Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County
Meeting Minutes of August 13, 2025
1st Floor North Conference Room
City Hall (70 Court Plaza)
4:00 p.m.

Present: Will Hornaday, Sioux Oliva, Cecil Holt, Hans Skouby, Amy Gharst, Celesta Gorman
Absent: Robert Mays, Leslie Humphrey, Bill Roberts, Amy Moxley, Shannon Watkins
Staff: Alex Cole, Jannice Ashley, Cydney Joyner, Drew Wilson

Administrative

- Vice Chair Oliva moved to approve the minutes and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the July 9, 2025 meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.
- After Chair Hornaday explained the public hearing rules, all those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 26 Grindstaff Drive (PIN 9648419948) - Construction of a one-and-a-half story, 2,224 square foot primary structure and a one-story, 460 square foot accessory structure. Applicant: Grindstaff Trust % Molly Iskorkutan

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

Owner/Applicant: GRINDSTAFF TRUST/Molly Iskorkutan
Subject Property: 26 Grindstaff Drive
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648419948
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.25 acre vacant parcel.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of a one-and-a-half story, 2,224 square foot primary structure with smooth stucco foundation, smooth LP fiber cement Smart Siding with 6" reveal, fiber cement board and batten siding, wood shake siding and Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle roof in Weathered Wood color; windows will be Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum-clad 6/1 and 4/1 double-hung and 3- and 4-lite casement putty SDL in Black Sable color; primary entry door

will be 4-lite wood and rear entry doors will be single lite aluminum-clad; all trim, fascia and soffits will be constructed of Miratec; front entry will be set within a covered porch with wood posts supported by stone piers, painted wood decking flooring, painted wood railing with 2"x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps with stone posts at entry; rear elevation will feature a 28' x 10' covered porch with painted wood decking flooring, painted wood railing with 2"x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps; porch will be screened with square painted wood lattice. Construction of a one-story, 460 square foot accessory structure with smooth LP fiber cement Smart Siding with 6" reveal and Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle roof in Weathered Wood color; window will be Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum-clad 9/9 double-hung in Black Sable color; entry door will be _____; garage doors will be_____. No mature trees will be removed to accommodate construction; construct 12-17' wide Dove Grey limestone gravel driveway with concrete apron adjacent to the east elevation, and 30' x 22' wide gravel parking pad adjacent to rear elevation; all gravel areas will have metal edging; installation of __ x __ x__ mechanical unit screened with plantings adjacent to west elevation. Foundation plantings will be installed; 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 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 Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding proposed fenestration on both structures (p. 85, #8).
2. Staff has concerns regarding some of the design details of the primary structure, including the front porch posts, foundation material, the use of stone material on a Craftsman-style structure and the proportions of the proposed dormers and section of arched roof (p. 85, #4).
3. Staff has concerns regarding lack of design consistency between the proposed structures (p. 29, # 7).
4. Staff has concerns about the site configuration in the rear yard and the lack of landscape screening for the parking/driveway areas (p. 35, # 3(c).
5. Staff has concerns regarding the lack of landscaping proposed for the site, both for the structures and the driveways and parking (p. 35, #5); plan lacks sufficient foundation plantings, driveway and parking screening and ground cover.
6. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Revised New Construction Worksheet for accessory structure with correct square footage calculation
    - Accessory structure door specifications
    - Trim material specifications
    - Stone sample or image and intended construction method
    - Revised site plan showing location/materials of front walkway and location of proposed retaining wall, as well as additional landscaping
    - Mechanical unit dimensions

The standards for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 84-85, Garages and Accessory Structures on pages 28-29, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 44-45, Landscaping and Trees on pages 34-35, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 76-77, Lighting on pages 36-37, and Archaeology on pages 26-27 in the St. Dunstan's Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. 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.
2. New primary structure is designed so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained.
3. Grading will be minimized, and significant site features, including trees greater than 6" DBH and known archaeological features, will be protected from damage during or as a result of construction.
4. New primary structure is designed to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding buildings.
5. New primary structure is designed to be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district.
6. Detailing on new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
7. Materials and finishes are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail and color to historic materials found in the district.
8. Doors and windows are compatible in materials, proportion, subdivision, pattern and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.
9. Proportion of new garages and accessory structure is compatible with the proportion of the main house.
10. New accessory structure incorporates traditional roof forms, materials, and details compatible with the main building.
11. New accessory structure is located in the rear yard and in a traditional relationship to the main building.
12. New driveway and off-street parking are compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
13. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees.
14. Trees to be removed will be replaced with same or similar species from the St. Dunstan's Recommended Species list. Mechanical unit will be located on the rear elevation and screened with plantings.

Ms. Cole began her presentation with an overview of the application for new construction of a primary and an accessory structure. She explained to the commission that the site was in the northwest corner of the St. Dunstan's historic district, and was part of a newly developed

section of the neighborhood on the edge of the district boundary. She described St. Dunstan's as a varied neighborhood with different architectural styles, where some houses were close to the street and others were more spaced out. The lot in question was in a section of the neighborhood where multiple lots were subdivided, and new houses had been built in recent years, giving it its own development pattern to some degree.

Ms. Cole then noted her concerns about the fenestration in her staff report, particularly the narrow double-hung windows and casement windows. She said she thought the windows were too varied and lacked a sense of cohesion. She also pointed out several details that she considered not consistent with the Craftsman architectural style the house was referencing. She specifically mentioned the open, piered stone foundation which she thought was unusual and suggested it should instead be a continuous foundation to be more consistent with the architectural style. Additionally, she observed that the front and rear dormers seemed mismatched, noting the lightness of the front dormer versus the heaviness of the back dormer, and said they appeared as though they belonged on two different houses.

Regarding the accessory structure, Ms. Cole stated that while she had no concerns about it generally, she thought it did not have a strong enough design relationship to the primary structure. She recommended making the fenestration and roof form more consistent between the two buildings, and suggested that a simple change like a gable-end roof for the accessory structure could significantly improve the design. She then reviewed the landscaping plan, and said that there should be more plantings to screen the foundation of the accessory structure and the driveway/parking area, as required by the standards.

Ms. Cole outlined several outstanding items that the applicant still needed to provide, including a new construction worksheet for the accessory structure with correct square footage calculations, door and trim specifications, a stone sample or image, the construction method for the foundation, a plan for a walkway from the front entry to the driveway, and the dimensions for the mechanical unit. She noted that these were minor issues that staff could address.

Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Cole if the stone on the front columns was an applied veneer. Ms. Cole replied that she did not know and that she had requested clarification on the intended construction method for the foundation material in her report. Chair Hornaday also asked if the same material was going on the crawl space, to which Ms. Cole responded that she believed that the foundation material was stucco on the side elevations.

General contractor, Mr. Shawn Verbrugghe, speaking on behalf of the applicant, Ms. Molly Iskorkutan, addressed the commission. Mr. Verbrugghe explained that the stone on the columns was an individual-piece veneer. He then presented a specification sheet for the windows, doors, driveway, and railings, as well as the dimensions for the mechanical unit.

Chair Hornaday and Ms. Cole questioned why the front and rear dormers were out of scale with each other. Mr. Verbrugghe explained that the front dormer was not a bedroom, and the owner was trying to stay within a specific square footage for cost reasons. He continued that the front dormer was nine feet wide and the rear was fifteen feet. Mr. Verbrugghe then proposed a compromise to make the rear dormer smaller, and to enlarge the front dormer to better balance the design.

Chair Hornaday then asked Ms. Cole to elaborate on her concerns about the fenestration. Ms. Cole replied that she felt the windows varied too much in size and type, which created a lack of cohesion. Mr. Verbrugghe clarified that the windows were either double-hung or fixed, not casement. Ms. Cole said that she wasn't concerned about whether or not the windows would be casement or awning. She said her concern was that the windows didn't have consistency across the design of the house.

Mr. Verbrughhe explained one of the shorter windows in question on the top right elevation was a stairwell window, and its size was meant to provide more light for a tight space. He also noted that because of its placement under the roofline, it could not be a square window. Ms. Cole suggested another window could be altered to match the proportions of the upper sashes, proposing a three-over-three version of another window on the plan. Mr. Verbrugghe agreed that this was possible. Mr. Verbrughhe discussed two other smaller windows on the top left elevation and that their size and placement were for privacy, as they were in the bathrooms and directly faced the neighbor's house. He again reiterated that he was open to suggestions.

Chair Hornaday moved to the next item on staff's list of concerns, referencing the rear yard. Mr. Verbrugghe stated that he sent an updated plan that included a walkway to the garage. He explained that the garage had a standard hip roof but said he could add a dormer if the commission felt it would better match the primary house. Chair Hornaday explained that the staff's concern was the garage's roof form in relation to the main house and suggested that a less-flattened roof might help alleviate some of the design concerns. Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed he could change the roof to a more pitched form, such as a 7/12 pitch with open gables on the sides, to better match the main house. Chair Hornaday replied that he did not want to design it for the applicant but was satisfied with the suggestion. Vice Chair Oliva suggested using shake siding in the gable ends to match the main house. Mr. Verbrugghe agreed, stating that he could run a band and then put shakes on it.

Ms. Cole noted that the only missing item regarding the garage was the specifications for the pedestrian door. Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed that he would send the specifications for the door.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Verbrugghe if the main house had any six-over-six windows like the garage. Mr. Verbrugghe said that was a mistake on the plan and that the window would be six-over-one instead.

Chair Hornaday questioned the thirteen foot elevation rise between the road and the garage, asking if it would be a hill or a cut. Mr. Verbrugghe clarified that the elevation change was likely closer to eight or nine feet, explaining that a stone retaining wall would be cut into the slope to create a flat area for the driveway. Chair Hornaday also asked if the wall would be a consistent height along the side of the road, and Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed that it would be and that they would retain all existing vegetation around the garage.

Vice Chair Oliva asked Mr. Verbrugghe how he planned to make the three windows on the upper story of the left elevation more cohesive. Mr. Verbrugghe suggested making the two windows in the bathrooms wider to match the one over the kitchen sink on the lower level of the left elevation, and removing the transom window over the tub entirely. Chair Hornaday pointed out that the two transom windows on the lower level of the left elevation were on a different

plane from the other windows, and Mr. Verbrugghe agreed to change them to align their headers with the others, stating he was flexible on the window design because the home was a spec house, so the owners were not emotionally attached to the design.

Chair Hornaday stated he didn't think the windows on the right elevation of the house looked odd, especially if the upstairs stairwell window was changed to a double-hung, and that his main concern was making sure the header heights of all the windows were the same. Ms. Gorman agreed.

Chair Hornaday moved on from fenestration noting the house's four exterior materials of stucco, lap siding, board and batten, and shake siding.. Mr. Verbrugghe noted the proposed design was similar to a recently approved design next door. Ms. Cole pointed out that the house next door had a continuous stone foundation. Mr. Verbrugghe explained the differences in the houses and that stone was chosen for the support posts on this house instead of brick, and that a railing was proposed instead of cheek walls for cost reasons. Similarly, lattice was proposed for underneath the porch and stucco for the side foundation walls, also for cost reasons. He noted the decorative wood posts behind the stone support posts on the front porch were to reference a historic home within the district.

Chair Hornaday noted that the use of many different materials, including stucco, lap siding, shake, board and batten, and stone, seemed more like contemporary construction and deviated from the architectural style. Mr. Verbrugghe explained he used many different materials to differentiate the house from the one next door. Chair Hornaday suggested changing the stone support posts to stucco, but Mr. Verbrugghe did not think it would look right. Chair Hornaday and Mr. Verbrugghe then discussed the landscaping, and Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed that plantings would be added along the base of the house and around the porch. He said multiple existing trees would be preserved to provide adequate landscaping..

Chair Hornaday asked the commission if anyone else had any questions for the applicant. Vice Chair Oliva asked if the stone would be painted. Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed that it would not.

Chair Hornaday asked about sidewalk and driveway plans. Mr. Verbrugghe said they would be constructed of gravel.

Chair Hornaday asked if the gang of three windows on the front-facing dormer was consistent with the dormers on houses next door. Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed that the house (west of the proposed home, 30 Grindstaff) had the same window on its dormer.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Verbrugghe to confirm his alterations to the garage. Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed he would change the garage roof to have side-facing gable-ends with a trim board with shake siding in the gable ends.. He also said he would change the window by removing the muntins on the bottom pane.

Vice Chair Oliva asked about the landscaping and if the unmanicured, natural area would just be in the backyard, or if it would also surround the sides of the garage. Mr. Verbrugghe confirmed the landscaping would surround the sides of the garage to minimize its footprint, adding that the owners were not even sure they would build it but wanted to get it

approved as part of the plans. Chair Hornaday asked if anything would change with the driveway if the garage was not built. Mr. Verbrugghe responded that the parking pad would likely be smaller, but he was largely unsure. Ms. Cole asked the applicant to let her know if they altered the site plan in the future, and it could likely be reviewed at staff level if needed.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:50 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Application (2 pages); Exhibit B - New Construction Worksheet (4 pages); Exhibit C - Elevation Drawings, Floor Plans, and Site Plans (9 pages); Exhibit D - Material Specifications (3 pages); Exhibit E - Trustee Document; Exhibit F - Streetscape Rendering (received 6/4/25); Exhibit G - Revised Plans (10 pages - received 7/21/25); Exhibit H - Additional Material Specifications (7 pages - received 7/21/25); Exhibit I - Accessory Structure New Construction Worksheet (4 pages - received 7/21/25); 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 construction of a one-and-a-half story, 2,224 square foot primary structure with stone veneer and smooth stucco foundation, smooth LP fiber cement Smart Siding with 6" reveal, fiber cement board and batten siding, wood shake siding and Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle roof in Weathered Wood color; windows will be Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum-clad 6/1 and 4/1 double-hung and 3- and 4-lite casement putty SDL in Black Sable color; primary entry door will be 4-lite wood and rear entry doors will be single lite aluminum-clad; all trim, fascia and soffits will be constructed of Miratec; front entry will be set within a covered porch with wood posts supported by stone piers with wood posts, painted wood decking flooring, painted wood railing with 2"x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps with stone posts at entry; rear elevation will feature a 28' x 10' covered porch with painted wood decking flooring, painted wood railing with 2"x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps; porch will be screened with square painted wood lattice. Construction of a one-story, 460 square foot accessory structure with smooth LP fiber cement Smart Siding with 6" reveal and Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle roof in Weathered Wood color; window will be Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum-clad 9/9 double-hung in Black Sable color; entry door will be 3-lite material TBD; garage doors will be 8-lite transom over panel. No mature trees will be removed to accommodate construction; construct stone walkway connecting front entry stair to driveway; construct 12-17' wide Dove Grey limestone gravel driveway with concrete apron adjacent to the east elevation, and 30' x 22' wide gravel parking pad and walkway adjacent to rear elevation; all gravel areas will have metal edging; construction of 24" tall stacked boulder retaining wall along east side of driveway; installation mechanical unit screened with plantings adjacent to west elevation. Foundation plantings

will be installed; 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 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 84-85, Garages and Accessory Structures on pages 28-29, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 44-45, Landscaping and Trees on pages 34-35, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 76-77, Lighting on pages 36-37, and Archaeology on pages 26-27 in the St. Dunstan's Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted September 12, 2012, 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. Grading will be minimized, and significant site features, including trees greater than 6" DBH and known archaeological features, will be protected from damage during or as a result of construction.
    d. New primary structure is designed to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding buildings.
    e. New primary structure is designed to be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district.
    f. Detailing on new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
    g. Materials and finishes are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail and color to historic materials found in the district.
    h. Doors and windows are compatible in materials, proportion, subdivision, pattern and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.
    i. Proportion of new garages and accessory structure is compatible with the proportion of the main house.
    j. New accessory structure incorporates traditional roof forms, materials, and details compatible with the main building.
    k. New accessory structure is located in the rear yard and in a traditional relationship to the main building.
    l. New driveway and off-street parking are compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
    m. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees.
    n. Trees to be removed will be replaced with same or similar species from the St. Dunstan's Recommended Species list.
    o. Mechanical unit will be located on the rear 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 St. Dunstan's Historic District.

Motion by: Vice Chair Oliva
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

1. Revised primary and accessory structure elevation drawings will be submitted for staff review and approval.
2. Revised site plan will be submitted for staff review and approval.
3. Revised new construction worksheet for accessory structure with corrected square footage will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Vice Chair Oliva
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

2. Certificate of Appropriateness - 174 Montford Ave (PIN 9649028665) - Site work, including restoration of windows; addition of a side, rear external stairway; addition of French and sliding doors on the rear facade; rear chimney removal; repair of original windows and replacement of some non-original windows; repair and replacement of rear porch and supports; screening of porch; extension of patio and surfacing with flagstone. Applicant: Kirsten Millan

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

Owner/Applicant: Kirstan Millan
Subject Property: 174 Montford Avenue
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649028665
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.72 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century two-and-a-half story vernacular dwelling with bungaloid details, shingle over stucco siding, irregular roof form, Montford brackets and clipped dormers; constructed prior to 1910.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Modifications to rear elevation, including demolition of existing porch and stairways beneath second story, and construction of new enclosed screened porch on first floor with open patio beneath; porch will have ___ x ___ wood support posts, wood flooring, and wood railings matching front porch; new stair will extend from porch along south elevation; all new siding, trim and other exterior materials will match existing in material, color, texture and dimension. Modifications of multiple windows and doors on the rear elevation, including removal of four (4) existing windows and one (1) door; new wood Marvin Authentic Divided Lite (ADL) multi-lite French doors with multi-lite sidelites will be installed on basement level; two new pairs of wood Marvin Ultimate ADL multi-lite French doors with multi-lite sidelites will be installed on first floor; and replacement of all existing _____ windows on second story with new Marvin Ultimate ADL 12-lite casement (or awning?) windows. Replacement of two (2) existing non-historic windows on front elevation with new wood Marvin Ultimate ADL 9-lite casement windows. Replacement of one original double-hung window on north elevation with repurposed original window from rear elevation. Any original or historic windows and doors will be retained and preserved on site. Removal of existing secondary, non-character defining brick chimney adjacent to the rear of the house. Removal of existing concrete pad at basement level on rear elevation, and construction of a new ___ x ___ gray flagstone patio. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. No information on their provenance, material, condition and/or need for replacement; original/historic windows and doors that contribute to the overall character and form of historic buildings should be retained and preserved (#1, p. 85).
2. Window and door openings proposed to be modified are on the rear elevation; however, new units are not compatible with the overall design of the building (#6, p. 85).
3. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Storm window specifications
    - Dimensions for proposed patio
    - Information regarding existing metal fence; it appears it will need to be modified to accommodate new porch stair

The standards for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors on pages 84-85, Materials: Masonry and Stucco on pages 64-65, Materials: Wood on pages 66-37, Chimneys and Chimney Caps on pages 58-59, and Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended December 11, 2019, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Existing porch on rear elevation is not original; new porch will be constructed on the rear elevation and will be compatible with the existing structure in terms of roof form, scale, details, materials and color.
2. Existing original/historic windows and door are being retained and preserved on site; new windows and doors will be on the rear elevation and compatible with the overall design of the structure.
3. New storm windows will have a narrow profile so that they do not obscure or damage existing windows sashes, will be painted or have a baked enamel finish color compatible with the sash color, and will align with meeting rails of existing double-hung windows.
4. All new exterior materials, including siding and trim, will match existing in design, material, dimension, color, texture and detail.
5. Chimney to be removed is not a character-defining chimney.
6. New patio will be in the rear yard, constructed of stone and compatible with the historic neighborhood in material and scale.

Ms. Cole said the proposed alterations to the house were primarily limited to the rear elevation. She noted the existing second-story sleeping porch was not original to the house, and explained that the porches beneath it were to be demolished and rebuilt with a slightly larger footprint that would fit beneath the sleeping porch.. Ms. Cole pointed out several concerns noted in her staff report, including the proposed replacement of existing rear windows and doors with a new arrangement of French and sliding doors. She stated that this entirely new configuration did not align with the home's existing fenestration. Ms. Cole said she also had concerns regarding the proposed replacement of the sleeping porch windows, as it wasn't clear that they weren't historic windows... She also noted that it wasn't clear what was planned for the existing metal fence on the side elevation, as it appeared the new stairway to the porch would extend into the yard where the fence was located. Lastly, she said the specifications for the storm windows and the patio dimensions were still outstanding.

Chair Hornaday asked if the chimney proposed for removal could be seen from the front of the house. Ms. Cole said she had not noted it as a concern in her report because it was a secondary chimney not visible from the street.

Kirsten Millan, property owner, explained that the proposed changes were for her family's lifestyle and to improve light and airflow into the back of the house. She explained that the chimney to be removed was in disrepair and was not visible from the street

Ms. Millan then addressed the windows. She said the front attic windows would be replaced because they were not in good condition and had been leaking. She explained that she would replace them with windows that matched the home's original aesthetic and matched the windows of the identical house next door. Ms. Millan then addressed the top floor, rear windows, and explained that they were a part of the sleeping porch and had no insulation. She proposed replacing them with Marvin Ultimate Windows that would look the same from the outside but would be better suited for the interior use of a bedroom or office.

Ms. Millan then explained her rationale for the proposed window alteration on the side elevation. She said that she wanted to add French doors to the kitchen to bring more light and airflow into the space and that this would also allow for an easy flow from the kitchen to the backyard porch. She also said she wanted to add another French door in the back hallway to bring light into the living and dining rooms. Finally, she said she planned to add sliding doors to the finished basement to connect it to the backyard.

Ms. Cole expressed confusion about the rear elevation plans, noting that the floor plan did not show all the windows that could be seen in the photos. She questioned if it would be possible to keep at least one of the original windows on the first floor. Ms. Millan explained that the laundry area where the window was located was a recent, unoriginal addition to the house. She said they needed to remove that section to preserve an original bathroom, which required them to move the windows to a new location.

Chair Hornaday addressed the proposed changes, starting with the attic windows. He said the owner wanted to replace the non-original, contemporary attic windows with six-over-six windows to match the style of a nearby house. He noted that he did not hear any commission concern about this change. He then moved on to the chimney, stating that he also did not hear any concerns about its removal.

Chair Hornaday then asked Ms. Cole for her thoughts on moving the window from the north elevation, and Ms. Cole replied that she was not concerned about the window being relocated. She said her concerns were regarding the consistency of the proposed fenestration on the rear elevation with the rest of the house. Ms. Cole asked if Ms. Millan had consulted with a window specialist on the rear sliding windows. Ms. Millan responded that she had consulted with Logan Restoration, who recommended replacing the rear windows because they were not built for a tight seal adequate for an interior space. She explained that they would be replaced with Marvin Ultimate Windows, which would match the original windows' appearance and function. Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Millan if there were films on those windows. Ms. Milan replied there were not.

Chair Hornaday then asked if Ms. Millan would be altering the band board, and she responded not during this project. Chair Hornaday then revisited the sleeping porch window replacement and asked for staff input. Ms. Cole said that generally historic windows should be retained and preserved, but she said she was understanding that the existing windows were not suitable for the enclosed space on the interior of the house..

Chair Hornaday said he had no concerns about replacement of the storm windows. He asked Ms. Millan about the new stairway and the fence Ms. Cole had referenced. Ms. Millan explained that they would preserve the metal gate and either move it forward, or they would create a new matching panel to bridge the gap created by the new stairs. She also suggested adding wood lattice under the stairs to match the neighbors. Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Millan to commit to one or the other so as to avoid having to bring the application back to the commission, and Ms. Millan responded that they would move the fence forward by about six feet.

Chair Hornaday asked for the commission's thoughts on the proposed fenestration on the rear elevation. Ms. Cole said that if the commission was in support of the new doors and windows on the rear elevation, she would recommend that the grilles be removed or revised to be more consistent with the existing windows on the house.

Ms. Millan responded that she was open to suggestions, and explained that the French doors were placeholders and that she was willing to revise the design.. Mr. Skouby suggested an 18-lite pattern for the French doors to better match the top floor window pattern. Chair Hornaday responded that Ms. Millan should let the commission know what changes she would like to make so they can amend the application and approve it. Ms. Cole stated the French door lite pattern could be added as a condition and reviewed by staff later.

Chair Hornaday asked what part of the rear elevation would be screened, and Ms. Milan replied the first floor porch would be screened. Ms. Millan added that she would be happy to provide the dimensions of the patio to staff.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:44 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Application and Project Description (3 pages); Exhibit B - Site Plans, Floor Plans & Elevation Drawings (5 pages); Exhibit C - Material Specifications (23 pages); Exhibit D - Photographs (17 pages); Exhibit E - 1952 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (added by staff 8/4/25); Exhibit F - Additional Photo (added by staff 8/4/25); 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 modifications to rear elevation, including demolition of existing porch and stairways beneath second story, and construction of new enclosed screened porch on first floor with open patio beneath; porch will have wood support posts, wood flooring, and wood railings matching front porch; new stair will extend from porch along south elevation; all new siding, trim and other exterior materials will match existing in material, color, texture and dimension. Modifications of multiple windows and doors on the rear elevation, including removal of four (4) existing windows and one (1) door; new wood Marvin Authentic Divided Lite (ADL) multi-lite French doors with multi-lite sidelites will be installed on basement level; two new pairs of wood Marvin Ultimate ADL multi-lite French doors with multi-lite sidelites will be installed on first floor; and replacement of all existing multi-lite windows on second story with new Marvin Ultimate ADL 12-lite casement all wood true divided lite windows. Replacement of two (2) existing non-historic windows on front elevation with new wood Marvin Ultimate ADL 9-lite

casement windows. Replacement of one original double-hung window on north elevation with repurposed original window from rear elevation. Any original or historic windows and doors will be retained and preserved on site. Removal of existing secondary, non-character defining brick chimney adjacent to the rear of the house. Removal of existing concrete pad at basement level on rear elevation, and construction of a new gray flagstone patio. 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 Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors on pages 84-85, Materials: Masonry and Stucco on pages 64-65, Materials: Wood on pages 66-67, Chimneys and Chimney Caps on pages 58-59, and Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended December 11, 2019, were used to evaluate this request.

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

    a. Existing porch on rear elevation is not original; new porch will be constructed on the rear elevation and will be compatible with the existing structure in terms of roof form, scale, details, materials and color.
    b. Existing original/historic windows and door are being retained and preserved on site; new windows and doors will be on the rear elevation and compatible with the overall design of the structure.
    c. New storm windows will have a narrow profile so that they do not obscure or damage existing windows sashes, will be painted or have a baked enamel finish color compatible with the sash color, and will align with meeting rails of existing double-hung windows.
    d. All new exterior materials, including siding and trim, will match existing in design, material, dimension, color, texture and detail.
    e. Chimney to be removed is not a character-defining chimney.
    f. New patio will be in the rear yard, constructed of stone and compatible with the historic neighborhood in material and scale.

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: Mr. Skouby
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

1. Revised drawings and specifications for new doors will be submitted for staff review and approval.
2. Storm window specifications will be submitted for staff review and approval.
3. Patio dimensions will be submitted to staff.

Motion by: Mr. Skouby
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 169 Montford Ave (PIN 9649121754) - Installation of roof mounted solar panels on the front/street-facing portion of roof and battery backup. Applicant: Allen Singleton

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

Owner/Applicant: Allen Singleton
Subject Property: 169 Montford Avenue
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649121754
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.50 acre parcel containing the Locke Craig House: an early 20th-century two-and-a-half story vernacular Colonial Revival- style dwelling with weatherboarded, Doric type posts, simple details; constructed c. 1902; home of Locke Craig when he was elected governor in 1912; the house later served as a boarding house.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Installation of twenty three (23) solar panels on west and south facing portions of roof. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Nineteen solar panels are proposed facing a primary public right of way and will be highly visible; solar energy collectors on roof surfaces facing the primary public right of way shall be considered only when there is no other option, and there is no detrimental impact to the integrity of the historic structure and neighborhood (#2, p. 81).

The standards for Sustainability and Emerging Technology found on pages 80-81 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended December 11, 2019, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff does not recommend approval of the request for the following reasons:

1. Installation of solar panels on a character defining/front facing portion of roof visible from the right of way would be detrimental to the integrity of the historic structure and the neighborhood.

Ms. Cole explained that the application was for the installation of a solar panel array on the front-facing roof of a house on Montford Avenue. She stated that while she was not opposed to renewable energy, she felt the highly visible panels would be detrimental to the historic integrity of the structure and neighborhood, leading her to not recommend approval of the application.

Chair Hornaday asked if the roof plan with the four solar panels on the side of the roof were enough to make the project viable. Ms. Cole replied it was not, which was why the owners submitted a proposal to place them on the front of the house. She reiterated that while she supports solar panels, she thought it would be detrimental to the historic character of the neighborhood if the commission allowed them to be placed on front-facing and highly visible portions of roofs. She noted the commission had recently approved a solar array facing a right of way, but that the panels were on a side-facing portion of the roof in that case. Lastly, Ms. Cole explained that North Carolina law allowed local governments to regulate placement of solar panels anywhere in the city, not just in historic district overlays.

Mr. Skouby asked Ms. Cole about the alternative plan that had been submitted. Ms. Cole stated she thought that the desired plan was proposed for optimal solar capture. She said she would defer to the applicant to explain their rationale.

Mr. Allen Singleton, property owner, addressed the commission, and explained that there was limited viability for solar capture if he placed the panels on the side or rear elevations of the home. He said that the current proposal placed the majority of the panels on the porch roof, where they would have a low profile and would be almost unnoticeable from the street. The remaining six panels would be placed symmetrically on the front of the roof, aligned with the chimneys. He said that he did not think that the solar panels would be detrimental to the historic character of the neighborhood, and they would improve its resiliency against severe weather events.

Chair Hornaday asked if Mr. Singleton had looked into a uniform solar roof. Mr. Singleton replied he had not. He said he had played with different configurations of the solar panels and this was the most optimal solution.

Mr. Isaac London, with Sugar Hollow Solar, addressed the commission, and explained that just removing the six panels on the front of the roof would result in a 19% reduction in power output. He stated that this would amount to a loss of approximately $470 annually,

significantly impacting the system's viability and payoff timeline. He also explained that the system included a battery for whole-home generation, providing power during long-term outages.

Vice Chair Oliva asked Mr. London if it was possible for the applicant to still receive the benefits of a solar installation without panels on the front-facing portion of the roof. Mr. London responded that removing the front-facing panels and moving them to other roof sections was not feasible because of safety regulations requiring a one-foot offset from ridges. He also stated that other roof sections received significantly less sunlight, which would drastically reduce energy production and not make the project worthwhile.

Chair Hornaday asked if there was an accessory structure on the property that may be viable for solar capture. Mr. Singleton explained there were other structures, but they were heavily shaded.

Vice Chair Oliva stated that while she understood and supported the applicant's desire for solar panels, the commission had to follow the current guidelines. She expressed concern that approving the application could set a precedent for others, which would be detrimental to the historic nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Singleton asked the commission what specific aspect of the solar panels violated the historic character of the home and neighborhood. Chair Hornaday explained that a local historic district's purpose was to preserve the look and feel of the period, including setbacks and street patterns. He stated that the solar panels would alter the neighborhood's historic nature and were visible from the street, which was a primary concern.

Mr. Singleton asked the commission if they would be more willing to approve solar panels if they were only on the lower profile front porch and not on the upper portion of the roof. Chair Hornaday responded that this change was still not acceptable since the solar panels were on the front of the house.

Mr. Singleton countered that determining what was detrimental to a historic neighborhood was a subjective judgment, and argued that adding solar panels would not make it "less Montford" but rather an adaptation to changing circumstances. Ms.Cole noted that the National Park Service (NPS), which provides historic preservation guidance at the federal level, does not recommend solar panels on the front-facing or character defining elevations of historic structures. Ms. Cole then stated she had reached out to other preservation commission staff across the state, and none had approved solar panels on a front-facing or character-defining elevation. She also stated that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had provided the feedback from the NPS.

Mr. Singleton pointed out the standards state solar panels should not be placed on a front-facing elevation "unless it's the only possible location," and asked why that carve out existed if it was never approved. Ms. Cole noted that the commission had approved solar panels on street-facing roofs before, but only when they were not on the primary, character-defining front of the house and were barely visible.

Mr. London provided additional context on the cost and practicality of different solar options. He explained that conventional solar panels, like the ones proposed, were much more cost-effective than solar shingles, which could be nearly twice as expensive for the same energy output. He also noted that solar shingles were more difficult to install and maintain, as any damage to the roof or electronics could disable the entire system and require both a certified roofer and electrician to fix.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 6:15 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Chair Hornaday asked if the commission had any thoughts on the application. Mr. Skouby noted he agreed that solar panels should not be placed on the front of a historic house. Ms. Gorman also agreed that solar panels on the front of this house would dramatically change the historic character of it.

Ms. Gorman asked if the commission wanted to allow the applicant to withdraw their application since it seemed likely to be denied if a vote were to be taken. Mr. Singleton asked about the process and benefits of withdrawing. Vice Chair Oliva explained that if the application was denied, which it was likely going to be, the applicant couldn't apply for anything similar for at least one year. Mr. Singleton then requested that his application be withdrawn.

Chair Hornaday called for a recess at 6:21 p.m., and the meeting was then called back to order at 6:24 p.m.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness - 2-6 Brook Street (PIN 9648609201) - Installation of one (1) new flush-mounted sign, two (2) blade signs and two (2) window signs. Applicant: Debbie Word

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

Owner/Applicant: SOUTHSLOPE APOTHECARY REAL ESTATE LLC/Debbie Word
Subject Property: 2-6 Brook Street
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9648609201
Zoning District: Community Business II

Property Description: 0.23 acre parcel containing a one-story commercial structure with stucco siding, multiple front entryways, front-facing gable ends and dormers; parcel also contains a one-story commercial structure with pebbledash siding, half-timbering details, projecting gable end roof - structure originally functioned as a post office; both structures were constructed ca. 1900, and designed by Richard Sharp Smith.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Installation of one (1) 20 square foot rectangular painted metal flush-mounted sign above northernmost primary entrance; installation of two (2) 4 square foot square painted metal projection signs attached with black steel brackets adjacent to primary entrances on front elevation; one (1) 26 square foot painted window sign will be installed in southernmost window at 2 Brook Street; one (1) 1.625 square foot painted window sign will be installed on primary entrance door at 6 Brook Street; gooseneck light fixtures will be affixed to projecting signs and ____ on building. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Maximum area shall be 20 square feet for all window signs; total area of signs also may not exceed 25% of the glass area (#52, p. 41, Book 1).
2. A maximum of two projecting sign faces per building is allowed (#51, p. 40).
3. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Glass dimensions for locations of proposed window signs
    - Location of proposed gooseneck light fixture

The standards for Signs found on pages 35-42 of Book 1 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Standards, adopted October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Signs will be painted metal or painted within a window or door.
2. Flush mounted sign is within the allowable size limit, and is located to avoid obscuring ornament and detail to the extent possible.
3. Projecting signs is within the allowable size limit, and will be located along the first floor level of the facade.
4. Window signs are within the allowable size limit, and will not exceed 25% of the glass area.
5. Signs will be externally illuminated.

Ms. Cole explained that the buildings where the signage was proposed had been recently connected by a small ell to create one building. She explained that although Chemist would occupy both buildings, they were treating it as a multi-tenant development with a mercantile on the left, a speakeasy bar on the right, and a coffee space in the middle. She stated that the main reason the application was before the commission was that the Biltmore Village standards do not allow signage to obscure architectural features, and the proposed sign on the building would cover the trim and half-timbering. She stated that she was supportive of the sign, as she believed that was the only place for it to go. She then pointed out that the application proposed two projecting blade signs, but the standards only allowed for one, even

though the building could be considered two separate structures. She concluded her report by noting that the proposed window signage was larger than the maximum of twenty square feet and exceeded the 25% glass area allowance. She said she had requested more information, including a calculation of the glass area, dimensions for the window signs, and the location of proposed gooseneck light fixtures.

Chair Hornaday noted corner buildings received additional signage, but Ms. Cole stated the driveway on the corner of this building led to a parking garage and was not considered a street.

Applicant and project manager, Mr. Jon Burritt, introduced himself and Mr. James Donaldson. Mr. Burritt explained that because the building appeared to be on a corner, he assumed it would receive multiple signs similar to the Chico's on the opposite corner, which had three signs. He then asked the commission what questions they had for him.

Chair Hornaday asked if Mr. Burritt had provided the window dimensions to staff. Mr. Burritt stated that he had not yet provided the staff with the exact dimensions and percentages of the proposed window signage. He said he was willing to reduce the sign's size to meet the 25% window coverage limit and square footage requirements.

Chair Hornaday then asked if Mr. Burritt had provided staff with the gooseneck light fixture locations. Mr. Burritt said that there would be three gooseneck lights directly above the main Chemist sign.

Chair Hornaday said the main issue to him was determining whether to count what had been two separate buildings as one, stating that he visually saw it as two buildings. Mr. Burritt noted that the previous three businesses on the property had approximately eight signs, and he felt that his proposal for only three signs was a reasonable reduction that still fit the village aesthetic.

Mr. Burritt explained that the additional signs were primarily for clarity, so customers would understand the different businesses and their hours of operation. He said the signs would denote the separate entrances for the mercantile, coffee shop, and speakeasy, ensuring that a closed door for one business did not imply that the entire building was closed. Chair Hornaday asked for clarification on the entrance for the speakeasy. Mr. Burritt explained that the door on the front of the old post office building would not be a functioning entrance. The window sign on that door would direct people with an arrow to the correct entrance through the other building.

Chair Hornaday questioned what sign was proposed for the door of the post office. Mr. Burritt explained it was a window sign on the door that would read "Penny Black." Chair Hornaday then asked Ms. Cole how many signs a business was allowed to have. Ms. Cole replied a business can have up to two signs, but she was supportive of allowing them additional signage since it was technically going on two buildings. She reiterated that the main issue was the window sign by the coffee shop entrance since it well exceeded the maximum size allowed. Vice Chair Oliva suggested writing a condition where staff could approve a reduced version of the sign later. Mr. Donaldson noted his support of these changes and explained his flexibility with signage designs.

Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Cole if the measurement for the window sign's square footage included the negative space around the letters. Ms. Cole confirmed that the measurement included the entire space containing the lettering, as if a straight line were drawn around it. Mr. Donaldson understood these rules and noted he would comply with covering less than 25% of the total window area.

Chair Hornaday asked the other commission members if they had any issues with the other signs. Mr. Skouby and Vice Chair Oliva replied they did not. Mr. Burritt asked for clarification on the 25% window coverage rule, confirming that it applied to the total area of the sign, including any negative space, rather than just the lettering itself. Vice Chair Oliva explained it included all negative space inside the lettering but not outside.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 6:44 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Application and Project Description (4 pages); Exhibit B - Site Plans (2 pages); Exhibit C - Lighting and Mounting Specifications (9 pages); Exhibit D - Proposed Signage (12 pages); Exhibit E - Photographs (5 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 installation of one (1) 20 square foot rectangular painted metal flush-mounted sign above northernmost primary entrance; installation of two (2) 4 square foot square painted metal projection signs attached with black steel brackets adjacent to primary entrances on front elevation; one (1) painted window sign will be installed in southernmost window at 2 Brook Street; one (1) 1.625 square foot painted window sign will be installed on primary entrance door at 6 Brook Street; gooseneck light fixtures will be affixed to projecting signs and above primary entrance on building. 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 Signs found on pages 35-42 of Book 1 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Standards, adopted October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.

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

    a. Signs will be painted metal or painted within a window or door.
    b. Flush mounted sign is within the allowable size limit, and is located to avoid obscuring ornament and detail to the extent possible.

c. Projecting signs is within the allowable size limit, and will be located along the first floor level of the facade.
d. Window signs are within the allowable size limit, and will not exceed 25% of the glass area.
e. Signs will be externally illuminated.

1. 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: Vice Chair Oliva
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

1. Revised window sign with window area calculation will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Vice Chair Oliva
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

5. Certificate of Appropriateness - 31 Grindstaff Drive (PIN 9648428118) - Construction of two-story, 2,360 square foot primary structure. Applicant: Jakub Markulis

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

Owner/Applicant: CTGNC1 LLC/Jakub Markulis
Subject Property: 31 Grindstaff Drive
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648428118

Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.20 acre vacant parcel.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of a two-story, 2,360 square foot primary structure with stucco foundation, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement lap siding with 5.25" reveal, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement shingle siding, and CertainTeed Landmark Max Def asphalt shingle roof in Cobblestone Gray; windows will be 1/1 double-hung _____ and single lite awning; doors will be Simpson Craftsman Collection 3-lite over wood panel with single lite transoms; all trim, fascia and soffits will be constructed of Miratec; front and rear entries will be set within covered porches with wrapped posts supported by stucco piers, painted wood deck flooring, painted wood railing with 2" x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, painted wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps; porches will be screened with square painted wood lattice. _____ mature trees will be removed to accommodate construction; remove existing driveway and construct 12' wide _____ shared driveway with concrete apron adjacent to side elevation, and ___ x ___ parking pad adjacent to rear elevation; existing historic brick swale will be retained and preserved; construct brick walkways connecting front entry stairs to driveway; installation of __ x __ x__ mechanical unit screened with plantings adjacent to east elevation. Foundation plantings will be installed; 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 have been notified and have inspected the site. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans.

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding retention of mature trees on the site; retain and preserve mature historic trees and landscape features that contribute to the overall character of the district; protection is required for mature trees and other site features to prevent damage during construction (#1 & 6, p. 35).
2. Staff has concerns regarding relocation of driveway and impacts to existing historic brick swale/sidewalk; retain, preserve and protect all historic public right-of-way features and infrastructure such as sidewalks, roadways, sewer grates, man hole covers, curbs, alleys, parks, trees, and walls that contribute to the overall character of a property or district (#1, p. 41).
3. Staff has concerns regarding the relationship of the proposed structures to the existing structure; new and old on the same site: The only historic examples of this in the neighborhood are outbuildings such as garages, carriage houses and servants' quarters built to the rear of main buildings. It is appropriate for the newer outbuildings to be located behind and be smaller and similar in design (#4, p.85).
4. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Window specifications
    - Tree removal plan
    - Tree and brick swale/sidewalk protection plan
    - Brick samples for new walkways and repair material for swale/sidewalk

- Mechanical unit specifications
- Trash enclosure rendering
- Driveway/parking material

The standards for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 84-85, Garages and Accessory Structures on pages 28-29, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 44-45, Landscaping and Trees on pages 34-35, Sidewalks, Streets and Public Infrastructure on p. 40-41, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 76-77, Lighting on pages 36-37, and Archaeology on pages 26-27 in the St. Dunstan's Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. 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.
2. New primary structure is designed so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained.
3. Grading will be minimized, and significant site features, including trees greater than 6" DBH, brick swale/sidewalk and any known archaeological features, will be protected from damage during or as a result of construction.
4. New primary structure is designed to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding buildings.
5. New primary structure is designed to be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district.
6. Detailing on new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
7. Materials and finishes are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail and color to historic materials found in the district.
8. Doors and windows are compatible in materials, proportion, subdivision, pattern and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.
9. New driveway and off-street parking are compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
10. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees.
11. Trees to be removed will be replaced with same or similar species from the St. Dunstan's Recommended Species list.
12. Mechanical unit will be located adjacent to the side elevation and screened with plantings.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness - 35 Grindstaff Drive (PIN 9648428118) - Construction of two-story, 2,360 square foot primary structure. Applicant: Jakub Markulis

Owner/Applicant: CTGNC1 LLC/Jakub Markulis
Subject Property: 35 Grindstaff Drive
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648428118
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.20 acre vacant parcel.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of a two-story, 2,360 square foot primary structure with stucco foundation, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement lap siding with 5.25" reveal, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement shingle siding, and CertainTeed Landmark Max Def asphalt shingle roof in Cobblestone Gray; windows will be 1/1 double-hung _____ and single lite awning; doors will be Simpson Craftsman Collection 3-lite over wood panel with single lite transoms; all trim, fascia and soffits will be constructed of Miratec; front and rear entries will be set within covered porches with wrapped posts supported by stucco piers, painted wood deck flooring, painted wood railing with 2" x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, painted wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps; porches will be screened with square painted wood lattice. _____ mature trees will be removed to accommodate construction; construct 12' wide _____ shared driveway with concrete apron adjacent to side elevation, and ___ x ___ parking pad adjacent to rear elevation; construct brick walkways connecting front entry stairs to driveway; installation of __ x __ x__ mechanical unit screened with plantings adjacent to east elevation. Foundation plantings will be installed; 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 have been notified and have inspected the site. **All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding retention of mature trees on the site; retain and preserve mature historic trees and landscape features that contribute to the overall character of the district; protection is required for mature trees and other site features to prevent damage during construction (#1 & 6, p. 35).
2. Staff has concerns regarding relocation of driveway and impacts to existing historic brick swale/sidewalk; retain, preserve and protect all historic public right-of-way features and infrastructure such as sidewalks, roadways, sewer grates, man hole covers, curbs, alleys, parks, trees, and walls that contribute to the overall character of a property or district (#1, p. 41).
3. Staff has concerns regarding the relationship of the proposed structures to the existing structure; new and old on the same site: The only historic examples of this in the neighborhood are outbuildings such as garages, carriage houses and servants' quarters

built to the rear of main buildings. It is appropriate for the newer outbuildings to be located behind and be smaller and similar in design (#4, p.85).

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

    - Window specifications
    - Tree removal plan
    - Tree and brick swale/sidewalk protection plan
    - Brick samples for new walkways and repair material for swale/sidewalk
    - Mechanical unit specifications
    - Trash enclosure rendering
    - Driveway/parking material

The standards for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 84-85, Garages and Accessory Structures on pages 28-29, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 44-45, Landscaping and Trees on pages 34-35, Sidewalks, Streets and Public Infrastructure on p. 40-41, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 76-77, Lighting on pages 36-37, and Archaeology on pages 26-27 in the St. Dunstan's Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. 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.
2. New primary structure is designed so that the overall character of the adjacent streetscape and building site is maintained.
3. Grading will be minimized, and significant site features, including trees greater than 6" DBH, brick swale/sidewalk and any known archaeological features, will be protected from damage during or as a result of construction.
4. New primary structure is designed to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding buildings.
5. New primary structure is designed to be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district.
6. Detailing on new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
7. Materials and finishes are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail and color to historic materials found in the district.
8. Doors and windows are compatible in materials, proportion, subdivision, pattern and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.
9. New driveway and off-street parking are compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
10. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees.
11. Trees to be removed will be replaced with same or similar species from the St. Dunstan's Recommended Species list.
12. Mechanical unit will be located adjacent to the side elevation and screened with plantings.

Ms. Cole said these two applications would be presented together since they were immediately adjacent to each other and proposed by the same applicant. She explained that the parent parcel contained a Queen Anne-style structure; the parent parcel had been recently subdivided twice to create the two vacant lots where the new primary structures were proposed. She noted that developing these lots would require removal of a large oak tree in the middle of the property. She also emphasized the importance of preserving the existing brick swale and sidewalk on the north side of the street, and ensuring that the newly proposed driveway did not destroy it.

Ms. Cole then addressed the design of the two new structures. Although she found the designs to be fine on their own, she felt their "sister structure" massing and identical placement were out of character for the neighborhood, which did not have two identical buildings next to each other. She believed the designs should have more architectural differentiation and massing to better reflect the character of the existing Queen Anne-style structure. She also noted that the standard for new and old buildings on the same site stated that new construction should be similar in design but smaller and located behind the main building, which was not the case with the proposed plans. Finally, she asked for a separate tree removal plan and noted that the application was missing other minor items that could be reviewed administratively as conditions.

Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Cole if the city-required apron for the driveway would be inside or outside the existing brick swale and sidewalk, questioning if the brick's unique nature would lead to the apron being ignored. Ms. Cole stated that she had reached out to the city staff who would review the driveway plan to flag the presence of the historic brick sidewalk.

Chair Hornaday swore in the applicant, Mr. Jakub Markulis. Mr. Markulis then explained that they would only be shifting the driveway from its current location by about half its width to center it between the two newly subdivided lots. He added that they would also be straightening the driveway out. Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Markulis if he planned to restore the sidewalk and reuse existing brick that may be impacted. Mr. Markulis explained he would do whatever was necessary. He said he was unsure what the material for the apron would be, but the driveway was proposed to be gravel.

Chair Hornaday asked if the brick swale and sidewalk were continuous down the north side of Grindstaff Drive, and Ms. Cole said yes but noted that it appeared to have some variation in the brick color and type. She then showed the commission a recent image from Google Streetview and suggested the brick where the existing driveway was located looked like it may have been replaced at some point in time as it was different from the other brick on either side. Chair Hornaday asked if the applicant could receive a professional opinion on this patch of brick. Ms. Cole noted that may not be necessary because the driveway apron may be require to be concrete. Chair Hornaday said the applicant should retain and preserve as much of the brick as possible.

Mr. Markulis addressed the tree that would need to be removed, and said they had explored different options for placement of the driveway. He said that placing the driveway and parking in the front of the buildings would save the tree, but that would not be in keeping with the neighborhood's character. He said they chose to propose a shared driveway to the rear of

the property, which would require the removal of the large tree but would preserve all other mature trees.

Mr. Markulis then explained that the houses were designed to be different from each other, and that the plans and varied foundation heights created differences in proportion. Chair Hornaday asked if Mr. Markulis could find a way to make the new houses better relate to the Queen Anne-style structure next door, specifically by adding different siding materials like shingles. Mr. Markilus noted he had added shingles to parts of the design, such as the projecting gables and other elements on the floor plans, to match the shingles on the Queen Anne-style structure. In response to Chair Hornaday, Mr. Markulis said there were other houses with shingle siding similar to the design he had proposed.

Vice Chair Oliva agreed the shingle siding created better differentiation. She then asked if the two houses could have staggered setbacks. Mr. Markulis said it could be possible but noted concerns with existing trees and proposed parking spaces. Vice Chair Oliva noted that staggering the houses would also create more privacy. She then asked if 35 could be moved forward to avoid messing with trees and parking. Mr. Markulis said he was concerned that moving 35 forward would overshadow 31 since it was smaller, but he was open to the commission's suggestions. Chair Hornaday then suggested moving 31 forward instead.

Ms. Gorman stated that she did not think bringing one of the new houses forward made sense because, as secondary structures, they should be behind the main Queen Anne house. She added that placing the two new houses in line with each other was consistent with the newer construction projects across the street. Chair Hornaday noted the added gables potentially differentiated the houses enough.

In response to Ms. Cole Mr. Markilus stated that the driveway would be gravel.

Chair Hornaday asked about the proposed landscaping plan and new plantings. Mr. Markulis said the plan included shrubs from the recommended species list, as well as a new Scarlet oak tree to replace the one being removed. Chair Hornaday asked how many trees would be removed for construction, and Mr. Markilus said one.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 7:15 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

HEARING ON CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Owner/Applicant: CTGNC1 LLC/Jakub Markulis
Subject Property: 31 Grindstaff Drive
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648428118
Zoning District: RS8

MOTION TO APPROVE/DENY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Application and Project Description (3 pages); Exhibit B - New Construction Worksheet (4 pages); Exhibit C - Site Plans, Floor Plans & Elevation Drawings (7 pages); Exhibit D - Material Specifications (5 pages); Exhibit E - Owner's Affidavit; Exhibit F - Photographs of Existing Structure (2 pages); Exhibit G - Streetscape Rendering; 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 construction of a two-story, 2,360 square foot primary structure with stucco foundation, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement lap siding with 5.25" reveal, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement shingle siding, and CertainTeed Landmark Max Def asphalt shingle roof in Cobblestone Gray; windows will be 1/1 double-hung and single lite awning; doors will be Simpson Craftsman Collection 3-lite over wood panel with single lite transoms; all trim, fascia and soffits will be constructed of Miratec; front and rear entries will be set within covered porches with wrapped posts supported by stucco piers, painted wood deck flooring, painted wood railing with 2" x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, painted wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps; porches will be screened with square painted wood lattice. One (1) mature tree will be removed to accommodate construction; remove existing driveway and construct 12' wide dark colored shared driveway with concrete apron adjacent to side elevation and parking pad adjacent to rear elevation; existing historic brick swale will be retained and preserved; construct brick walkways connecting front entry stairs to driveway; installation of mechanical unit screened with plantings adjacent to east elevation. Foundation plantings will be installed; 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 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 84-85, Garages and Accessory Structures on pages 28-29, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 44-45, Landscaping and Trees on pages 34-35, Sidewalks, Streets and Public Infrastructure on p. 40-41, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 76-77, Lighting on pages 36-37, and Archaeology on pages 26-27 in the St. Dunstan's Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted September 12, 2012, 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. Grading will be minimized, and significant site features, including trees greater than 6" DBH, brick swale/sidewalk and any known archaeological features, will be protected from damage during or as a result of construction.
d. New primary structure is designed to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding buildings.
e. New primary structure is designed to be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district.
f. Detailing on new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
g. Materials and finishes are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail and color to historic materials found in the district.
h. Doors and windows are compatible in materials, proportion, subdivision, pattern and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.
i. New driveway and off-street parking are compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
j. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees.
k. Trees to be removed will be replaced with same or similar species from the St. Dunstan's Recommended Species list.
l. Mechanical unit will be located adjacent to the side elevation and screened with plantings.

2. 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 St. Dunstan's Historic District.

Motion by: Mr. Skouby
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

1. Window specifications, tree and brick sidewalk protection plan, brick sample, mechanical unit specifications, trash enclosure rendering and driveway/parking surface material will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Mr. Skouby
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

HEARING ON CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Owner/Applicant: CTGNC1 LLC/Jakub Markulis
Subject Property: 35 Grindstaff Drive
Hearing Date: August 13, 2025
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648428118
Zoning District: RS8

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (35 Grindstaff Dr.)

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - Application and Project Description (3 pages); Exhibit B - New Construction Worksheet (4 pages); Exhibit C - Site Plans, Floor Plans & Elevation Drawings (6 pages); Exhibit D - Material Specifications (5 pages); Exhibit E - Owner's Affidavit; Exhibit F - Streetscape Rendering & Photographs of Existing Structure (3 pages); Exhibit G - Plat; 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 construction of a two-story, 2,360 square foot primary structure with stucco foundation, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement lap siding with 5.25" reveal, smooth Hardieplank fiber cement shingle siding, and CertainTeed Landmark Max Def asphalt shingle roof in Cobblestone Gray; windows will be 1/1 double-hung and single lite awning; doors will be Simpson Craftsman Collection 3-lite over wood panel with single lite transoms; all trim, fascia and soffits will be constructed of Miratec; front and rear entries will be set within covered porches with wrapped posts supported by stucco piers, painted wood deck flooring, painted wood railing with 2" x 2" square pickets spaced 4" on center, painted wood tongue and groove ceiling, and painted wood steps; porches will be screened with square painted wood lattice. One (1) mature trees will be removed to accommodate construction; remove existing driveway and construct 12' wide dark colored gravel shared driveway with concrete apron adjacent to side elevation, and parking pad adjacent to rear elevation; existing historic brick swale will be retained and preserved; construct brick walkways connecting front entry stairs to driveway; installation of mechanical unit screened with plantings adjacent to east elevation. Foundation plantings will be installed; 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 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 84-85, Garages and Accessory Structures on pages 28-29, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 44-45, Landscaping and Trees on pages 34-35, Sidewalks, Streets and Public Infrastructure on p. 40-41, Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 76-77, Lighting on pages 36-37, and Archaeology on pages 26-27 in the St. Dunstan's Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted September 12, 2012, 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. Grading will be minimized, and significant site features, including trees greater than 6" DBH, brick swale/sidewalk and any known archaeological features, will be protected from damage during or as a result of construction.
    d. New primary structure is designed to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, footprint, material, detail, fenestration and proportion with surrounding buildings.
    e. New primary structure is designed to be compatible but differentiated from historic buildings in the district.
    f. Detailing on new structure is consistent with its overall scheme and design.
    g. Materials and finishes are compatible in composition, texture, pattern, detail and color to historic materials found in the district.
    h. Doors and windows are compatible in materials, proportion, subdivision, pattern and detail with those of surrounding historic buildings.
    i. New driveway and off-street parking are compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
    j. Protective fencing will be installed around critical root zones of existing mature trees.
    k. Trees to be removed will be replaced with same or similar species from the St. Dunstan's Recommended Species list.
    l. Mechanical unit will be located adjacent to 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 St. Dunstan’s Historic District.

Motion by: Vice Chair Oliva

Second by: Ms. Gorman

Vote for: Unanimous

Vote against: None

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

1. Window specifications, tree and brick sidewalk protection plan, brick sample, mechanical unit specifications, trash enclosure rendering and driveway/parking surface material will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Vice Chair Oliva
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

Other Business

Ms. Cole stated there was no other business for the meeting.

Adjournment

At 7:27 p.m., Chair Hornaday moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Vice Chair Oliva and carried unanimously.