Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County

Meeting Minutes of September 9, 2026

1st Floor North Conference Room

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

Present: Vice-Chair Amy Moxley, Cecil Holt, Hans Skouby, Robert Mays, Leslie Humphrey, Richard Mattson, Jane Mathews

Absent: Jenny Bowen

Staff: Alex Cole, Matt Holloway, Aspen Johnston

Administrative

- Ms. Cole informed the commission that Chair Gorman had resigned, and Vice-Chair Moxley would be acting chair.
- Ms. Cole then explained that the City Clerk's office had alerted her to the fact that the commission had not adopted the minutes from the April Special Work Session. Mr. Skouby made a motion to continue the vote to adopt the April 28, 2026 minutes to give commission members additional time for review. This motion was seconded by Mr. Mays and carried unanimously.
- Mr. Holt moved to approve the minutes and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the and August 12, 2026 meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Skouby and carried unanimously.
- After Vice-Chair Moxley 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 -** Reconstruction of an existing damaged retaining wall with a new brick or stone wall. Applicant: Julian Montoya

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

Project Location and Contacts:

- 7 Cherokee Road (PIN 9649226978)
- Owner: EMMA SAAVEDRA KELLY REVOCABLE TRUST
- Applicant: Julian Montoya
- Historic District: Albemarle Park
- Zoning District: RM6

Property Description:

- 0.13 acre parcel containing a ca. 1965 two-story house with a low gable roof, aluminum sash windows, and wide clapboard siding above a brick veneered first story.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request:

- Removal of a deteriorated retaining wall constructed of railroad ties with a new 47' long x 1.4'-6' tall CMU retaining wall with _____ veneer. 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 concerns regarding the cap illustrated in the renderings; "the wall should not include formal elements such as smooth capstones, stone piers or ornamental finials." (Bullet 2, p. 35)
- The standards for Walls found on page 35 of the Albemarle Park Historic District Landscape Design Standards, adopted July 8, 2015, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation:

- Staff does recommend approval of the application for the following reasons, provided concerns are addressed:
    - New wall is replacing a previously existing deteriorated wall constructed of an inappropriate material.
    - Wall is necessary to stabilize the slope.
    - New wall material will be _____.

Ms. Cole noted that the former wall was constructed out of railroad ties, which was not allowable in Albemarle Park. The wall collapsed and therefore required reconstruction. Ms. Cole shared examples of the proposed rock wall materials compared to existing walls in the district. It was her opinion that the proposed materials may not be appropriate, and referenced a wall the

City had built on Cherokee Road some years ago as perhaps a good example of a newer stone wall. Ms. Cole showed examples of existing historic walls in the neighborhood, and referenced the work in Riverside Cemetery and their use of multiple stone materials to achieve the desired appearance. Ms. Mathews added that if a stone sample were to be sent to a stone supplier, they can often match the variety based on the local knowledge of different availability from local quarries.

Mr. Mays asked if the wall had to be engineered and if so, if exemptions existed for code requirements. Ms. Cole replied that the wall would have to be built to code since it would be new. Ms. Mathews added that an engineered wall would never be seen with the appropriate veneer.

Julian Montoya, contractor, and Steve Berry, applicant introduced themselves. Mr. Montoya shared that one alternative to reconstructing the wall would be grading the hillside. Ms. Mathews expressed concern over the large tree with exposed roots behind the wall. Mr. Berry explained that the tree would have to be removed to construct the wall anyway. He also noted there was one utility pole that would need to be relocated and one that needed to be removed as part of the scope of work. Ms. Mathews questioned where the property line was and whether there would be enough clearance to properly grade the hillside.

Ms. Cole noted that tree removal was not included in the initial application, and tree removal in Albemarle Park normally required major work review. Mr. Mays noted that the application would likely need to be amended. Mr. Berry showed images of existing site conditions. Ms. Cole said that the commission could give feedback on the proposed wall material, but if the tree removal and utility poles were to be considered they'd need to request a continuance and amend the application. Ms. Cole noted that an arborist would need to assess the tree.

Ms. Mathews suggested that the applicant look at other existing retaining walls in the district, referencing one on Terrace Road, across from Brown Bear Cottage and another wall at the intersection of Sunset and Cherokee. Both of those walls were built by the City of Asheville.

Ms. Humphrey asked if the applicant could replace the wall with railroad ties, and Ms. Cole noted that that was not allowed per the design standards. The commission discussed different stone configurations and which would be more appropriate for Albemarle Park. Ms. Mathews shared that most walls in the district had deep-set mortar joints. The applicant questioned whether brick would be allowable, and Mr. Mattson suggested dry-laid fieldstone might be more consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Mays and Mr. Mattson referenced the third stone option in the application as perhaps being the most consistent in appearance with existing stone in the district.

Ms. Cole explained that the engineering report, arborist report, site plan, and updated material specifications would need to be submitted prior to September 23, 2026 to meet the deadline for the October regular meeting. Mr. Skouby suggested that the applicants return with their preferred stone options, specifically a top choice to expedite the public hearing, and added

that he agreed with Ms. Mathews' suggestion to visit stone suppliers with access to a quarry in order to source the appropriate materials.

Ms. Humphrey asked whether the driveway could be widened to the other side to protect the existing tree. Mr. Berry shared that the topography did not make that feasible.

Mr. Mays made a motion to continue the application until the October 2026 meeting, this was seconded by Ms. Mathews and carried unanimously.

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness -** Modifications to existing non-contributing accessory structure, including enclosure of an existing porch. Applicant: Gregory Borden

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

Project Location and Contacts:

- 40 Watauga Street (PIN 9639944206)
- Owner: BORDEN GREGORY;BORDEN KIMBERLY
- Applicant: Gregory Borden
- Historic District: Montford
- Zoning District: RM8

Property Description:

- 0.29 acre parcel containing the Dr. J. L. Adams House - an early 20th century two-story vernacular stucco dwelling with a clipped gable roof, ornamented dormer, molded detail, wide porch and Montford brackets designed by Richard Sharp Smith and constructed prior to 1917. The parcel also contains a one-story accessory structure with clipped gable roof constructed in 2005.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request:

- Modification of existing accessory structure, including enclosure of existing porch on rear elevation with Pella Lifestyle 6/1 aluminum clad SDL double-hung windows, painted wood lap siding with ____ reveal and painted wood trim and corner boards; construction of a new _____ gable end roof overhang above door; removal of existing ADA ramp on west elevation and construction of a 4' x 3.5' one-story addition with _____ door, wood lap siding and asphalt shingle roof matching existing to house hot water heater; installation of 33 1/16" x 13" x 27 15/16" Mitsubishi mechanical unit screened with ____ adjacent to west elevation. 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 concerns regarding the proposed siding material;
- Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:
    - Revised/corrected elevation drawings
    - Door specifications for addition
    - Siding reveal dimension
    - Mechanical unit screening information
- The standards for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 35-36 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended July 8, 2026, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation:

- Staff does recommend approval of the application for the following reasons, provided concerns are addressed:
    - Existing structure was constructed in 2005 and is not historic.
    - Modifications to existing structure use traditional roof forms, materials and details compatible with the main building or other historic accessory structures in the district.

Ms. Cole gave an overview of the project, which involved enclosure of an existing porch on the rear elevation of an accessory structure built in the 2000s. She explained that her only concern regarding the proposal was the two different siding materials Ms. Cole said that clarity was needed on the materials for the new gable-end roof overhang. She added that the applicant had proposed a new metal door on the water heater room expansion, which was a door material that had been previously approved in Montford. For new construction, the commission had historically approved fiberglass or aluminum clad doors, which was her recommendation.

Mr. Mays offered to recuse himself from the vote since he was an adjacent property owner. Mr. Holloway advised that if Mr. Mays did not have a clear conflict of interest, and was just a neighbor, there should not be an issue in casting a vote.

Greg Borden, property owner, approached the commission to speak. In regards to the metal door, he did not feel strongly about having a metal door and would be open to other options. Mr. Mays asked how visible the door would be, and Mr. Borden explained that it would

be visible from the road but the material selected was intended to blend into the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Mathews asked why metal was proposed, Mr. Borden noted that they didn't want wood in that location because it would be more exposed to the weather.

Mr. Mays reiterated Ms. Cole's notes about the new gable-end roof overhang. Mr. Borden clarified that it would be a simple gable with shakes to match the rest of the structure. Mr. Borden noted that for siding, he planned to install German lap siding instead of stucco. Mr. Skouby followed by asking what type of water heater would be installed and Mr. Borden noted that it would be a new gas water heater with a vent through the roof.

Vice-Chair Moxley opened the floor for public comment at 4:52 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the floor for public comment.

Mr. Skouby said he thought a fiberglass door for the addition would be ok.

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 project description (3 pages); Exhibit B - site plan, floor plan, and elevation drawings (3 pages); Exhibit C - materials (21 pages); Exhibit D - photos (8 pages); Exhibit E - additional materials and email correspondence (3 pages - received September 9, 2026); Exhibit F - revised elevation (1 page - received September 9, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except _____;

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

1. That the application is for modification of existing accessory structure, including enclosure of existing porch on rear elevation with Pella Lifestyle 6/1 aluminum clad SDL double-hung windows, painted German wood lap siding with 6 ¾" reveal matching primary structure and painted wood trim and corner boards; construction of a new gable end roof overhang above door with painted wood support posts and asphalt shingle roofing matching existing; removal of existing ADA ramp on west elevation and construction of a 4' x 3.5' one-story addition with fiberglass door, wood lap siding and asphalt shingle roof matching existing to house hot water heater; installation of 33 1/16" x 13" x 27 15/16" Mitsubishi mechanical unit screened with shrubs from the Montford Recommended Species List adjacent to west elevation. 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.**

2. That the standards for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 35-36 and Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 82-83 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. Existing structure was constructed in 2005 and is not historic.

    b. Modifications to existing structure use traditional roof forms, materials and details compatible with the main building or other historic accessory structures in the district.

4. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are/are not congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Mr. Mays

Second by: Mr. Skouby

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 door specifications will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Mr. Mays

Second by: Mr. Skouby

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 -** Amendment to major work approval for changes to mechanical equipment configuration and modification of existing front entry vestibule. Applicant: Lucy Moore/Beyer Blinder Belle

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

Project Location and Contacts:

- 3 Angle Street (PIN 9647696594)
- Owner: ALL SOULS EPISCOPAL AKA THE CATHEDRAL OF ALL SOULS
- Applicant: Lucy Moore - Beyer Blinder Belle
- Historic District: Biltmore Village
- 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:

- Amendment to Major Work CA #26-3728PZ to modify existing wood entry vestibule to accommodate new porch floor height and to recess existing entry doors within vestibule to accommodate ADA compliance; three (3) mechanical units on north elevation will be placed on elevated metal platforms and screened with 58" tall black metal picket fencing and landscaping; existing brick walkways on the site will be reset/relaid for ADA compliance. 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 concerns regarding the proposed fencing adjacent to the north elevation; fences may be used in side and rear yards only. They must be kept behind any building facade that faces a street. Heights of up to 4 feet are allowed in side yards and up to 6 feet in rear yards. Historic fence patterns are strongly encouraged (#10, p. 25 of Book 1).
- Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:
    - Existing and proposed entry porch elevation drawings
- 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 recommend approval of the application for the following reasons, provided concerns are addressed:
    - Alterations to historic materials and significant architectural features will be the minimum necessary to meet current building code.
    - Utility cabinets and service areas will be located away from the view of the primary facade.
    - Utility equipment will be elevated and screened with mature landscaping.

Ms. Cole gave an overview of the application, which included altering the entry vestibule to accommodate the raised porch floor height, which the commission previously approved. Ms. Cole expressed her concern about the proposed changes to the hardware on the vestibule door. She explained that the applicant was now proposing to elevate the mechanical units on metal platforms and screening them with 58" tall fencing on the north side of the building instead of constructing a flood wall as previously approved. She said the design standards only allowed for 48" tall fencing in side yards.

Jennie Gwin, architect with Beyer Blinder Belle, approached the commission to answer additional questions and provide clarity. She noted that the owners wanted taller fencing for security purposes due to the level of exposure along Hendersonville Road. She added that the screening type needed to be amended due to updated cost constraints. Ms. Gwin then showed existing fences on site that match the proposed fencing. Ms. Gwin cited security concerns for the equipment.

Ms. Mathews and Mr. Skouby agreed that the proposed fence height seemed reasonable due to life safety and security concerns. Mr. Skouby asked if other commissioners agreed, and Ms. Mathews, Mr. Mattson, and Ms. Humphrey were in favor. Ms. Humphrey wondered if a variance would be required. Mr. Mays questioned whether the fence standards should apply in this case since the property was identified as "institutional" in the standards book versus commercial. Ms. Cole tried to clarify that the property was in fact commercial in nature and the fence standards should apply.

Ms. Gwin explained that the mechanical units were being elevated four feet from grade, as that was the max height the flooding reached during Tropical Storm Helene. The owners wanted a fence that was tall enough to not be jumped over, due to the raised platforms that could allow someone to gain entry into the church. Ms. Cole asked whether there were security issues in the past. Ms. Gwin said she did not know but referenced other examples of

trespassing at the property. Mr. Mattson asked what shrubs would be installed. Ms. Gwin said the planting species had not been selected yet but she said they would be evergreens.

Mr. Holt asked whether the units were drawn to scale, and asked if a four foot fence could be installed on top of a one foot berm. Ms. Moore said she was concerned about the cost of the project.

Mr. Mays asked about the brick walkways, and Ms. Gwin said that the walkways needed to be reset to meet ADA requirements.

Mr. Mathews wondered if a metal picket fence might deter people from climbing over it. That, paired with taller plantings may deter trespassing.

Mr. Mays reiterated that he did not feel the standards for fencing applied in this case. Ms. Mathews referenced the service area screening which did not have any height standards. She wondered if the commission could apply the standards for service areas, and the rest of the commissioners agreed.

Ms. Gwin moved on to address the proposed changes at the front entry. She noted that the inner doors would be recessed about six inches. She said the existing door hardware was not ADA compliant and would be replaced. Ms. Gwin said she believed the hardware was not original.

Mr. Mattson asked whether conversion levers would be applicable in this case. Ms. Gwin said that the doors would not latch. She added that she would be concerned about long term maintenance of conversion levers. Additionally, existing hardware was not at the right height.

In response to Mr. Mays, Ms. Gwin said that there would not need to be a ramp inside the entry since the doors were being recessed. This option was not the church's preference, but was a compromise following feedback from the commission at the July meeting. Mr. Mays said he thought it was strange that they would be moving the doors to preserve the vestibule which was not an original feature.

Vice-Chair Moxley opened the floor for public comment at 5:39 p.m.

Glenn Stach, Preservation Landscape Architect, commended the applicant and architect for working to preserve the vestibule and other architectural features. He supported the idea of the fence, though wanted to confirm that the landscaping would completely enclose the mechanical screening so it would not be visible coming down Hendersonville Road. He said he would like clarification around the proposed grading and raising of the walkways, and wanted to ensure that the trees and other important features would be preserved.

Ms. Gwin asked to address Mr. Stach's comment. Mr. Holloway noted that Mr. Stach did not present sufficient evidence to establish standing, and that any comments made by the speaker should not be taken into account by the commissioners when they made their final

decision. Ms. Gwin then explained that grading would be minimal and no trees would be impacted.

When there was no one else to provide comment, Vice-Chair Moxley closed the floor to public comment at 5:44 p.m.

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 project description (3 pages); Exhibit B - site plan, renderings, materials, and photos (15 pages); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property;

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

1. That the application is for amendments to Major Work CA #26-3728PZ to modify existing wood entry vestibule to accommodate new porch floor height and to recess existing entry doors within vestibule to accommodate ADA compliance; three (3) new mechanical units on north elevation will be placed on elevated metal platforms mounted on a 28' x 10.5' concrete pad screened with 5' tall black metal picket fencing and landscaping; existing brick walkways on the site will be reset/relaid for ADA compliance. 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.**

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 elevated and screened with mature landscaping

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: Mr. Mays

Second by: Ms. Mathews

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. Door hardware will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Mr. Mays

Second by: Mr. Skouby

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

Other Business

- S.J. Ashworth National Register Nomination (1733 Charlotte Hwy, Fairview, NC)

Ms. Cole gave a brief overview of the property, and explained that the house was built around 1800 and is one of the best local examples of a picturesque late Victorian style dwelling. She then explained the commission's role as a Certified Local Government (CLG) in making recommendations on National Register listings. She said that the commission acts in an advisory role to the SHPO on nominations to the National Register. Ms. Cole gave an overview on the criteria for listing in the register, and explained the benefits of listing in the register.

Vice-Chair Moxley recommended in favor of the nomination for the Ashworth House, which was supported unanimously by the rest of the commission. Ms. Cole noted that the commission's recommendation would be sent to the SHPO.

Adjournment

At 5:59 p.m., Mr. Skouby moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Mathews and carried unanimously.