and to avoid removing or altering any historic material or significant architectural features. Ms. Cole agreed with Ms. Bowen, that the landmark standard Ms. Gwin referenced should apply to the vestibule, as it has now achieved historic significance.

Mr. Mays asked whether the applicant would need to return with an entirely new application, to which Ms. Ashley stated that they could bifurcate the application and return with

an amendment down the line. Mr. Mays expressed concern about approving the application. Ms. Gwin countered that the standards say, “experience has shown that in most cases design can be developed that respect the historic integrity of a building and can accommodate new functions. Original materials and details should be preserved whenever feasible.” Ms. Gwin shared that these standards had been guiding the design.

Ms. Hulburt pointed the commissioners to the new ADA compliant ramp at the Biltmore Estate, and that many other ADA ramps are not beautiful, unlike the one being proposed for the cathedral.

Ms. Humphrey commented on the architectural firm’s work on Ellis Island, citing that as evidence that the architects had been extremely sensitive to the historic nature of the building and the original design intent. Mr. Mays commented on temporary ramps that provide accessibility, and noted that this could be done at a different door on site. Ms. Mathews argued that accessibility for all should be a priority, not subjecting ADA access to a second-rate entrance.

Ms. Gwin requested that the commission vote on the application without the vestibule, giving the congregation an idea as to whether or not the accessible porch design will be approved. Chair Gorman reiterated the need to keep the porch and vestibule components together, as it would be difficult to approve one without knowing what the other design may be. Ms. Bowen asked how much the vestibule would need to be modified in order to be compliant, to which Ms. Gwin responded it likely would not be much, but without proper studies she could not say. Mr. Holt then asked if the applicant could move the interior vestibule door further back to allow access, and Ms. Gwin said that would be a good option to look at.

Chair Gorman then conducted a straw poll to understand which commissioners would be comfortable with approving the raising of the porch and bringing a revised vestibule design to the commission at a later date. Mr. Holt, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Mays, Ms. Mathews, and Ms. Humphrey raised their hands. With the reminder that Mr. Mattson’s vote would be counted as a yes, Ms. Gwin requested an amendment to the application that would involve bringing a revised vestibule design before the commission at a later date.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application (2 pages); Exhibit B - photos, drawings, and plans (52 pages); Exhibit C - revised north elevation (1 page - received June 5, 2026); Exhibit D - additional elevation drawings (9 pages - received June 1, 2026); Exhibit E - revised plans (45 pages - received June 5, 2026); Exhibit F - additional revised plans (52 pages - received June 26, 2026); Exhibit G - alternative front elevation drawing (1 page - received July 6, 2026); Exhibit H - alternative site plans (17 pages -

received July 7, 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 Modification of existing structure, including infill of basement-level window openings with brick, installation of new gasketed metal 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, 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 TBD; 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 28.5' x 12' x 4' tall pebbledash and brick flood wall enclosure adjacent to west elevation containing mechanical and electrical equipment; installation of two mechanical units within interior courtyard; installation of generator and mechanical unit within new 4' tall pebbledash and brick flood wall enclosure adjacent to south elevation; installation of backflow preventer cabinet adjacent to south elevation - cabinet will be painted color TBD; repair as needed of existing brick walkways. 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 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.

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

    a. Alterations to historic materials and significant architectural features will be the minimum necessary to meet current building code.

    b. Utility cabinets and service areas will be located away from the view of the primary facade.

c. Utility equipment will be screened by flood walls and landscaping; backflow preventer housing will be painted to blend with the structure and landscape.

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 Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Ms. Bowen

Second by: Mr. Mays

Vote for: Mr. Mattson, Ms. Humphrey, Ms. Mathews, Mr. Mays, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Holt

Vote against: Chair Gorman, Vice-Chair Moxley, Ms. Oliva

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: (if applicable)

1. Vestibule modifications will be submitted at a later date for review and approval by the commission.
2. Manufacturer specifications for new doors will be submitted for staff review and approval.
3. Brick sample will be submitted for staff review and approval.
4. Paint colors will be submitted for staff review and approval.
5. All limestone material being removed from front porch will be retained, preserved and stored on site.

Motion by: Ms. Bowen

Second by: Mr. Mays

Vote for: Mr. Mattson, Ms. Humphrey, Ms. Mathews, Mr. Mays, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Holt

Vote against: Chair Gorman, Vice-Chair Moxley, Ms. Oliva

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

Following a brief recess which ended at 7:09 p.m., Mr. Holt was formally excused from the meeting.

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness - 53 Birch Street (PIN 9639826325) - Establishment of new burial area within Riverside Cemetery and associated construction of retaining walls, fencing, pathways and pergola. Applicant: Jonathan Warner**

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

Project Location and Contacts:

- 53 Birch Street (PIN 9639826325)
- Owner: CITY OF ASHEVILLE
- Applicant: Jonathan Warner
- Historic District: Montford
- Zoning: RS8

Property Description:

- 49.09 acre parcel containing Riverside Cemetery.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request:

- Site improvements for new burial area in southeastern section of existing cemetery property, including installation of stabilized granite fines paths, one (1) 3.25' tall stone veneer retaining wall, one (1) 4' tall stone retaining wall, two (2) 2' tall stone veneer free-standing walls, and one (1) ~6' tall stacked stone wall, installation of 40" tall section of black aluminum fencing, construction of a brown flagstone paved area with 9' 4" tall x 28' wide stained wood pergola and bench, and installation of landscaping; ground cover must be established within 15 days of completion of construction, and the remainder of the landscaping must be installed within three years; if archaeological resources are discovered during site work, work will cease until City staff and State archaeology staff have been notified and have inspected the site. 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 Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. A minimum landscape plan for new construction shall incorporate foundation plantings, driveway and parking area buffers and yard trees of native or regionally adapted plant species which are non-invasive (see recommended species list) (#5, p. 41); landscape plan should incorporate more plant materials identified in the Montford Recommended Species List.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to confirm whether any mature trees 6" or greater or any

other existing landscape features will be impacted by the proposed scope of work.

3. The standards for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, Fences and Walls on pages 36-37, Archaeology on pages 32-33, and Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 50-5 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. Landscape plan incorporates foundation plantings, driveway and parking buffers and yard trees of native and non-invasive plant species from the Montford Recommended Species List.

    2. New landscape structures are compatible with the historic neighborhood in material and scale.

    3. New fence will be metal and sited in a location that is compatible with the traditional historic relationship of fences to historic properties in the district.

    4. New walls will be stone and site in locations that are compatible with the traditional historic relationship of walls to historic properties in the district.

    5. New walkways will be stone and compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.

Ms. Cole gave an overview of the application, and explained that this would be a new burial area within Riverside Cemetery. She talked through the proposed landscaping elements, and noted that boulder walls were not typical of Montford. However, the property was immediately adjacent to the Tempie Avery Center property, and would not really be visible from anywhere. Ms. Cole said she had requested clarification on any tree impacts, and had suggested that more plantings from Montford Recommended Species List be incorporated into the landscaping plan.

Mr. Mays asked about the potential for unmarked graves, and Ms. Cole referenced the requirement in the CA that if any archeological features were to be discovered work would cease so that staff could assess.

Ms. Bowen asked if there were any way to require the stones being removed from a previously approved retaining wall replacement at the cemetery to be used for the new retaining walls being constructed at this location. Ms. Cole did not know if there was a way to require that, and noted it may be difficult to coordinate. Ms. Cole suggested that the applicants may check with the Parks and Recreation Department about the potential to use some of that stone.

Mr. Jonathan Warner, of Equinox Environmental, approached the commission to answer any questions, and specifically addressed the question of unmarked graves. He noted that he had already checked with cemetery staff and was fairly confident that there were no unmarked graves in the vicinity due to the location being previously filled with dirt from other projects.

Mr. Mays asked about the retaining walls, and Mr. Warner replied that they would be seven (7') feet at the tallest point. The walls would taper out to curb height on each end. The boulder retaining wall would not be very visible due to plant selection/screening. There was one that would be visible and clad with local Hooper's Creek stone. No other wall will be higher than four (4') feet. Mr. Warner noted that this project was made possible by a land swap with the city. This project will not be impacted by the i-26 expansion project. Mr. Warner added that all of the plants will be native to the region, and come from the approved species list.

Ms. Bowen reiterated that there may be unmarked graves of people of color in this part of the cemetery, and encouraged being sure there were no unmarked graves.

Chair Gorman opened the floor for public comment at 7:24 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application (2 pages); Exhibit B - site plans (11 pages); Exhibit C - fence, wall, and pergola specifications (3 pages); Exhibit D - site photos and material images (2 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 site improvements for new burial area in southeastern section of existing cemetery property, including installation of stabilized granite fines paths, one (1) 3.25' tall stone veneer retaining wall, one (1) 4' tall stone retaining wall, two (2) 2' tall stone veneer free-standing walls, and one (1) ~6' tall stacked stone wall, installation of 40" tall section of black aluminum fencing, construction of a brown flagstone paved area with 9' 4" tall x 28' wide stained wood pergola and bench, and installation of landscaping; ground cover must be established within 15 days of completion of construction, and the remainder of the landscaping must be installed within three years; if archaeological resources are discovered during site work, work will cease until City staff and State archaeology staff have been notified and have inspected the site. 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 Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, Fences and Walls on pages 36-37, Archaeology on pages 32-33, and Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 50-51 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended July 8, 2026, were used to evaluate this request.

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

    a. Landscape plan incorporates foundation plantings, driveway and parking buffers and yard trees of native and non-invasive plant species from the Montford Recommended Species List.

    b. New landscape structures are compatible with the historic neighborhood in material and scale.

    c. New fence will be metal and sited in a location that is compatible with the traditional historic relationship of fences to historic properties in the district.

    d. New walls will be stone and site in locations that are compatible with the traditional historic relationship of walls to historic properties in the district.

    e. New walkways will be stone and compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.

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. Oliva

Second by: Mr. Mays

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. Oliva

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 - 215 Cumberland Avenue (PIN 9649131843) - Construction of a two-and-a-half story, 6,968 square foot primary structure. Applicant: Griffin Architects/Robert Griffin**

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

Project Location and Contacts:

- 215 Cumberland Avenue (PIN 9649131843)
- Owner: PALMETTO MOON LP
- Applicant: Griffin Architects PA
- Historic District: Montford
- Zoning: RS8

Property Description:

- 0.44 acre vacant parcel.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request:

- Construction of a two-and-a-half story, 6,968 square foot primary structure with brick veneer foundation, painted gravel-dash and smooth fiber cement shake siding with 5" reveal, two (2) brick veneer chimneys and GAF Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle roof in Hazelwood color; windows will be Marvin _____ SDL aluminum clad 9/1, 6/1, 8/1 and 2/1 double-hung and 9-lite casement; pedestrian doors will be wood 6-lite panel with sidelites and multi-lite transom, wood 3-lite and 9-lite panel, and Marvin Ultimate fiberglass multi-lite sliding; garage doors will be Cloplay Canyon Ridge paneled with multi-lite transom; front entry will be set within 347 square foot covered porch with _____ railings with ____ pickets spaced __" on center, ____ posts with brackets, _____ flooring and ceiling supported by brick piers screened with painted wood lattice; 321 square foot screened porch on north elevation will open to a ___ square foot patio with _____ surface; new dark brown pervious paver driveway with concrete apron will be constructed on the rear of the parcel; existing gravel driveway in front yard to be expanded to include a new turnaround area adjacent to northwestern corner of structure; construct 10' x 10' pervious paver pad in front yard; new 4' tall loop wire fencing with metal posts will be installed in rear and side yards; installation of two (2) mechanical units adjacent to south elevation; five (5) mature trees will be removed to accommodate

construction; ground cover must be established within 15 days of completion of construction and the remainder of the landscaping must be installed within 3 years; if archaeological resources are discovered during site work, work will cease until City staff and State archaeology staff have been notified and have inspected the site. 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 Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding the overall consistency and compatibility of the proposed structure with surrounding structures and other historic structures in the district; design new primary structures so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained (#3, p.93); design new primary structure to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings and other historic buildings in the district (#4, p. 93).

2. Staff has concerns regarding the proposed fencing; design new fences in keeping with the architectural style of the house (#11, p. 37).

3. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional items for review:

    a. Revised streetscape rendering with all portions of proposed structure shown in color

    b. Revised site plan showing all walkways and/or landings

    c. Porch railing detail

    d. Proposed patio material

    e. Manufacturer specifications for windows and mechanical units

    f. Clarification on location of proposed screened porch door

4. The standards for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 50-51, Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41, Fences and Walls on pages 36-37, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 82-83, Lighting on pages 42-43 and Archaeology on pages 32-33 in the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended May 13, 2026, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation:

1. Staff recommends that the commission give feedback to the applicant.

Ms. Cole explained that this was a newly subdivided lot. She said her primary concerns with the project was the overall size of the new structure, noting that it was nearly seven thousand (7,000) square feet. Ms. Cole said she'd added a document to the commissioner

folder with square footage calculations for adjacent houses. Most of them were much smaller than the proposed structure. She showed a drawing for the north elevation, noting that it will be highly visible since it's on a corner. She also noted that the proposed structure has an exposed basement on the front elevation, which was not typical of the district.

Ms. Cole then noted the proposed fence. She said she didn't have concerns regarding the wire material, but said the posts were metal, which she hadn't seen in the district.. Ms. Cole also observed the red screen door in the specifications, but she wasn't sure where it was proposed on the house.

Mr. Mays asked whether any similar attached garages had been approved in Montford, and Ms. Cole replied that she could remember only one where the topography allowed the garage to be hidden on the site underneath a porch. Mr. Mays then asked if the garage door was one door for a double bay garage, to which Ms. Cole confirmed that it was one continuous door for two bays.

Mr. Robert Griffin, architect, addressed the commission and shared that the house was large because the applicants have three (3) children. Mr. Griffin clarified that the total heated area was four thousand (4,000) square feet. Mr. Griffin pulled up the site plans, and showed the configuration of the lot which has streets along three (3) sides. He noted that the lot was more challenging to develop because of a large oak tree that they're required to keep per the deed. He said they could change the garage doors if needed.

Mr. Griffin began to show examples of other properties in the district with houses with long building footprints. He then shared that they looked at different ways to detach the garage but could not find a way that made sense.

Ms. Mathews asked where the screen door would be, Mr. Griffin showed the location on the site plan, noting that it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Mays asked what was shown on the plans as far as the base of the front porch steps, Mr. Griffin responded that he designed wider steps at the bottom so there could be places to have flower pots. It would be approximately seven feet between the grade and porch.

Mr. Griffin showed examples of the proportion and scale of other homes in the neighborhood, and noted that their proposed building footprint covered 21% of the lot. Noah Illes, with Griffin Architects clarified that the 4,000 square feet number was the building footprint, not total heated square footage.

Chair Gorman opened the floor for public comment at 8:06 p.m., and Mr. Scott Dedmon, owner of 209 Cumberland Avenue approached the commission to express his support for the construction of this house.

At 8:11 when there was no one else to speak, Chair Gorman closed the floor for public comment.

Ms. Jill Rhoden, property owner, addressed the commission and shared her reasoning for the size of the home, noting that they wanted room to grow and the ability to bring the outside in. The proposed footprint allowed them to do both.

Mr. Mays expressed concern about the attached garage feeling suburban, the screened-in porch with a large chimney, and the front steps with a large amount of brick. Mr. Mays, however, expressed overall support for construction of a new house.

Vice-Chair Moxley expressed her desire to see the garage doors redone in order to visually indicate two separate doors which Ms. Cole said could be included as a condition of approval.

The commission continued to discuss the placement of the garage and design of the front steps. The commission members expressed general support for the site plan and understood Mr. Griffin's reasoning for each choice.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and owner's affidavit (2 pages); Exhibit B - site and floor plans (6 pages); Exhibit C - renderings and elevation drawings (5 pages); Exhibit D - material specifications and new construction worksheet (7 pages); Exhibit E - photos (2 pages); Exhibit F - adjacent properties - finished square area square footage and parcel map (2 pages - added by staff June 29, 2026); Exhibit G - revised streetview rendering (received July 8, 2026); Exhibit H - revised site plan (received July 8, 2026); Exhibit I - site and square footage comparison documents (21 pages - received July 8, 2026); Exhibit J - 3-D imagery (??? pages - received July 8, 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 construction of a two-and-a-half story, 6,968 square foot primary structure with brick veneer foundation, painted gravel-dash and smooth fiber cement shake siding with 5" reveal, two (2) brick veneer chimneys and GAF Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle roof in Hazelwood color; windows will be Marvin TBD SDL aluminum clad 9/1, 6/1, 8/1 and 2/1 double-hung and 9-lite casement; pedestrian doors will be wood 6-lite panel with sidelites and multi-lite transom, wood 3-lite and 9-lite panel, and Marvin Ultimate fiberglass multi-lite sliding; garage doors will be Cloplay Canyon Ridge paneled with multi-lite transom; front entry will be set within 347 square foot covered porch with painted wood railings with 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, painted wood posts with brackets, wood flooring and ceiling supported by brick piers screened with painted wood lattice; 321 square foot screened porch with custom painted screen door on north elevation will open to a 210 square foot patio; new dark brown

pervious paver driveway with concrete apron will be constructed on the rear of the parcel; existing gravel driveway in front yard to be expanded to include a new turnaround area adjacent to northwestern corner of structure; construct 10' x 10' pervious paver pad in front yard; new 4' tall loop wire fencing with metal posts will be installed in rear and side yards; installation of two (2) mechanical units adjacent to south elevation; five (5) mature trees will be removed to accommodate construction; ground cover must be established within 15 days of completion of construction and the remainder of the landscaping must be installed within 3 years; if archaeological resources are discovered during site work, work will cease until City staff and State archaeology staff have been notified and have inspected the site. 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, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 50-51, Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41, Fences and Walls on pages 36-37, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 82-83, Lighting on pages 42-43 and Archaeology on pages 32-33 in 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. New primary structure is sited so that it is similar to the historic pattern in terms of orientation, setback, retention of green space and spacing between structures.

    b. New primary structure is designed so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained.

    c. New primary structure is compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding historic buildings and other historic buildings in the district.

    d. Location and size of window and door openings are compatible in placement, orientation, spacing, proportion, size and scale with surrounding historic buildings.

    e. Materials and finishes are typical of those found in the district.

    f. New paved areas will be compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.

    g. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees during construction.

h. Mechanical units will be located on the side elevation and screened with plantings.

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 Moxley

Second by: Ms. Mathews

Vote for: Ms. Oliva, Vice-Chair Moxley, Chair Gorman, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Mays, Ms. Mathews, Mr. Mattson

Vote against: Ms. Humphrey

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. Porch railing detail, manufacturer specifications for windows and mechanical units will be submitted for staff review and approval.

2. Revised garage door specifications and rear elevation drawing will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Vice-Chair Moxley

Second by: Mr. Mays

Vote for: Ms. Oliva, Vice-Chair Moxley, Chair Gorman, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Mays, Ms. Mathews, Mr. Mattson

Vote against: Ms. Humphrey

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

Other Business

Ms. Cole reminded the commission of the rescheduled HRC Education Event at YMI Cultural Center on Friday, August 14, 2026.

Ms. Cole also reminded the commission about the CLG training in Waynesville, NC on August 7, 2026. The training was not required but commission members were encouraged to attend.

Ms. Cole then informed the commission about a TDA LIFT grant application the City was submitting for the Biltmore Village infrastructure project, and asked them for a motion to approve a letter of recommendation for the grant.

There will be a tour scheduled for the Basilica construction site.

Adjournment

At 8:37 p.m., Ms. Bowen moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Oliva and carried unanimously.