Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County
Meeting Minutes of December 10, 2025
1st Floor North Conference Room
City Hall (70 Court Plaza)
4:00 p.m.

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

Absent: Amy Gharst, Hans Skouby

Staff: David Hazzard, Jannice Ashley, Drew Wilson, Logan Smith

Administrative

- Ms. Gorman moved to approve the minutes and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the November 12, 2025 meeting and the minutes of the November 14, 2025 special work session. This motion was seconded by Mr. Mays 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

Vice-Chair Oliva made a motion to continue the application for 52 Cumberland Circle to the January 14, 2026 meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.

Urban Designer David Hazzard presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 5-9 Kitchin Place (PINs 9647697848, 9647697846, 9647697834) - Replacement of front entry door, installation of new awnings and signage, and installation of opaque film on rear elevation windows. Applicant: Jason Kirby

Owner/Applicant: KITCHIN PLACE LLC/Jason Kirby
Subject Property: 5-9 Kitchin Place
Hearing Date: December 10, 2025
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9647697848, 9647697846, 9647697834
Zoning District: Community Business II

Property Description: 5 Kitchin Place: Two-story, red-brick building with a flat roof and flat parapet. Half-round, basketweave brick blind arches top the three upper-level windows;

storefront consists of a large display window and a single-leaf, fully-glazed door; ca. 1929. 7 Kitchin Place: One-story, red-brick, flat-roofed commercial building with flat parapet topped with tile; storefront consists of a large, divided light display window and a recessed half-glazed door; ca. 1965. 9 Kitchin Place: One-story, red-brick, flat-roofed commercial building with a flat parapet. Entrance is recessed between canted walls and large display windows with wood shingles below; ca. 1929.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing wood paneled front entry door with new Kawneer single-lite aluminum door; repair of existing wood trim and repainting of wood trim and doors; replacement of existing green canvas awnings with new black canvas awnings with gold lettering in same locations on front and rear elevations; repainting of existing flush-mounted sign panel in Benjamin Moore Black Ink; application of black opaque film to windows on rear elevation. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Maintain large display windows that are characteristic of original commercial buildings; opaque materials are not appropriate in the place of glass, because they diminish pedestrian interest as well as alter the historic character (Book 2, p. 11 #18); staff has concerns regarding the proposed opaque film on the rear display windows.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Rendering of structure showing new door
    - Exact style of door and framing identified in the specifications

The standards for General Guidelines for Rehabilitation found on pages 5-10 of Book 2, Chapter 2, General Guidelines for Rehabilitation of "Commercial Type" Buildings on pages 11-16 of Book 2, Chapter 3, the Guidelines for Signs on pages 35-42 of Book 1, Chapter 6, the Guidelines for Color on pages 43-44 of Book 1, Chapter 7, were used to evaluate this request.

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

1. Original design character of the building is being respected.
2. Door to be replaced was damaged due to flooding, and does not contribute to the historic character of the building or district.
3. New door is compatible with the existing building and district in design and material.
4. Signage and awnings are existing; new awnings and signage colors are consistent with the overall color scheme of the buildings.

Mr. Hazzard presented an application for replacement of a front entry door, installation of new awnings and signage, and installation of opaque film on rear elevation windows. He explained the proposed front elevation work included replacing the green awning with a black awning, repainting the existing sign black, and replacing a non-original wooden door with a new green aluminum and glass door similar to an existing door on the adjacent building. Mr. Hazzard explained the work on the rear elevation included replacing the existing green awning with a black awning and applying an opaque film to a window. He noted staff had no significant concerns with the proposal, finding it consistent with adjacent properties.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Hazzard for clarification on the film proposed for the front window, noting it sounded different from the film discussed for the rear window. Mr. Hazzard said the application noted the film would be transparent, but he preferred to let the applicant speak directly to the issue for further detail.

Project designer Tracy Moore clarified the window film proposal. She explained that the front display windows will have the existing dark film replaced with a crystal-clear UV film to improve visibility, while two rear windows exposing the back-of-house area will receive a darker, blackout film for protection and privacy. Ms. Moore also noted that they will repair the storefront window muntins and repaint the existing brown trim on that facade to match the green used elsewhere on the building. The new door will be finished to closely match the surrounding existing metalwork.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:21 p.m. Property owner Benjamin Mitchell addressed the commission, and clarified that the application specifically concerned 7 Kitchin Place. Mr. Mitchell noted that 7 Kitchin Place was constructed around 1970 after a fire, resulting in a difference in brick material compared to older surrounding buildings. He confirmed that the new door proposed for this building would align with the existing style of the entry door on the adjacent building, which was installed during a 2013 renovation. Mr. Mitchell noted his support of the application.

Ms. Humphrey asked Mr. Mitchell why the door replacement aimed for a commercial storefront look rather than a more historic appearance. Mr. Mitchell responded that the proposed door replacement was intended to match the existing commercial, aluminum-framed door at the adjacent property, 5 Kitchin Place.

Ms. Humphrey asked Mr. Mitchell why the opaque film was needed. Mr. Mitchell explained the rear elevation was 60 to 80 feet from the public right-of-way and was used primarily for service access versus public storefront access. He noted that the adjacent parcel to the south was under contract, which may further obscure the rear windows in the near future. The window film was intended to provide staff privacy.

When no one else spoke, Chair Hornaday closed the floor for public comment at 4:24 p.m.

Planning Technician Drew Wilson asked for clarification on what conditions were to be submitted for staff review. Ms. Moore explained that half of the muntins on the window on the

front elevation were missing or broken, and their contractor proposed to repair them to their original appearance using like-for-like materials. Additionally, all existing brown trim on the front elevation of the building was to be repainted to a green color that staff will receive for reference. This information would be submitted for staff review and approval following the meeting.

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 (4 pages); Exhibit B - project description (4 pages); Exhibit C - owner affidavit; Exhibit D - door proposal and specifications (43 pages); Exhibit E - sign and awning proposal and specifications (10 pages); Exhibit F - pre-helene storefront images; 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 replacement of existing wood paneled front entry door with new Kawneer single-lite aluminum door; repair of existing wood trim and repainting of wood trim and doors; replacement of existing green canvas awnings with new black canvas awnings with gold lettering in same locations on front and rear elevations; repainting of existing flush-mounted sign panel in Benjamin Moore Black Ink; application of black opaque film to windows on rear elevation. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for General Guidelines for Rehabilitation found on pages 5-10 of Book 2, Chapter 2, General Guidelines for Rehabilitation of "Commercial Type" Buildings on pages 11-16 of Book 2, Chapter 3, the Guidelines for Signs on pages 35-42 of Book 1, Chapter 6, the Guidelines for Color on pages 43-44 of Book 1, Chapter 7, were used to evaluate this request.

3. This application **does** meet the design standards for the following reasons:
    a. Original design character of the building is being respected.
    b. Door to be replaced was damaged due to flooding, and does not contribute to the historic character of the building or district.
    c. New door is compatible with the existing building and district in design and material.
    d. Signage and awnings are existing; new awnings and signage colors are consistent with the overall color scheme of the buildings.
    e. Opaque black film on rear display windows is not visible from the public right of way.

4. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** congruous with the special historic character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: 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 condition:

1. Documentation of needed window repair and paint color 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 - 15 Pearson Dr (PIN 9649026247) - Modifications to two (2) existing windows on a side elevation and partial enclosure of porch on rear elevation. Applicant: Vincent Wiegman

Mr. Hazzard presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Hearing on Certificate of Appropriateness

Owner/Applicant: JONES WILLIAM F;JONES JILL N/Vincent Wiegman
Subject Property: 15 Pearson Drive
Hearing Date: December 10, 2025
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649026247
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.19 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century plain two-story shingle sided dwelling with bungaloid details, center gable, wide eaves, shingle porch posts; constructed prior to 1917.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Modification of two existing double-hung windows on side elevation; partial enclosure of existing porch on rear elevation; enclosed area will have two new wood 1/1 double-hung windows and wood siding and trim matching existing. 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. Changing existing window openings should be undertaken only for compelling reasons (p. 84); retain and preserve original windows that contribute to the overall character and form of historic buildings (#1, p.8); proposed modification is for the purpose of accommodating interior countertop height; staff does not support removal of the lower sashes for this purpose; staff does support an interior modification, such as covering the interior of the lower sashes with a film so as to retain and preserve the existing windows.
2. Enclosure of a side or rear porch is discouraged. If enclosure of a side or rear porch is requested for a new use, design the enclosure so that the historic character and features of the porch are preserved (#9, p. 73); proposed enclosure should incorporate existing railing and post so that they remain visible from the exterior.
3. New window within enclosed area should be wood (#7, p. 85); new window is proposed to be wood but updated specifications will be needed if upper sash will have divided lites as shown on the drawing.
4. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:
    - Revised window specifications

The standards for Windows and Doors found on pages 85-86 and Porches, Entrances and Balconies on pages 72-73 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 recommend approval of the request for the following reasons, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. Existing windows are being retained and preserved.
2. Porch enclosure is on the rear elevation, and enclosure is designed so that the historic character and features of the porch are preserved.
3. New window will be wood.

Mr. Hazzard presented an application for modifications to two existing windows on a side elevation and partial enclosure of porch on rear elevation. Mr. Hazzard explained the applicant sought to remove the lower sashes of two side windows and infill the openings with shake siding due to interior renovations, but staff recommended maintaining the windows on the exterior. Additionally, he noted, the application proposed enclosing a portion of the upper rear covered porch and adding one new 6/1 wood window. Mr. Hazzard advised that the design of this rear addition should maintain or recognize the existing dominant porch posts to preserve the original design.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Hazzard if staff's recommendation to retain the original elements applied only to the posts or also to the white frame around them. Mr. Hazzard believed the intention was to maintain the frame, but he deferred to the applicant for details, noting the proposed new window would be located in that area.

Project architect Vince Wiegman confirmed Mr. Hazzard's presentation, noting the owner was prepared to follow the commission's recommendation regarding the windows on the side elevation, choosing between infilling the lower sash with shingles or retaining the window with internal film and insulation. Mr. Wiegman explained that for the rear porch enclosure, the initial design used cedar shingles and a new window, mimicking an adjacent window, but staff suggested retaining the visible white framing. Mr. Wigman stated that they could install panels set back from the white trim but worried it might look unusual. He also confirmed the replacement window was a Marvin authentic wood divided light window.

Chair Hornaday expressed concern that maintaining the framing of the sleeping porch brackets would result in them cutting through the proposed new window, making it unclear where the window should be placed. Mr. Weigman explained the proposed window was positioned to align with a bathroom window, and it was set specifically to work alongside the existing architectural elements. Chair Hornaday asked how many of the four porch posts would remain. Mr. Weigman replied that they were keeping the last two posts.

Mr. Mays asked Mr. Weigman what the porch was being used for currently. Mr. Weigman explained it was a sleeping porch with a low ceiling. Mr. Mays asked if there was any screening or windows in the openings. Mr. Weigman noted he thought it was completely open but was unsure. He explained that the porch had been altered many times over the years, and it was screened by vegetation in the backyard.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Weigman if he agreed to keeping the white trim around the proposed enclosed area. Mr. Weigman said that was correct, and he planned to match the wood shakes and recess them behind the existing white trim. Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Weigman if he agreed to saving the door that was to be removed from the porch. Mr. Weigman agreed and noted it could be stored in the basement. Chair Hornaday then asked Mr. Weigman whether the shingles on the proposed addition would wrap around the corner or terminate at a wood post. Mr. Weigman clarified that the shingles would likely wrap around the corner to match the home's existing cedar-shingled corners.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:38 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Ms. Humphrey asked Mr. Weigman how many windows and doors were being modified. Mr. Weigman clarified that for the side elevation, they intended to follow staff guidance by keeping both bottom window sashes unchanged. On the rear elevation, the plan involved adding one matching 6/1 wood window and removing a door to create an enclosed space, while also repairing a separate glass door by replacing its current cat door with a glass panel.

Ms. Gorman asked Chair Hornaday to explain what the commission was voting to approve. Chair Hornaday clarified that the windows on the side elevation would remain unchanged on the exterior, and that the framing around the porch area being enclosed would remain. Ms. Gorman asked for clarification as to whether all the porch posts would remain as staff recommended, or if two posts were being removed. Mr. Weigman noted that either could be done. Chair Horndady noted that it was best to leave all posts and trim as is.

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 (5 pages); Exhibit B - owner affidavit; Exhibit C - floor plans and elevation renderings (9 pages); Exhibit D - photographs; 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 partial enclosure of existing porch on rear elevation; enclosed area will have one new wood 6/1 double-hung window and wood siding and trim matching existing. 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 Windows and Doors found on pages 85-86 and Porches, Entrances and Balconies on pages 72-73 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 windows are being retained and preserved.
    b. Porch enclosure is on the rear elevation, and enclosure is designed so that the historic character and features of the porch are preserved.
    c. New window will be wood.

4. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

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

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

1. Manufacturer specifications for new window will be submitted for staff review and approval.
2. Existing door being removed will be retained and preserved on site.

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.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 123 West Chestnut Street (PIN 9649123772) - Construction of new one-and-a-half story, 1,000 square foot accessory structure. Applicant: Donald Nicholson

Mr. Hazzard presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Hearing on Certificate of Appropriateness

Owner/Applicant: NUALART JAIME;GREENE ELEANOR/Donald Nicholson
Subject Property: 123 West Chestnut Street
Hearing Date: December 10, 2025
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649123772
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.27 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century asymmetrical stucco dwelling with wide eaves, Montford brackets, stone foundations, molded detail, bay windows.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construction of a one-and-a-half story, 1,000 square foot accessory structure with stone veneer foundation, painted pebbledash and wood shake siding, and CertainTeed Landmark asphalt shingles in Colonial Slate color; windows will be Marvin aluminum clad 12/1 and multi-lite casement SDL in Wineberry color; pedestrian doors will Reeb wood multi-lite over panel and garage doors Carriage House Door Company wood panel with multi-lite transoms; entry on south elevation will be set within an engaged porch with wood flooring, steps, ceiling and handrail matching primary structure; structure will have painted wood brackets at roof overhangs matching primary structure. Site work, including removal of one 12" DBH Cherry tree, construction of brick walkway between primary structure and new accessory structure; construction of a ___ long x __ tall stone veneer retaining wall, and installation of 28" x 37" x 15" mini-split unit adjacent to east elevation of new structure; ground cover must be established within 15 days after 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. Keep the proportion of new accessory structures compatible with the proportion of the main house (primary structure) in terms of height, footprint and massing. New accessory structures should be no more than 30% of the scale of the main house (# 6, p. 35); square footage of the proposed new structure is nearly 50% of the square footage of the existing primary structure.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Manufacturer specifications for door on south elevation and light fixtures
    - Dimensions for proposed retaining wall
    - Certified arborist report for tree removal and replanting plan

The standards for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, Landscaping and Trees on pages 40-41, Lighting on pages 42-43, Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking on pages 50-51, Fences and Walls on pages 36-37, Archaeology on pages 32-33 and Utilities and Mechanical Systems on pages 82-83 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 recommend approval of the request for the following reasons, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. Proportion of new accessory structure is compatible with the proportion of the primary structure in terms of height, footprint and massing, and is not more than 30% of the main house and not taller than one-and-a-half stories.

2. New accessory structure is sited in a location so as to be in keeping with the historic pattern in terms of relationship to primary structures, traditional location of ancillary buildings, orientation, setback, retention of green space and spacing between structures.
3. New accessory structure has a traditional roof form, materials and details compatible with the main building.
4. New mechanical unit will be inconspicuously located and screened with shrubs.
5. Retaining wall will be constructed of stone veneer and will be sited in locations that are compatible with the traditional historic relationship of walls and walkways to historic properties in the district.
6. Walkway will be constructed of brick and is compatible with the site and district in terms of dimension, configuration, materials, color and texture.
7. Tree being removed is _____; replacement tree will be the same or similar species from the Montford Recommended Species List.

Mr. Hazzard presented the application for a new one-and-a-half story, 1,000 square foot accessory structure. He explained that the design of the new structure was consistent with the primary structure. Mr. Hazzard noted staff's main concern was that the overall square footage of the new structure exceeded 30% of the square footage of the primary structure. He noted, however, the accessory structure's footprint was only 36% of the primary structure's footprint. Mr. Hazzard continued that staff's remaining concerns were minor and included requests for specific manufacturing specifications for the pedestrian door on the south elevation, as well as any light fixtures. Staff had also requested the dimensions for a proposed retaining wall. Overall, staff found the project generally acceptable, provided the scale and missing technical specifications were addressed to the commission's satisfaction.

Ms. Humphrey asked Mr. Hazzard where the front entrance for the accessory structure was going to be located. Mr. Hazzard replied that he thought it was facing Cumberland Alley, but said he would defer to the applicant. Ms. Humphrey raised concern about addressing. Mr. Hazzard explained that would be addressed later in the development application process.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Hazzard if the six feet for setbacks was enough for the district. Mr. Hazzard explained that the underlying zoning allowed for 6' side and rear setbacks for accessory structures. Mr. Roberts then asked if this proposed structure would affect parking requirements. Mr. Hazzard explained that parking was not required from a zoning perspective.

Mr. Donald Nicholson, applicant and builder, addressed the commission and explained that the proposed accessory structure complied with established precedents in his opinion, and noted that under the City of Asheville's zoning ordinances, unconditioned space like a garage was typically excluded from square footage calculations for accessory dwelling units (ADUs). He contended that if the garage level were excluded from the square footage calculation, the project would align with other recently approved ADUs in Montford; furthermore, he suggested that the guidelines lack a standardized volumetric formula for comparison.

Mr. Mays suggested there had potentially recently been an amendment to the Montford Standards in regards to massing. Ms. Ashley noted that while the City has a general ordinance for ADUs, the historic district operated as an overlay where more restrictive standards often

apply. She recalled past discussions about refining the definitions of mass and one-and-a-half-story structures but questioned whether the commission ever reached a clear, finalized method for calculating those comparisons.

Vice-Chair Oliva asked Mr. Nicholson what the height of the proposed structure was. Mr. Nicholson responded it was 24 feet, but he was unsure of the primary structure's height. He assumed it was quite tall given its large foundation and being two stories tall.

Mr. Mays observed that the proposed accessory structure would not appear to overwhelm the site. He noted that he struggled to see how several other accessory dwelling units built in the neighborhood over the last decade could have complied with the 30% rule or the one-and-a-half-story requirement if the garage level were included in those calculations. Mr. Nicholson agreed and explained he wished Historic Resources Planner, Alex Cole, was present because he had talked with her before on these issues. Chair Hornaday noted there were four other similarly sized structures on Cumberland Alley.

Chair Hornaday asked if the garage doors were natural wood or a painted finish. Mr. Nicholson said he was not sure. Chair Hornaday suggested that the applicant coordinate with staff to specify the garage door finish. Additionally, he recommended that Mr. Nicholson apply for a separate minor work application for the proposed structure's lighting plan. Chair Hornaday then asked Mr. Nicholson for the dimensions of the proposed retaining wall and about placement of the HVAC unit. Mr. Nicholson clarified that the proposed retaining wall would be a triangular tapered design, reaching a maximum height of 18 inches and tapering down to zero over the approximately 12-foot depth of the parking pad. He noted that if the city imposed no requirement for the parking area, no retaining wall would be constructed at all.

Ms. Bowen asked Mr. Nicholson why the cherry tree was being removed. Mr. Nicholson explained the tree was growing at an angle that would eventually impact the proposed structure. He noted they were planting a replacement tree from the Montford Recommended Species list.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:09 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Vice-Chair Oliva asked Mr. Hazzard for clarification on the discrepancy between staff's 50% total square footage calculation and his 36% footprint measurement. Mr. Hazzard clarified that while the design qualified as a one-and-a-half-story structure, it still exceeded the 30% limit set by the standards. He suggested that the project was not strictly compliant with the numerical guideline, but remained relatively close.

Chair Hornaday noted the standards explicitly state accessory structures are to be no larger than 30% in scale of the primary structure. Mr. Hazzard explained the proposed structure did not have an official calculation. Chair Hornaday asked if it was staff's responsibility to calculate this measurement. Mr. Hazzard replied he did not believe it fell on staff to calculate.

Ms. Gorman stated that if the garage and porch were excluded from the calculation, the actual livable space of the new structure would be roughly 600 square feet, which aligned closely with the 30% scale requirement of the main home's living area. Chair Hornaday acknowledged the difficulty of defining mass and scale but noted that the structure's height

would not be out of place given the series of tall ADUs along Cumberland Alley. He stated that he was willing to accept staff's 36% footprint calculation as a reasonable interpretation of the guidelines.

Vice-Chair Oliva expressed concern regarding precedent being set, noting that without a standardized formula, the commission was essentially guessing at the mass and relying on a 36% figure that may not be precisely defined.

Chair Hornaday requested the applicant submit a drawing showing the primary structure and proposed accessory structure side-by-side. Mr. Mays raised concern that side-by-side comparison was not a complete representation of scale or massing.

Mr. Nicholson suggested that if the massing calculation accounted for the primary house's full walk-in basement, which is currently excluded from footprint and square footage data, the volume of the accessory structure would fall well under the 30% threshold. Vice-Chair Oliva noted the side-by-side scale comparison would illustrate the structures above ground.

Mr. Nicholson asserted that a volume-based calculation of the structures above grade would likely prove the accessory structure is less than 30% of the main house, as traditional square footage and footprint metrics fail to accurately reflect their scale relationship by inconsistently accounting for unconditioned spaces such as the primary structure's multi-story basement. Chair Hornaday emphasized that the commission's focus was on visual scale and ensuring the structure belonged in the historic neighborhood, clarifying that their goal was not to be personal but to honor the intent of the 30% guideline.

Mr. Nicholson argued that if the commission strictly applied footprint or square footage metrics that included the garage space, no ADU approved in the last decade would be compliant, and he pointed to 230 Cumberland Avenue and 326 Cumberland Avenue as potential nearby precedent for the commission to consider. Mr. Mays suggested that the most appropriate course of action might be to return with a formal above-grade volume calculation or additional research on how the scale of previously approved ADUs was measured.

Mr. Nicholson asked what specific data he needed to bring back to the commission to get his application approved. He noted he has never needed this much information to get an accessory structure approved in Montford before. Ms. Watkins stated that while the commission generally supports the project, they require more precise numbers and certainties within the exhibits to move forward.

Ms. Gorman asked Mr. Nicholson if he was open to making the accessory structure smaller. Mr. Nicholson explained he was willing if needed, but he wanted to better understand the 30% rule. He pushed back on new calculations, pointing out that since the proposal currently showed a 50% square footage and 36% footprint ratio against a 30% guideline, requiring a specific volumetric calculation would be inconsistent with how past projects were evaluated.

Ms. Ashley explained if Mr. Nicholson continued his application to the January meeting, he would have time to talk with Ms. Cole about similar previously approved cases. She noted the commission was just interpreting and enforcing the concerns raised in Ms. Cole's staff

report. Mr. Mays and Mr. Hazzard agreed.

Chair Hornaday suggested, again, that Mr. Nicholson provide a side-by-side comparison of the primary structure and proposed accessory structure. Ms. Gorman noted the cost associated with having these images drawn, and she suggested that Mr. Nicholson wait and discuss additional materials needed with Ms. Cole.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Nicholson if he wanted to continue the application to January. Mr. Nicholson asked if he needed the side-by-side drawing, and Ms. Gorman replied he should consult with Ms. Cole first. Mr. Nicholson, again, questioned the accuracy of the data being used to judge the project, pointing out that a 1,700-square-foot footprint for a two-story house would typically result in a much higher total square footage than the 2,000 feet listed on the tax card. He argued that the current footprint and square footage metrics are inadequate substitutes for a true massing calculation. Mr. Nicholson argued the commission was using flawed data to strictly enforce an arbitrary 30% guideline.

Ms. Watkins explained the commission and Mr. Nicholson needed to consult with staff, and she believed this could be easily sorted out by next month. Chair Hornaday asked if Mr. Nicholson would continue his application to January 2026. Mr. Nicholson agreed to continue his application.

Vice-Chair Oliva made a motion to continue the application for 123 West Chestnut Street to the January 14, 2026 meeting. Ms. Gorman seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness - 71 Starnes Ave (PIN 9649225103) - Removal of rear addition and deck; construction of new rear addition and covered porch. Applicant: Andrew Willett

Chair Hornaday asked to recuse himself from the hearing because the applicant was his client. Vice-Chair Oliva made a motion to recuse Chair Hornaday, and to take Chair responsibilities while Chair Hornaday was recused. Ms. Watkins seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously.

Mr. Hazzard presented the following staff report and oriented the commission to the property.

Hearing on Certificate of Appropriateness

Owner/Applicant:	KIRCHGASSER THOMAS M;KIRCHGASSER JOYCE D/Willett Architecture
Subject Property:	71 Starnes Avenue
Hearing Date:	December 10, 2025
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649225103
Zoning District:	RM8

Property Description: 0.11 acre parcel containing a late 19th-early 20th-century one-story plain vernacular cottage; constructed prior to 1917.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Removal of existing deck on rear elevation; modification of existing ell on rear elevation, including removal of shed roof and replacement with new hipped roof, replacement of an existing non-original window with a new 6/1 TDL double-hung wood window, and resurfacing of block foundation with textured stucco; construction of a new _____ square foot, two-story addition with wood lap siding and asphalt shingle roofing matching existing, 4/1 and 6/1 TDL double-hung wood windows, _____ entry door and Assa Abloy garage door with multi-lite transom on lower level; construction of a 16' x 21' covered porch with _____ composite decking, painted wood railing with ___ wide top and bottom rails and 1.5" square pickets spaced 4" on center, and painted ____ screening above railing on east elevation. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Inset additions from rear building corners to differentiate them from the existing building and to reduce public visibility (#3, p. 89); new addition is not inset from rear building corner.
2. New or replacement windows and doors on existing historic homes should be wood (#7, p. 85); proposed windows are aluminum clad.
3. Windows in additions should be similar to those in the original building in their proportion, spacing and materials (#6, p. 89); staff has concerns regarding consistency of the 4/1 windows with existing windows on the house.
4. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional items for review:

    - Square footage calculation for addition
    - Manufacturer specifications for wood windows and pedestrian door
    - Railing and screening detail drawings
    - Composite decking material sample

The standards for Additions found on pages 88-89, Porches, Entrances and Balconies on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors on pages 78-79 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 recommend approval of the request for the following reasons, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. New addition will be inset and sited as inconspicuously as possible on the rear elevation where historic character defining features are not damaged, destroyed or obscured.

2. Addition is designed to be compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch.
3. Windows in addition are similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing and materials.
4. New porch is on the rear elevation and is compatible with the existing structure in terms of roof form, scale, details, materials and color.
5. New windows and doors will be wood.

Mr. Hazzard presented an application for construction of a new rear addition and covered porch. He explained that the applicant was proposing to remove an existing rear deck and shed-roof addition and construct a new addition/porch with a garage underneath. He noted that the applicant had addressed several initial staff concerns by switching to 6/1 all-wood windows, and replacing composite decking with black locust wood. Mr. Hazzard continued that the addition was not inset from the corners as typically recommended by the guidelines, but staff was generally supportive of the project. He concluded that the newly added lattice screening for the upper deck, though not in the original report, also appeared consistent with the standards.

Project architect, Andrew Willet, introduced himself and the project, and noted that the proposed work aimed to simplify and unify the rear of the structure. He explained that by removing a previous addition's non-standard siding and shed roof, they could integrate a new high-roof kitchen area and low-roof porch that mirrored the home's original roofline. Mr. Willet explained the newly proposed lattice was to provide privacy from a nearby common alley and a close neighbor. Finally, he confirmed that they would stucco the exposed CMU block foundation and install wood Marvin windows with a consistent 6/1 light pattern, adjusting sill heights only where necessary for internal kitchen counters.

Vice-Chair Oliva asked if Mr. Willet would consider changing the addition’s inset. Mr. Willet proposed that instead of maintaining a perfectly flush plane, they could in-set the addition and porch by six inches, which would allow for a proper mitered corner in the cypress siding that matched the existing craftsmanship of the house.

Vice-Chair Oliva asked Mr. Willet to explain the proposed changes in siding material. Mr. Willet explained that the current rear section features a confusing mix of materials, including asbestos siding and mismatched block foundation, which he believed may have been a former sleeping porch that was poorly infilled over time. He proposed applying stucco to the foundation as an economical way to hide the uneven joints and differing block sizes that currently show through the paint, while unifying the upper walls with consistent cypress siding.

Vice-Chair Oliva noted the lattice on the side of the porch looked modern and asked the commission for their opinions. Mr. Willet clarified that his proposal was for a nicer 2-inch stock lattice material, and confirmed the structure could easily be removed in the future to satisfy historic preservation preferences. Ms. Humphrey noted that it was removable, and she compared it to shades or curtains, which were commonly found in the Montford historic district.

Ms. Bowen stated she believed the lattice appeared too modern. Ms. Gorman asked for clarification on where in the standards lattice was discouraged. Ms. Bowen explained the

standards discouraged enclosing side or rear porches. Ms. Gorman argued that lattice was not considered an enclosure. Ms. Humphrey added this lattice was removable as well.

Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Willet for the dimensions of the top and bottom railing. Mr. Willet specified that since the house currently lacked a front porch railing, he planned to install a standard Montford historical profile featuring a 2x6” top rail, a 1x3” sub-rail, and a 2x4” bottom rail. The design includes 1.5 x 1.5” square balusters spaced four inches on center to maintain a traditional appearance consistent with the neighborhood's character.

Vice-Chair Oliva opened the floor for public comment at 5:59 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the floor for public comment. There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and project description (5 pages); Exhibit B - elevation renderings and floor plans (8 pages); Exhibit C - owner affidavit; Exhibit D - photographs (24 pages); Exhibit E - revised elevation renderings and floor plans (8 pages, Received 12-4-25); 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 Removal of existing deck on rear elevation; modification of existing ell on rear elevation, including removal of shed roof and replacement with new hipped roof, replacement of an existing non-original window with a new 6/1 TDL double-hung wood window, and resurfacing of block foundation with textured stucco; construction of a new 208 square foot, two-story addition with wood lap siding and asphalt shingle roofing matching existing, 4/1 and 6/1 TDL double-hung wood windows, wood entry door and Assa Abloy garage door with multi-lite transom on lower level; construction of a 16' x 21' covered porch with Black Locust decking, painted white wood railing with 4” wide top and bottom rails and 2" square pickets spaced 4" on rear, and painted white removable lattice screening above railing on rear and east elevations. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for Additions found on pages 88-89, Porches, Entrances and Balconies on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors on pages 78-79 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/does not** meet the design standards for the following reasons:

a. New addition will be inset and sited as inconspicuously as possible on the rear elevation where historic character defining features are not damaged, destroyed or obscured.
b. Addition is designed to be compatible with the existing building in height, massing, roof form and pitch.
c. Windows in addition are similar to those in the original building in their proportions, spacing and materials.
d. New porch is on the rear elevation and is compatible with the existing structure in terms of roof form, scale, details, materials and color.
e. New windows and doors will be wood.

4. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** congruous with the special historic character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Ms. Moxley
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous; Chair Hornaday was recused from voting
Vote against: None

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

Motion by: Ms. Moxley
Second by: Ms. Gorman
Vote for: Unanimous; Chair Hornaday was recused from voting
Vote against: None

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

Other Business

Lasting Legacies Exhibit

Ms. Bowen spoke about the Lasting Legacies exhibit at the Asheville Art Museum. The exhibit highlighted the work of Douglas Ellington, Richard Sharp Smith and Albert Heath Carrier. She emphasized that the commission has a professional responsibility to study the collection of architectural drawings, particularly those of Richard Sharp Smith given his significance to the Montford neighborhood. She invited the group to a guided tour on Thursday, December 18th, led by architectural historian Bruce Johnson, which will be held from 5:00 to 9:00 p.m. and included live jazz and cocktails.

Sacred Places Panel Discussion

Ms. Bowen announced a second event scheduled for January 11th, which would feature a presentation on sacred architecture led by Jessie Landl from the Preservation Society of Asheville and Buncombe County. The event will host a panel of faith leaders from local landmarks, including a synagogue, the Basilica, First Baptist Church, and A.M.E. Zion, to discuss the architectural significance of their respective houses of worship.

Montford Holiday Home Tour

Chair Hornaday reminded everyone that the Montford Holiday Home Tour was scheduled for Saturday, December 13th, starting at 12:00 p.m. and running for several hours as an all-day event. He noted that tickets can be purchased through the Chamber of Commerce or the Montford neighborhood website and expressed his anticipation for the show.

Adjournment

At 6:07 p.m., Vice-Chair Oliva moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.