Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County
Meeting Minutes of February 11, 2026
1st Floor North Conference Room
City Hall (70 Court Plaza)
4:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Will Hornaday, Amy Moxley, Shannon Watkins, Robert Mays, Jenny Bowen, Cecil Holt, Leslie Humphrey
Absent: Amy Gharst, Celesta Gorman, Vice-Chair Sioux Oliva, Bill Roberts
Staff: Alex Cole, Jannice Ashley, Haley Mahoney, Aspen Johnston

Administrative

- Ms. Bowen moved to approve the minutes as amended by Mr. Mays and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the January 14, 2026 meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Watkins 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.
- Ms. Watkins motioned to continue the hearing for 53 Birch Street to the March 2026 meeting. Mr. Mays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.
- Ms. Watkins motioned to continue the hearing for 345 Montford Avenue to the March 2026 meeting. Mr. Mays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 5 All Souls Crescent (PIN 9647792712) - Replacement of existing vinyl double-hung windows with new aluminum clad windows. Applicant: Josh Scala

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

Owner/Applicant: SEDGEFIELD PROPERTIES LLC/Josh Scala
Subject Property: 5 All Souls Crescent
Hearing Date: February 11, 2026
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9647792712
Zoning District: Community Business I

Property Description: 0.14 acre parcel containing a ca. 1895 one-and-a-half story cottage designed by Richard Sharp Smith.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing double-hung vinyl windows with new wood double-hung SDL windows. 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. Replacement of missing architectural elements should be based on accurate duplications of original features (#9, p.7); use materials similar to those employed historically where feasible (#10, p. 8).

The standards for General Rehabilitation Guidelines found on pages 5- of Chapter 2, Book 2 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted October 1, 1988, 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 were damaged by flooding from Helene, and are not original to the structure or historic.
2. New windows will be wood and similar to the original in design and material.

Ms. Cole stated that the application was for replacement of existing non-original vinyl windows on a cottage in Biltmore Village designed by Richard Sharp Smith. She explained that the existing windows had been damaged by Hurricane Helene and needed to be replaced. Ms. Cole presented the commission with comparable Richard Sharp Smith drawings for 10 All Souls Crescent. The drawings illustrated original window configurations typical of Smith's cottages. Ms. Cole noted that the most common window style featured 9 over 1 sashes, though some 12 over 1 and 8 over 1 windows could also be found in Biltmore Village. The existing vinyl windows contain both 9 over 1 and 6 over 1 configurations. Ms. Cole also presented images of 11 All Souls Crescent for more examples of existing window configurations. She said the application was for replacement of the existing windows with new simulated divided lite windows. This had not come up often in Biltmore Village, but the commission had required true divided lite wood replacement windows in Montford recently. Ms. Cole noted that the original windows on the building would have had true divided lites, but she said she would leave it open for the commission to discuss.

In response to Ms. Humphrey, Ms. Cole said she would recommend that the new windows be 9 or 12 over 1 to be consistent with other windows on existing Sharp cottages.

Chair Hornaday questioned whether the various examples presented were from the same building and Ms. Cole responded that they were from different buildings. She explained that she had not found any examples of 12 over 1 and 9 over 1 windows existing on the same building, but also did not check the entirety of Richard Sharp Smith’s drawings of houses throughout the district so a case of mixed windows may exist. Ms. Cole then noted that for the

ease of the applicant, it may make the most sense to choose to only install 9 over 1 windows.

Chair Hornaday also asked about a case involving the post office building from a few months ago, and wondered if anyone remembered whether their replacement windows included true divided lites or not. Ms. Cole said she didn't recall. She said that the last application that came before the commission for that property was for signage.

Mr. Mays asked about the materials for the replacement windows, and Ms. Cole said that although the agenda stated the application was for aluminum-clad windows, the applicant had revised their proposal to include wood windows.

Mr. Josh Scala, applicant, addressed the commission and reiterated that the current windows on the building were vinyl and not original. Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Scala about the proposed pane configuration, and he responded that he thought the application included 9 over 1 windows. Mr. Mays noted that in the specifications, nineteen of the windows were to be 9 over 1, and two were 6 over 1. Ms. Humphrey noted that those two windows were smaller and on the upper story.

Ms. Cole asked Mr. Scala how high the water had risen during the storm at this location, and Mr. Scala said it had reached the top of the porch.

Ms. Moxley asked if the applicant would be open to true divided lites, and Mr. Scala responded that they would, and if consistency was an issue they would be willing to have all of the windows be 6 over 1 rather than have mixed windows.

Ms. Humphrey asked if the Dutch door on the front elevation was being retained, and Mr. Scala replied that they would be refinishing the door.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:18 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

In response to Mr. Mays on whether or not the commission should require true divided lite windows, Ms. Cole explained that the design standards state that where there is a missing feature the replacement should match or be similar to the original. She said that since the building was missing all of the original windows perhaps simulated divided lites might be ok. She said it was more of a challenge when mixing window types on a building that has existing historic windows. Ms. Cole acknowledged, however, that the original windows on the subject property would have had true divided lites. Chair Hornaday asked Ms. Cole to clarify if her opinion was that the replacement windows should have true divided lites. She said she could go either way but reiterated that the original window type was known in this case.

Ms. Cole made a comparison to a recent application for a door replacement at 7 Kitchin Place where the commission had approved aluminum as the replacement material versus wood. However, she said that was likely not the best comparison since that was on a later commercial structure versus a cottage. Mr. Mays asked if there are different standards for the Joseph Bank store vs. this type of structure, and Ms. Cole explained that the standards do differentiate by building style. She said the previous case she had referenced was not a great comparison since that building was constructed in the 1960s.

Chair Hornaday asked if the commission supported true divided lites, and Ms. Moxley confirmed that she thought that would be most appropriate. Ms. Watkins wondered if the applicant could share whether or not it would set the project back significantly if they chose true divided lite windows. She said she thought that the applicant should look into the specs for ordering true divided lite windows and it could be discussed at the next meeting. Ms. Cole clarified that the exact window specifications could be reviewed at staff level.

Mr. Mays noted that true divided lite windows would be more expensive. Chair Hornanday reiterated that they cannot use that as a criteria for review, and Mr. Mays went on to say that he would feel better about approving the condition of true divided lites if there were a section of the standards that they could directly tie it to. Ms. Watkins pointed out that within page 18 of the Cottage Guidelines in Biltmore Village Standards Book 2 the standards state that the historic proportions of windows should be maintained. Mr. Mays responded that he had read that section, but still wanted more specifics. Ms. Cole noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which form the basis of local district standards, go into great detail as far as maintaining window details. She noted that in this case the historic window materials, styles and configuration are known, and this was an original cottage structure.

There was some general discussion around replacing original features, and what elements were critical. Mr. Mays pointed out the language on page seven that called out the general replacement of original features with new materials that match the original design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Ms. Watkins then pointed out the section regarding ‘missing features,’ in which the architectural elements should be based on accurate duplications of the original. Ms. Humphrey noted that although the original windows would have had true divided lite, the concern of the commission is whether or not the replacements will convey the visual appearance of the original. She noted that if one building had simulated divided lite windows compared to surrounding buildings with true divided lite windows, it would look different.

Chair Hornaday asked if there was need for more discussion, or whether the commission was prepared to make a motion. After confirming they were ready to proceed, Ms. Watkins made the following motion.

MOTION TO APPROVE/DENY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application, owner’s affidavit, and project description (4 pages); Exhibit B - photos (5 pages); Exhibit C - window specifications (3 pages - received January 29, 2026); Exhibit D - Richard Smith Drawing of 10 All Souls Crescent (added by staff February 10, 2026); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

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

1. That the application is for replacement of existing double-hung vinyl windows with new wood double-hung TDL windows. 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 General Rehabilitation Guidelines found on pages 5-10 and Rehabilitation of Cottage Type Structures on pages 17-20 of Chapter 2, Book 2 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted October 1, 1988, were used to evaluate this request.

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

    a. Existing windows were damaged by flooding from Helene, and are not original to the structure or historic.
    b. New windows will be wood, TDL and similar to the original.

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

Motion by: Ms. Watkins
Second by: Ms. Humphrey
Vote for: All
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 TDL window specifications will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Ms. Watkins
Second by: Mr. Mays
Vote for: All
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 - 52 Cumberland Circle (PIN 9649047709) - Replacement of screening on rear porch with windows. Applicant: Jane Haverty

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

Owner/Applicant: JANE MIDDLETON HAVERTY REVOCABLE TRUST/Mike Romero

Subject Property: 52 Cumberland Circle
Hearing Date: February 11, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649047709
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.29 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century one-and-a-half story weatherboarded vernacular shingle dwelling with large centered gables, steeply pitched roof, and Montford brackets; constructed prior to 1917.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing deck screening and door on rear elevation with new wood single lite windows and single lite wood door; windows and doors will be trimmed with wood matching existing materials. 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. Porches may be introduced on side or rear elevations and must be compatible with the existing structure, in terms of roof form, scale, details, materials and color (#12, p. 73); all exterior trim and/or siding materials should be wood to match existing rather than fiber cement.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:
    a. Clarification on need for use of exterior trim/siding materials;
    b. Proposed color of windows and trim/siding materials.

The standards for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 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. New windows and door will be wood.
2. Materials, details and color of porch enclosure are compatible with the existing structure.

Ms. Cole explained that the application for 52 Cumberland Circle had been revised to include wood windows versus aluminum as previously proposed to the commission. She stated that her only concern was that the project description noted that fiber cement was proposed for the trim material, and noted that it should be wood. She said she'd also asked for clarification on the proposed window and trim colors.

Ms. Jane Haverty, property owner, and Mr. Mike Romero, Ms. Haverty's contractor addressed the commission. Mr. Romero explained that the details of the application could easily be amended to suit the recommendations of the commission. He noted that the new windows would be custom made to fit the existing screened openings.

Chair Hornaday asked if the scope involved any work below the windows. Mr. Romero responded that the only work within that area involved sealing the interior since it currently functioned as a porch versus an interior space. Chair Hornaday asked for clarification on the trim materials, and Mr. Romero responded that they would use wood trim rather than fiber cement.

Ms. Cole asked whether the applicant had selected a color for the windows, and Ms. Haverty said the new materials would be painted to match the house. Chair Hornaday asked about whether they were planning to remove the deck railing, and Mr. Romero answered that they were not.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:39 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE/DENY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application (2 pages); Exhibit B - project description; Exhibit C - additional project description; Exhibit D - manufacturer specifications (18 pages); Exhibit E - project quote (2 pages); Exhibit F - photographs (4 pages); Exhibit G - additional photograph; Exhibit H - Sanborn maps (2 pages - added by staff November 3, 2025); Exhibit I - revised project description, photos & specifications (18 pages - received by staff January 27, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

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

1. That the application is for replacement of existing deck screening and door on rear elevation with new wood single lite windows and single lite wood door; windows and doors will be trimmed with painted wood matching existing materials. 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 84-85 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. New windows and door will be wood.
    b. Materials, details and color of porch enclosure are compatible with the existing structure.

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. Mays
Second by: Ms. Watkins
Vote for: All
Vote against: None

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

Motion by: Mr. Mays
Second by: Ms. Watkins
Vote for: All
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 - 265 Cumberland Avenue (PIN 9649045369) - Alteration of existing retaining wall in front yard. Applicant: Jennifer & Andrew Ayala

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

Owner/Applicant: AYALA ANDREW;AYALA JENNIFER/Jennifer & Andrew Ayala
Subject Property: 265 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date: February 11, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649045369
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.36 acre parcel containing the Dr. J. E. Cocke House - an early 20th-century vernacular German sided cottage with irregular roofline and porte-cochere.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Widening of existing driveway and relocation of existing concrete retaining wall in front yard; removal of existing ~8" DBH dogwood tree in front yard to accommodate wall relocation. 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. Retain and preserve historic walls that contribute to the overall historic character of a building or site (#1, p. 37); retain and preserve the location, configuration and materials of intact character defining historic driveways that contribute to the overall historic character of the site, streetscape and district (#1, p. 51); widening of existing driveway and wall relocation will alter the character of the site, streetscape and district.

The standards for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 and Fences and Walls on pages 36-37 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, provided concerns have been addressed:

1. Historic walls that contribute to the overall historic character of a building or site should be retained and preserved.
2. Location, configuration and materials of intact character defining historic driveways that contribute to the overall historic character of the site, streetscape and district should be retained and preserved.

Ms. Cole began by explaining that the application involved alteration of a retaining wall along a driveway on a property that had been undergoing renovations for several years. She explained that the applicant was proposing to alter a retaining wall along the right side of the driveway in order to increase the driveway width. Ms. Cole stated that it was her opinion that widening the driveway would alter the historic character of the site, streetscape, and district. She noted that the driveway in question was fairly wide compared to others in the district. and referenced the driveway at a neighboring property that was much narrower. She also pointed out that the specific way the applicant's driveway opened onto the street was characteristic of the site itself and overall streetscape, furthering her opinion that changing the driveway would alter the character of the streetscape.

Ms. Humphrey asked about a similar driveway approval where a retaining wall was permitted to be moved at a property on the corner of Soco Street and Cumberland Avenue. Ms. Humphrey recalled that this was approved during a renovation of that property, and large trucks were hitting the wall. Ms. Cole responded that she could not remember the specifics of the aforementioned case. She said this type of query came up from time to time, and the commission had made past decisions on a case by case basis.

Mr. Andrew Ayala, property owner and applicant, began by explaining that people were hitting the wall due to the angle of it. He noted that the driveway was approximately ten feet wide throughout until it reached the apron, where it opened up and became much wider.

Mr. Mays asked the applicant if he would be replacing the retaining wall with concrete. Mr. Ayala confirmed that the reconstructed wall would be concrete and match the height and material of the current wall. Chair Hornaday asked whether the driveway itself would be replaced with new concrete. Mr. Ayala said that the existing driveway had been approved previously to be replaced with new concrete, and said that the expanded section of driveway would also be paved with concrete.

Ms. Cole recalled that the portion of the driveway behind the port-cochere had previously been approved to be repaved but she said she didn't recall that the rest of the driveway had been approved for repaving. Mr. Ayala mentioned he thought the previous approval was for the entire driveway, and stated he would revisit the application. Mr. Ayala returned to Chair Hornaday's original question, confirming that the newly exposed ground would be paved with concrete, but he said he would be open to a permeable strip if permeability were a concern.

Chair Hornaday noted that the standards state that historic walls should be retained and preserved, and stated that he didn't see that this application met that standard.

Mr. Mays stated that he wasn't sure straightening the curve of the wall would actually help the issue of people hitting the wall. He also noted that new concrete doesn't resemble the appearance/color of older concrete.

Mr. Holt asked the applicant whether or not an emergency vehicle had ever traversed the driveway, and Mr. Ayala said no. Chair Hornaday noted that the day prior there appeared to have been a trailer "wall to wall" in the driveway Mr. Ayala acknowledged the ability for some vehicles to maneuver the driveway, but said it was a challenge to navigate on a daily basis.

Mr. Ayala noted that he had submitted an alternate site plan. Ms. Cole added that the previous approval had included resurfacing of the entire driveway. Mr. Ayala explained how the alternate site plan differed from the initial proposal, in that it reduced the curve of the retaining wall rather than eliminating it. Ms. Humphrey said she thought the alternate would be preferable as it would look more similar to the existing streetscape. Mr. Ayala added that they were planning to pressure wash the retaining walls in order to have a more cohesive look with the new concrete. Ms. Humphrey suggested they could use buttermilk or dirt to give the new concrete an aged appearance.

Chair Hornaday stated that he understood the applicant's goal, but said he didn't see a huge difference between the two plans. Ms. Watkins noted that the standards state that walls that are damaged beyond repair can be replaced, but questioned whether the wall was in fact damaged beyond repair. She pondered what additional information, including specific measurements, might help with the review. Mr. Mays noted that it would be helpful to know where the new wall would start at the curb to depict how much the driveway would change.

Mr. Ayala said that the driveway was difficult to navigate due to it having walls on either

side.

When there were no further questions for the applicant, Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:08 p.m. When no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Ms. Moxley said she was aligned with Chair Hornaday's stance on the character defining nature of the driveway. Ms. Watkins reiterated that the standards required retention and preservation of the location, configuration, and materials of intact character defining historic driveways. Mr. Mays agreed, and said that he considered the driveway character defining and to alter it would change the configuration. He said he thought the second alternative presented by Mr. Ayala was a better option, but said it would still alter the configuration of the wall.

Conversely, Ms. Bowen said she would like to find a way to work with the applicant to accommodate larger vehicles and somehow maintain the rest of the driveway. She said that the commission must be practical and work with the evolution of peoples' needs. She added that she did not find concrete to be that historical, though she noted you can age it to look more historical over time. She said she was open to compromise; however the original drawing was not something she would approve. Ms. Bowen wondered if there was a way to exclude the curved portion of the wall.

Mr. Holt brought up the issue of access for emergency vehicles. He noted that the design did not seem to be a major deviation from the existing, and expressed interest in working with the applicant to find a solution that addressed access and safety.

Ms. Humphrey remarked that it would be interesting to see a plan where they remove 10-12 feet of earth and move the existing wall backwards, wondering if the contractor could move the wall just at the curb.

Chair Hornaday confirmed that the commission would like to see a revised plan that allowed for adequate access, but that also was more surgical in its treatment of the wall. Ms. Cole said it would also be helpful if the commission made it clear whether there was support for altering the wall at all, as she wouldn't want the applicant to go through the process of revising the drawings if there was no support for any change.

In response to Mr. Mays, Mr. Ayala explained that there were several parts of the driveway that had been hit by vehicles, but he said that the curved part had been the most frequently hit. Mr. Ayala explained his thoughts as to why that part of the wall had been hit so much, saying he thought the angle of the curve was deceiving and drivers often misjudged it when entering the driveway from the south or reversing out of the driveway.

Ms. Moxley asked if there was a parking pad turnaround area adjacent to the newly constructed ADU, and Mr. Ayala responded that they had a turnaround area approved with their ADU application.

Chair Hornaday reiterated that an amended application would need to show a very gentle cutting back of the concrete, as a wholesale change wasn't likely to be approved.

Mr. Ayala asked for clarification on the commission's concerns surrounding the concrete,

and Ms. Bowen and Ms. Watkins clarified that the amount of new concrete should be reduced as much as possible.

Ms. Cole asked if the wall was embedded aggregate or solely concrete, and Mr. Ayala replied that it was concrete. Ms. Cole then clarified that the previously approved parking area/turnaround behind the porte-cochere was about 30 feet deep along the side of the house and approximately 25 feet wide, which would allow room for one to turnaround and drive forward to exit the driveway

Mr. Ayala then requested that his application be continued to the March meeting. Ms. Watkins motioned to continue the application to the March meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Humphrey, and carried unanimously.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness - 101 Santee Street (PIN 9639855198) - Construction of a new driveway. Applicant: Carole King

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

Owner/Applicant: JANE MIDDLETON HAVERTY REVOCABLE TRUST/Mike Romero
Subject Property: 52 Cumberland Circle
Hearing Date: February 11, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649047709
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.29 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century one-and-a-half story weatherboarded vernacular shingle dwelling with large centered gables, steeply pitched roof, and Montford brackets; constructed prior to 1917.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing deck screening and door on rear elevation with new wood single lite windows and single lite wood door; windows and doors will be trimmed with wood matching existing materials. 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. Porches may be introduced on side or rear elevations and must be compatible with the existing structure, in terms of roof form, scale, details, materials and color (#12, p. 73); all exterior trim and/or siding materials should be wood to match existing rather than fiber cement.
2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

a. Clarification on need for use of exterior trim/siding materials;
b. Proposed color of windows and trim/siding materials.

The standards for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 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. New windows and door will be wood.
2. Materials, details and color of porch enclosure are compatible with the existing structure.

Ms. Cole explained that the application was for construction of a new driveway/parking pad. She said the house had been constructed in 2022, at which time the developer had built the existing Verti-Block wall. The wall had to be retroactively approved, and the landscaping in the vicinity of the proposed driveway needed to remain to screen the wall per the CA approval for the wall. She noted that a 10' deep concrete driveway apron would be required. She said an updated site plan with dimensions or drawn to scale and landscaping accurately labeled would be needed to move forward with review of the application. There was an existing trash enclosure that had been installed on site without a CA, which would need to be relocated to accommodate the new driveway. She explained that a handrail adjacent to the front steps had also been installed without a CA.

Mr. Mays asked what the proposed material was for the new wall. Ms. Carole King, applicant and property owner, said it would match the existing wall. Ms. Cole clarified that the Verti-Block material had only been approved because the wall had already been built and there was no way to remove it since it was so tall and behind the house. She said the commission's approval had stipulated that the wall be mortared and screened with landscaping, and noted that Verti-Block would not be appropriate for the new wall. In response to Chair Hornaday, Ms. Cole said it wasn't clear from the site plan how tall the wall would be.

Ms. King explained the busy nature of Santee Street to further provide context to her case. Chair Hornaday asked Ms. King to describe the overall size and layout of the proposed driveway. Ms. King explained that there would be two concrete strips with landscaping and a wall on one side. She said that she had someone with an engineering background visit the site who informed her that she would need a 2-4 foot tall retaining wall to hold in the amount of earth to create a safe and usable driveway.

Chair Hornaday asked if the curb along the street was granite, Ms. King replied that she was not sure. Ms. King then described the layout of the proposed driveway, explaining that it would come up the existing slope and level out as the topography leveled. Ms. Cole noted that the project description states that the curb was concrete. Chair Hornaday questioned the purpose of the boulders and/or retaining wall if the ground was not being changed and Ms. King explained that there was quite a slope so it was proposed to have boulders or a retaining wall to

hold in the dirt.

Ms. Cole wondered if having the driveway come in straight versus curved may look more consistent with the other driveways in Montford. She questioned whether Ms. King had a licensed engineer visit the site, as she couldn't see a way that a retaining wall wouldn't be needed. Ms. Moxley noticed that there appeared to be some sort of swale on the far side of the driveway. Ms. King remarked that there was a drain in the middle of where the driveway was proposed, which she planned to have relocated. After confirming that boulders or a retaining wall may be necessary, Ms. Moxley and Ms. Cole noted that Verti-Block was not a material that would be approved.

Chair Hornaday asked whether there was room to park behind the house. Ms. King responded that due to parcel size, shape, and location, it had to be built in the proposed location or she would have to buy neighboring land or acquire an easement.

Ms. Cole noted that a grading plan was needed. Chair Hornaday wondered if the driveway could be redrawn with less of an angle. Mr. Mays said that the angle might be for the purpose of reducing the amount of grading that would be needed. The commission then recommended that the applicant find similar examples of her driveway configuration within Montford, including addresses. Ms. Humphrey remarked that the drawings made it seem like the parking area would end before the area flattened out, leading Ms. Watkins to reiterate the importance of an updated, scaled site plan. Ms. Cole reiterated that the landscaped area adjacent to the existing wall needed to remain to screen the wall.mChair Hornaday asked about the rules for screening for the parking area, and Ms. Cole noted that the commission typically required screening for driveways.

Ms. King requested that her application be continued to the March meeting, and Mr. Mays made a motion to continue the application. This motion was seconded by Ms. Watkins and carried unanimously.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness - Certificate of Appropriateness - 1 Woodlawn Avenue (PIN 9649227499) - Modifications to rear elevation, including removal of existing windows, installation of new French doors, and construction of a new deck. Applicant: Robert Barrett

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

Owner/Applicant: BRUGH THOMAS NELSON;BRUGH LISA FLOWERS/Robert Barrett
Subject Property: 1 Woodlawn Avenue
Hearing Date: February 11, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649227499
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.13 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century one-and-a-half story vernacular structure with German siding with shingles in gable and dormers, and a recessed porch.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Modification of rear elevation, including enclosure of existing covered porch, removal of four existing windows and one door, installation of two pairs of wood multi-lite French doors and construction of a 24' 4" x 14' 9" wood deck with horizontal shiplap railings matching front porch; all new siding and trim will match 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. 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).
2. Deck is designed to be compatible in scale, proportion, materials and detail with the historic building without directly duplicating details (#3, p. 39); proposed deck railing duplicates front porch railing.
3. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Manufacturer specifications for new doors
    - Revised site plan showing location of relocated mechanical unit

The standards for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, Porches, Entrances and Balconies on pages 72-73, Decks on pages 38-39 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. Porch being enclosed is on the rear elevation; enclosure is designed so that the historic character and features of the porch are preserved.
2. Existing windows and doors being removed will be retained and preserved on site.
3. New doors will be wood.
4. Deck will be located on the rear elevation and inset from the rear building corners by at least 12 inches.
5. Deck is designed to be compatible in scale, proportion, materials and detail with the historic building without directly duplicating details; deck railings are compatible in material, color, scale and detail with the historic building.

Ms. Cole explained that the applicant was proposing to enclose a small porch on the rear

elevation. They were also proposing to remove several windows, install new doors, and construct a new deck. Ms. Cole noted that she had added the 1951 Sanborn Map to the application folder for some additional context. She explained that it would be challenging to enclose the existing porch and to retain existing materials as required by the standards given the size of the porch. She said the design of the railing for the new deck was intended to match the front porch. She added that the manufacturer specifications for the new doors had not yet been submitted, and that a revised plan showing the location for the existing mechanical unit was also needed.

Chair Hornaday asked about the existing chimney, and noted that it would be odd to leave it floating. He then asked Ms. Cole to clarify her notes on the existing porch. Ms. Cole said that she had added the Sanborn map to show that the porch was original to the house. Mr. Mays stated that the existing chimney was set back within the house, while the photo made it look as if it was within the porch.

Ms. Cole then addressed the proposed doors. She said that single lite doors versus mult-lite doors might be more appropriate given the Craftsman style of the house and existing fenestration.

Mr. Robert Barrett, applicant, addressed the commission and explained that the enclosed area would have Dutch lap siding matching the siding on the house. He said the property owners wanted to add the doors to increase light inside the house. He said they could change the style if needed. Mr. Barrett added that the mechanical unit would be moved to the south side of the house.

In response to Chair Hornaday, Mr. Barrett said the deck railing was proposed to match the existing front porch railing. He said they could change it to have pickets if that was preferred. Chair Hornaday asked if new lights were being proposed, and Mr. Barrett said no light fixtures were being proposed. He also noted that no additional landscaping was proposed but that the deck would be screened with painted wood lattice.

Chair Hornaday asked the Commission whether they have questions for the Applicant, and Ms. Humphrey remarked that she is confused by the rear elevation, asking for clarity around the brick foundation, crawl space, and building materials. The applicant noted that the drawing shown doesn't fully depict the plan, where they will have horizontal siding.

Chair Hornaday and Mr. Barrett agreed that if the windows being removed were deemed historic the owners would be able to safely save them on site.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 6:13 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Chair Hornaday questioned whether a picket style rail on deck would be more appropriate, and the commission agreed that a picket railing would be more suitable for the deck. They also agreed on the single lite doors, and noted that revisions could be submitted to staff for review.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE/DENY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application & owner's affidavit (3 pages); Exhibit B - proposed site plans, floor plans and elevation drawings (5 pages); Exhibit C - interior photo & existing plans (6 pages); Exhibit D - project description (received January 28, 2026); Exhibit E - handrail detail (received January 28, 2026); Exhibit F - exterior photos (11 photos - received January 28, 2026); Exhibit G - 1951 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (added by staff February 2, 2026); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

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

1. That the application is for the modification of rear elevation, including enclosure of existing covered porch, removal of four existing windows and one door, installation of two pairs of wood single-lite French doors and construction of a 24' 4" x 14' 9" wood deck with wood railing with square pickets spaced 4" on center; all new siding and trim will match 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 84-85, Porches, Entrances and Balconies on pages 72-73, Decks on pages 38-39 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.

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

    a. Porch being enclosed is on the rear elevation; enclosure is designed so that the historic character and features of the porch are preserved.
    b. Existing windows and doors being removed will be retained and preserved on site.
    c. New doors will be wood.
    d. Deck will be located on the rear elevation and inset from the rear building corners by at least 12 inches.
    e. Deck is designed to be compatible in scale, proportion, materials and detail with the historic building without directly duplicating details; deck railings are compatible in material, color, scale and detail with the historic building.

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. Mays

Second by: Mr. Holt
Vote for: All
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 handrail drawing and door specifications will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Mr. Mays
Second by: Mr. Holt
Vote for: All
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 said that staff was working on engagement around the Montford design standard amendments. She stated that the City would be publishing a survey that would go live on February 27th; the survey would be live for three weeks. There will be a second special work session for the commission sometime in April so that the commission can discuss the results of the survey. Ms. Cole said she would likely attend the next Montford Neighborhood Association meeting in April to be available for questions. She said she hoped the commission could hear public comments at their May and/or June meetings.

Ms. Humphrey questioned how the survey will be distributed, and Ms. Cole explained that the survey would be digital, but she said she would be happy to distribute paper surveys if it would be able to reach more people. Ms. Bowen noted that a paper survey may not be necessary, but having a flyer with a QR code could be helpful.

Chair Hornaday noted some upcoming events, including a home tour facilitated by the Preservation Society on February 21-22. He said there would also be a presentation by George Smart at UNC Asheville on March 12th. Lastly, he noted that Anne Stokely would be speaking about James Vester Miller's legacy at the Asheville History Museum on February 24th.

Ms. Bowen noted an upcoming urban renewal research exhibit at Buncombe County Special Collections.

Adjournment

At 6:31 p.m., Ms. Bowen moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Mays and carried unanimously.