Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County
Meeting Minutes of April 8, 2026
1st Floor North Conference Room
City Hall (70 Court Plaza)
4:00 p.m.

Present: Will Hornaday, Sioux Oliva, Hans Skouby, Jenny Bowen, Leslie Humphrey, Bill Roberts, Cecil Holt, Celesta Gorman
Absent: Robert Mays, Amy Moxley, Shannon Watkins
Staff: Alex Cole, Carly Gillingham, Aspen Johnston

Administrative

- Vice-Chair Oliva moved to approve the minutes and the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law of the March 11, 2026 meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.
- After Chair Hornaday explained the public hearing rules, all those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.
- Vice-Chair Oliva made a motion to continue the application for 265 Cumberland Avenue to the May 2026 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holt and carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

1. Certificate of Appropriateness - 9 Kitchin Place (PIN 9647697834) - Replacement/modification of existing storefront and replacement of existing windows on rear elevation. Applicant: Dawn Dorn Hurkis Harris Design Assoc.

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

Owner/Applicant: KITCHIN PLACE LLC/Dawn Dorn Hurkes Harris Design Assoc.
Subject Property: 9 Kitchin Place
Hearing Date: April 8, 2026
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9647697834
Zoning District: Community Business II

Property Description: 0.04 acre parcel containing a one-story brick commercial building with recessed entry and large display windows; constructed ca. 1929.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Repair of existing storefront, including restoration/repainting of shingle siding, replacement of damaged framing with new black metal framing and new Kawneer black metal full lite entry door; storefront will retain its existing configuration; replacement of existing green fabric awning with new black fabric awning and installation of three (3) new gooseneck light fixtures on front elevation; replacement of one (1) missing multi-lite wood windows with new painted wood window and framing, and replacement of damaged pedestrian door with new hollow core metal pedestrian door on rear elevation; existing wood window and door trim/framing on rear elevation to be retained, repaired, and repainted as needed with any new material matching existing in dimension, configuration and material. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding replacement of existing wood storefront framing; avoid removing or altering any historic material or significant architectural features - examples of historically significant architectural features includes window trim (#3, p. 6 of Book 2).
2. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional items/clarification for review:

    - Manufacturer specifications for new window on rear elevation

The Standards for Color found on pages 43-44 of Chapter 7 and Illumination on pages 45-46 of Chapter 8 of Book 1, and the General Standards for Rehabilitation found on pages 5-10 of Chapter 2 and the Standards for Rehabilitation of "Commercial Type" Structures found on pages 11-16 of Chapter 3 of 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. The original size, shape and configuration of the storefront is being maintained and restored.
2. Existing window and door on rear elevation are damaged beyond repair; new window will be wood and door will be metal and similar to materials and design employed historically.
3. New light fixtures are simple and are appropriate to the period of the building.
4. Paint colors are consistent with the established color palette for the district.

Ms. Cole explained that the applicant had revised their plans based on the feedback at the last meeting. She said staff had visited the site to look at the existing shingles and knee wall framing; the shingles didn't appear to be original, but Ms. Cole noted there was only plywood under them. She confirmed that the original transom windows were present; however, the

applicant was not proposing to uncover them. Lastly, she said that the applicant was now planning to preserve one existing window on the rear that is salvageable.

Chair Hornaday followed up, questioning whether the leftmost window covered with aluminum was in the scope of work, and the commission agreed Chair Hornaday had a ‘good eye,’ in spotting that feature.

Project representative Robbie Frazier introduced herself as the Nationwide Construction Manager for Tempur-Pedic, noting that she was here to show a few options for the commission to review. Referencing an image of the neighboring storefront where JoS. A. Bank was located, Ms. Frazier stated they were aiming to give a consistent look to the two buildings. She also noted their desire to remove the tile from the entryway to make the building more accessible.

Ms. Cole stated that she wasn’t sure if the building owners were aware that the tiling in the entryway may be removed. Ms. Frazier replied that she would defer to the commission as to how to address the entryway. However, the owners had agreed to them completely redoing the storefront, so this change should not be an issue.

Ms. Bowen referenced the most recent project description which clearly states that the tiling and storefront would remain as is.

Ms. Humphrey questioned whether changing the tile would require another visit to the commission or if it would fall under a minor works permit. Ms. Cole responded that it depended on whether or not they could determine when the tile was installed.

Chair Hornaday asked about the proposed material of the storefront framing. Ms. Frazier replied that they originally chose aluminum as it would be a stronger material., She then detailed the project scope for the rear elevation. Chair Hornaday confirmed with Ms. Frazier that two (2) existing windows would be restored, one (1) missing/damaged window would be replaced with a new wood window, and one (1) damaged entry door would be replaced. All windows and doors were to be painted black.

Ms. Cole reminded the commission that the building occupied by Jos. A. Bank was built in the 1960s, which is why the commission had recently approved for their entry door to be metal versus wood..

Ms. Bowen expressed concern regarding the removal of the main entry door if it was original or significant. She further questioned whether the ceiling tiles would be removed or remained as is. Ms. Frazier responded that most ceiling tiles were removed by the water volume from Tropical Storm Helene, and the remaining tiles would be removed to address the mold in the structure, as well as all electrical and plumbing.

Ms. Cole said that she didn't think the existing entry door was original to the structure, and was likely added in the 1960s when the neighboring structure had been built.Chair Hornaday questioned whether the door should be preserved and restored or simply replaced. Ms. Frazier responded that the door was not salvageable and needed to be replaced.

Chair Hornaday stated that the main concern was changing materials on the front

elevation from wood to metal.

Ms. Cole noted that the standards state that the exterior material should have a painted or bronze finish, adding that for features that are completely missing, they may be able to approve the black metal if it is similar enough to what existed historically. She then stated that visually, the wood cap on top of the knee wall looked to be at least half intact and should be preserved due to its distinct shape. She added that it would be more consistent with the design standards if the storefront framing and door remained wood.

Ms. Frazier pulled up an image of the existing storefront showing that the knee wall to the left of the door was completely missing. Chair Hornaday confirmed with Ms. Frazier that the rebuilt storefront would match the existing configuration. Ms. Frazier agreed, and added that they wanted to replace the existing door with a metal door.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:30 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Ms. Cole brought recently taken interior images of the entryway to the commission's attention.

Ms. Oliva noted her concern regarding the proposed aluminum storefront material and how that would impact the building's historic character.

Mr. Skouby asked if the applicant had specifications for the existing storefront framing. Ms. Frazier referenced the interior photos showing the knee wall and windows that needed to be replaced. Mr. Skouby noted his concern was that aluminum framing would read as far too modern for the historic district. Ms. Frazier added that if the commission preferred wood framing over aluminum, they would be willing to adapt their design so long as they could use tempered glass versus standard glass for security reasons. There was consensus from the commission that the storefront materials should be wood versus aluminum.

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, project description, and owner affidavit (6 pages); Exhibit B - site survey and floor plans (3 pages); Exhibit C - material specifications (57 pages); Exhibit D - photos and proposed elevation drawings (5 pages); Exhibit E - additional photos (2 pages - added by staff March 11, 2026); Exhibit F - interior photos (3 pages - received March 12, 2026); Exhibit G - revised application and project description (4 pages - received March 30, 2026); Exhibit H - revised plans and additional photos (19 pages - received March 30, 2026); Exhibit I - revised material specifications (8 pages - received March 30, 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 repair of existing storefront, including restoration/repainting of shingle siding, replacement as needed of damaged wood storefront framing, and replacement of existing entry door with new wood single lite door; storefront will retain its existing configuration; replacement of existing green fabric awning with new black fabric awning and installation of three (3) new gooseneck light fixtures on front elevation; replacement of two (2) missing multi-lite wood windows with new painted wood window and framing, and replacement of damaged pedestrian door with new hollow core metal pedestrian door on rear elevation; existing wood window and door trim/framing on rear elevation to be retained, repaired, and repainted as needed with any new material matching existing in dimension, configuration and material. 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 Color found on pages 43-44 of Chapter 7 and Illumination on pages 45-46 of Chapter 8 of Book 1, and the General Standards for Rehabilitation found on pages 5-10 of Chapter 2 and the Standards for Rehabilitation of "Commercial Type" Structures found on pages 11-16 of Chapter 3 of 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. The original size, shape and configuration of the storefront is being maintained and restored.
    b. Existing window and door on rear elevation are damaged beyond repair; new window will be wood and door will be metal and similar to materials and design employed historically.
    c. New light fixtures are simple and are appropriate to the period of the building.
    d. Paint colors are consistent with the established color palette for the district.

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

Motion by: Mr. Skouby
Second by: Vice-Chair Oliva
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. Front door and rear window specs will be submitted for staff review and approval.

Motion by: Mr. Skouby

Second by: Vice-Chair Oliva
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 - 16 Short Street (PIN 9649119551) - Installation of fifteen (15) solar panels on south facing portion of roof. Applicant: Lily Ardrey

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

Owner/Applicant: S & R PRONOVOST FAMILY TRUST/Lily Ardrey
Subject Property: 16 Short Street
Hearing Date: March 11, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649119551
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 0.11 acre parcel containing a one-and-a-half story primary structure constructed ca. 2002.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Installation of fifteen (15) 67.87" x 44.65" x 1.18" black Solstice panel solar panels on south facing portion of roof and related power wall and equipment 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. Staff has concerns regarding the placement of the proposed solar panels; installation of solar devices on roof surfaces facing the primary public right of way shall be considered only when no other option is possible and there is not detrimental impact to the integrity of the neighborhood (#2, p. 81).

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

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

1. Proposed panels would be highly visible from the public right of way and would be detrimental to the integrity of the neighborhood.

Ms. Cole noted that at the last meeting the commission had requested that the applicant look at alternative configurations for the solar panels. She said they had submitted two alternative roof plans, but noted that neither of them would meet the energy needs noted by the applicant so they wanted to proceed with the roof plan as originally proposed. Ms. Cole reminded the commission that the standards dictate that the impacts to the entire district should be considered, not just the site where the solar panels were proposed.

Steven Pronovost, property owner, and Renu Energy Solutions representative Megan Price, introduced themselves. Addressing the alternate plans submitted, Mr. Pronovost said it would reduce the output by over 50%, making the installation not feasible. He noted that he could see five (5) roofs with solar panels from his house.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:47 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Chair Hornaday stated that he was okay with the originally proposed configuration of the solar panels, with six (6) on the rear and nine (9) closest to the street. Mr. Roberts added that he was okay with the original configuration. Chair Hornaday clarified that he believed the proposed solar panel configuration fit within the standards, as it was the most inconspicuous layout possible to still achieve the necessary energy output.

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, owner affidavit, and project description (4 pages); Exhibit B - engineering letter (2 pages); Exhibit C - roof plans (6 pages); Exhibit D - solar panel specifications (9 pages); Exhibit E - site photos (5 pages) Exhibit F - additional photos (4 pages - received March 11, 2026); Exhibit G - Renu Energy Solutions product sheet (12 pages - received March 16, 2026); Exhibit H - alternative roof plans (4 pages - received March 30, 2026); Exhibit I - additional photos (2 pages - received April 3, 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 installation of fifteen (15) 67.87" x 44.65" x 1.18" black Solstice panel solar panels on south facing portion of roof and related power wall and equipment 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 Sustainability and Emerging Technology found on pages 80-81 of the Montford Historic District Design Review Standards, adopted April 14, 2010 and amended December 11, 2019, were used to evaluate this request.

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

    a. Solar panels are located as inconspicuously as possible while still allowing for reasonable use, and they will not detrimentally impact the historic character of the district.

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:	Mr. Skouby
Vote for:	Vice-Chair Oliva, Mr. Skouby, Mr. Holt, Chair Hornaday, Ms. Gorman, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Roberts
Vote against:	Ms. Humprhey

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

Motion by:	Vice-Chair Oliva
Second by:	Ms. Gorman
Vote for:	Vice-Chair Oliva, Mr. Skouby, Chair Hornaday, Ms. Gorman, Ms. Bowen, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Holt
Vote against:	Ms. Humphrey

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

3. Certificate of Appropriateness - 255 Cumberland Avenue (PIN 9649046297) - Replacement of garage doors and pedestrian door on east elevation. Applicant: Griff Gamble

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

Owner/Applicant: SMITH PATRICK SHANE/Griff Gamble
Subject Property: 255 Cumberland Avenue

Hearing Date: April 8, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649046297
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.37 acre parcel; John A. Campbell House: an early 20th-century two-and-a-half story vernacular stucco dwelling with irregular massing, bay window, and a recessed porch with molded and paneled porch posts.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing wood paneled garage doors with new painted wood garage doors matching existing; replacement of three (3) existing pedestrian doors with Reeb _____ wood doors. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

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

    - Additional photos and details on proposed pedestrian doors

The standards for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 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:

1. Garage doors are deteriorated beyond repair; new doors will be wood and will match existing design, dimension and material.
2. Pedestrian doors to be replaced are not original to the structure; new doors will be wood, and compatible with the original openings and historic character of the building.

Ms. Cole said staff was requesting clarification on how many pedestrian doors were proposed for replacement..

Chair Hornaday questioned whether staff had any recommendations for a specific door from those that were proposed, and Ms. Cole responded that she thought the half-lite door was the most appropriate for the structure..

Mr. Griff Gamble, applicant and contractor, clarified that the only doors in the scope of work were the basement entry door and the carriage/garage doors. He added that the owner would prefer a half-lite door in order to bring some daylight into the basement. The applicant

planned to rebuild the carriage to match the existing design. Ms. Humphrey asked whether they would have to custom build the carriage doors, and Mr. Gamble confirmed they would be custom manufacturing them due to no manufacturer being willing to warranty the doors.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 4:58 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and project description; Exhibit B - door specifications; Exhibit C - photos; Exhibit D - additional photo (received March 31, 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 to replace existing wood paneled garage doors with new custom-made painted wood garage doors matching existing; replacement of one (1) existing non-original pedestrian doors with new half lite wood door. 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 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. Garage doors are deteriorated beyond repair; new doors will be wood and will match existing design, dimension and material.
    b. Pedestrian doors to be replaced are not original to the structure; new doors will be wood, and compatible with the original openings and historic character of the 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: Ms. Bowen
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**.

Motion by: Ms. Bowen
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.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness - 227 Cumberland Avenue (PIN 9649141078) - Removal of three (3) existing stained glass windows. Applicant: GREEK ORTHODOX PARISH OF ASHEVILLE

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

Owner/Applicant: GREEK ORTHODOX PARISH OF ASHEVILLE
Subject Property: 227 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date: April 8, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649141078
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 4.27 acre parcel containing the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church: mid 20th century brick church with vernacular medieval details.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Removal of three (3) existing stained glass windows; openings will be filled and exterior surface will be stuccoed to 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:

Staff has no concerns.

The standards for Non-Contributing Structures found on pages 68-69 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:

1. Existing windows to be removed are on the rear elevation, and removal will not affect the architectural integrity of the structure.

Ms. Cole explained the scope of work included removal of three existing stained glass windows on the back of the building. She said staff did not have any concerns since the building was a non-contributing structure and the windows were not visible from the street.

Andrew Apostolopoulos, project representative, addressed the commission and was sworn in to provide testimony. He noted that the church was working on a large iconography project and needed a large interior surface to mount the canvases.

Ms. Humphrey questioned whether the iconography would be inside, confirming that they will be altering the interior wall in order to hang the iconography. Mr. Apostolopoulos showed the iconography to the commission to provide further context. He reiterated that they needed an interior space completely sealed off to ensure no moisture would damage the canvas that will contain the iconography.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:06 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and project description (3 pages); Exhibit B - site plans (3 pages); Exhibit C - photos (5 pages); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

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

1. That the application is to remove three (3) existing stained glass windows; openings will be filled and exterior surface will be stuccoed to 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 Non-Contributing Structures found on pages 68-69 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 to be removed are on the rear elevation, and removal will not affect the architectural integrity of the 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: Ms. Gorman
Second by: Mr. Skouby
Vote for: Unanimous
Vote against: None

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

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

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

5. Certificate of Appropriateness - 62 Courtland Avenue (PIN 9649027120) - Enclosure of porch on rear elevation. Applicant:Joe Minicozzi

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

Owner/Applicant: MINICOZZI JOSEPH
Subject Property: 62 Courtland Avenue
Hearing Date: April 8, 2026
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649027120
Zoning District: RS8

Property Description: 0.19 acre parcel containing an early 20th-century one-and-a-half story shingle sided bungaloid dwelling with a wide porch, exposed rafters, shingle porch posts, and a stone foundation constructed prior to 1917.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Enclosure of existing screened porch on rear elevation with relocated window and door, painted cement paneling and wood trim. Construction of new 6' x 8' wood deck on rear elevation; existing porch railing and steps will be repurposed on deck; removal of metal awning. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

Staff has no concerns.

The standards for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 and Decks on pages 38-39 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:

1. Porch to be enclosed is on the rear elevation, and the enclosure is designed so that the historic character and features on the porch are preserved.

Ms. Cole explained that the applicant was proposing to enclose a small porch on the rear elevation. She said that an existing window and door would be repurposed on the new exterior walls. . She showed architectural drawings, noting how they planned to enclose the porch to give the appearance of where the porch was, which the standards indicate is the appropriate design choice. Ms. Cole noted they were proposing a fiber cement board as the exterior material. She added that there is no standard against it but wanted to bring it to the commission's attention, as often the commission has required wood, stucco, or other traditional materials for siding on historic structures.

The applicant, Mr. Michael McDonough, introduced himself to the commission and provided context for the renovation, adding that they chose smooth cement board as it would not look very different from plywood after all of the treatment that would be required.

Chair Hornaday questioned the gutter leading to the water catchment system, and Mr. McDonough responded that the previous resident had installed the system. They are building the new deck in part to cover the basin.

In response to Chair Hornaday, Mr. McDonough responded that the cement board was thinner than plywood, which would allow for the board to be set back from the trim in an effort to carry the appearance of the porch forward.

Mr. Skouby questioned the orientation of the fiber cement panels, and Mr. McDonough explained that there would be no visible panel joints due to the placement of the railing and existing trim.

Chair Hornaday questioned whether there were any issues with the cement board from the commission, and there were no objections. Mr. McDonough added it would be painted a green color that will tie into the wood.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:19 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application and project description (3 pages); Exhibit B - floor plans and elevation drawings (4 pages); Exhibit C - photos (7 pages); Exhibit D - owner's representative affidavit (2 pages - received 4.8.26) 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 to enclose the existing screened porch on rear elevation with relocated window and door, painted cement paneling and wood trim. Construction of new 6' x 8' wood deck on rear elevation; existing porch railing and steps will be repurposed on deck. All work will be completed in accordance with approved and attached drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

2. That the standards for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73 and Decks on pages 38-39 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 to be enclosed is on the rear elevation, and the enclosure is designed so that the historic character and features on the porch are preserved.
    b. Existing window and door are being reused on exterior walls.

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**.

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.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness - 1 Vance Gap Road - Zealandia (PIN 9649801740)- Replacement of existing deteriorated slate tile roof. Applicant: Zealandia Holding Company, Inc.

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

Owner/Applicant: FESTIVA REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS LLC/Zealandia Holding Company, Inc.
Subject Property: 1 Vance Gap Road (Zealandia)
Hearing Date: April 8, 2026
Historic District: Local Landmark
PIN: 9649801740
Zoning District: Office

Property Description: 11.23 acre parcel containing Zealandia - an early 20th century three-story Tudoresque style mansion with projecting masses, steep gables, random ashlar blue granite and half-timbered exterior and slate shingle roof.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Replacement of existing gray slate roof with new Vermont Unfading Green slate roof tiles with 8" reveal, and replacement of all galvanized ridge caps, flashing, gutters and fittings with copper. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

Staff has no concerns.

The standards for Roofs found in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff does recommend approval of the request for the following reasons:

1. Existing roof materials are deteriorated beyond repair; replacement materials will match existing and/or are compatible with the structure.

Ms. Cole explained that the scope of work included replacement of the existing deteriorated slate roof with a new slate roof. She said typically roof replacement was reviewed via minor work application; however, the change of material from galvanized metal to copper for the ridge caps required major work review. Ms. Cole said that the new tile would be green to match existing, and noted that since copper would be a period-appropriate material for the structure, staff did not have any concerns.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 5:26 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

There was no further discussion on the application.

MOTION TO APPROVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Chairman, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A - application (2 pages); Exhibit B - site plan, project description, and materials (12 pages); Exhibit C - photos (112 pages); Exhibit D - Zealandia landmark designation report (14 pages - added by staff March 26, 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 to replace the existing gray slate roof with new Vermont Unfading Green slate roof tiles with 8" reveal, and replacement of all galvanized ridge caps, flashing, gutters and fittings with copper. 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 Roofs found in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, were used to evaluate this request.

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

a. Existing roof materials are deteriorated beyond repair; replacement materials will match existing and/or are compatible with the 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 Local Historic Landmark.

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

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

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

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

7. Certificate of Appropriateness - 570 Walton Street - Walton Street Park (PIN 9648122845) - Adaptive reuse of pool structure and upfit of pool house and site. Applicant: Progressive Companies; Eric R. Howell/City of Asheville

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

Owner/Applicant: CITY OF ASHEVILLE/Progressive Companies
Subject Property: 570 Walton Street
Hearing Date: April 8, 2026
Historic District: Local Landmark
PIN: 9648122845
Zoning District: RM8

Property Description: 4.37 acre park containing the Walton Street pool and poolhouse (both are contributing resources to the site, an asphalt parking area, basketball court, covered picnic shelter, playground equipment, and a walking track.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Alterations to existing poolhouse structure, including replacement of existing _____ windows with new _____ Pella fiberglass windows, removal of existing entry doors and modification of door openings on west elevation, construction of new entryway and installation of new _____ doors on north elevation, removal of existing entry doors on east elevation, replacement of all other pedestrian doors with _____, removal of existing concrete ramp and handrail on west elevation and construction of new concrete entry landing, replacement of existing membrane and asphalt shingle roofing with _____ and installation of eight (8) skylights on roof. Site work, including construction of new concrete walkways around pool and poolhouse, construction of a skating area adjacent to south elevation of poolhouse, installation of exercise area adjacent to northeast elevation of poolhouse, installation of landscaping and construction of new concrete ramp and walls, astroturf surfaced area, commemorative diving board feature, and _____ covered _____ stage within pool space. Demolition of existing pool pump house. All work will be in accordance with attached and approved drawings and plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Staff has concerns regarding proposed replacement of existing windows.
2. Staff has concerns regarding proposed removal of existing doors and modifications to existing openings.
3. Staff has concerns regarding the proposed new door openings on the north elevation.
4. Staff has concerns regarding retention of the historic relationship between the poolhouse and pool.
5. Staff has asked the applicant to provide the following additional information for review:

    - Revised project description listing out all items included for HRC review
    - Additional information on existing windows and doors (i.e. existing materials, conditions assessment/need for replacement)
    - Additional information on proposed parapet wall cap (i.e. dimension and visibility)
    - Roofing material specifications
    - Drawing and material information for stage, kitchen area and other miscellaneous site furniture/features
    - Landscaping plan

The standards for Roofs, Windows, Doors, Entrances and Porches, Building Site, and Setting found in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were used to evaluate this request.

Staff Recommendation - Staff recommends the commission provide feedback to the applicant, and to invoke NC GS 160D-947(d) to formally request technical assistance from the NC HPO.

Ms. Cole explained that the pool and poolhouse had been identified as contributing

historic resources to the park when it was designated as a landmark several years ago. She noted her concerns regarding the proposed changes to the poolhouse, including the modification of existing doorways, replacement of existing windows, and the new door opening shown on the north elevation. She also explained that she had some concerns regarding the features shown within the swimming pool space, noting that it was hard to understand from the site plan how it would appear if one were actually in the space. She also noted that it was important for the pool to still remain intact.She added that the interior of the pool house was not included in the historic designation. Lastly, she said that in the past SHPO and NPS had not been supportive of adding site features like exterior kitchens as that would not be consistent with most historic sites, so she had concerns about that feature shown on the plans as well.Ms. Cole added that her recommendation was that the commission give their preliminary feedback, and invoke state statute to formally request the SHPO give their feedback on the proposal as well.

Mr. Eric Howell, Senior Project Manager with Progressive Companies addressed the commission, and explained that the City's Parks Department had conducted extensive engagement with the community on how they wanted to repurpose the pool and poolhouse, which had resulted in the design and scope of work for this project.He explained that the existing windows had deteriorated to a point where the steel lintels above the doors and windows had started to fail. He also noted that the windows were installed to provide light without allowing individuals to see inside, which Mr. Howell noted was no longer necessary for the new use of the building.

Chair Hornaday asked Mr. Howell about the replacement windows, and Mr. Howell responded that they planned to replace them with as similar of a material as possible in order to match the style of the original windows from the 1940s.

Regarding the removal of doors and altering the openings, Mr. Howell explained that they planned to remove the doors completely so that the space between the entryways could function as a breezeway

In response to Ms. Gorman, Mr. Howell said that there would be locking garage doors within the breezeway that would access the interior spaces on either side.

Chair Hornaday asked whether the building was climate controlled, to which Mr. Howell added that it was not. Mr. Holt asked about the existing conditions of the building, with Mr. Howell said that the building was in pretty rough shape currently.

Mr. Howell then addressed the new entryway proposed on the north side of the building. This opening would allow the space to function as a teaching kitchen or for other events put on by the community. It was proposed to be located on the north elevation due to the City’s concerns about adding the opening/kitchen area on the south side of the building. It would also create a connection between the basketball court and other outdoor areas to the kitchen. Mr. Howell detailed the electrical and utility concerns, and noted that they were aiming to clean up the exterior connections.

In response to Chair Hornaday's question about the existing transom windows above the doors, Mr. Howell said that they planned to repair or replace everything with the same or similar

materials in keeping with the integrity of the historical structure.

Mr. Howell explained that they were also proposing to add skylights to the roof of the building to bring in more natural lighting. Chair Hornaday questioned whether they were removing the gutters, and Mr. Howell said the gutters would remain. He added that the new ADA ramp would be built to current building code.

Ms. Humphrey asked whether the existing windows were fixed or operable, to which Mr. Howell answered that they are not operable. Ms. Humphrey clarified that she was asking about the proposed windows, and Mr. Howell noted that they haven't made that design decision yet. Ms. Humphrey then questioned reducing the number of toilets to two when they were planning for the building to be an event space. Mr. Howell responded that the proposed design will meet code requirements. He said larger events may require exterior restrooms.

Mr. Roberts expressed his concern over having a covered breezeway that would be open all the time.

In response to Vice-Chair Oliva, Mr. Howell said the doors within the breezeway would be closed when the interior spaces weren't in use. The restrooms would be open at all times from May to November. Ms. Humphrey said this was similar to how the restrooms at Montford Park functioned.

After taking a moment to swear in additional speakers, Tracy Wyman with the City of Asheville's Parks and Recreation Department addressed the commission. She said she wanted to express her pride in her department in terms of the community engagement process for this specific project, as there historically has been a lot of distrust between this community and the city. She added that the community primarily wanted a swimming pool, but that was not an option. With that in mind, the community identified other needs that they wanted, including a gathering space, community space, somewhere that encourages the interaction between the inside and outside spaces, and a place for many generations.

Ms. Wyman agreed that the open breezeway was a concern for Parks and Recreation as well, and noted that there would likely be a way to lock the space. She then added how much they loved the way the designers gave a strong nod to the history of the swimming pool through re-creating the circle steps down to the pool, and also creating a visual for the diving board at the performance end of the open space.

Chair Hornaday questioned whether they were proposing retaining the original pool steps in the design. Ms. Wyman said she thought the steps would be replaced. Ms. Wyman then reiterated the importance of community space. She noted that in order for it to be a safe place, it would need to be used on a day-to-day basis and be available and inviting to people of all ages. Mr. Roberts noted that his issue with the breezeway was not maintenance, but the concerns that children coming to play may have an uncomfortable experience, leading to them feeling unsafe.

Ms. Wyman cited the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles, and that they recommend designing spaces where there is no space to hide, lurk, or be invisible, which the Parks Department will also be advocating for. She then brought attention to the grills, which were added years later, as cooking outdoors was such a big part of the

community. Following the community engagement process, one of the main requests was for a commercial kitchen. Since that couldn't be done, they are trying to ensure that the design incorporates cooking and gathering spaces.

Mr. Holt asked whether or not this would be a community center, and Ms. Wyman clarified that the Parks Department would not have the capacity to staff and program the space as they do in other community centers. She also added that when programming took place there, it would be arranged through the Parks Department, and was the only time the interior spaces would be used.

When there were no more questions for Ms. Wyman, Ms. Mariko McNamara, landscape architect, approached the podium to discuss the exterior site plan. She then referenced the 2025 community survey that took place in the community, and that much of the language and features on the proposed site plan came directly from the survey. Elaborating on the site plan, Ms. McNamara walked the commission through the walkway near the basketball court that leads to a place where food trucks can park, picnic tables, and new benches along the side of the basketball court. Connecting the walkway to the pool was a mural on the concrete featuring bubbles. The bubble art was intended as a nod to the historic use of the pool. The steps into the pool shown on the plans will be a replica of what is currently there. The open lawn within the pool will have ADA access.

Ms. McNamara then further explained pool layout, noting that the original rectangular footprint of the stage will be retained, with a slight interior tilt which would allow the tiered seating to be created. This space would also feature small landscaped areas. At the deep end of the pool, they were preserving the diving board location as a memento to what was there before, as both a seating element and structural art element

Vice-Chair Oliva asked whether the community had seen the plans, to which Ms. McNamara confirmed they had.

Chair Hornaday clarified that the pool itself was historic, noting that he was unsure about the angled design and whether it would be acceptable, though he understood the reasoning behind it. He agreed that they'll likely need some advice from SHPO. He then asked about the outdoor kitchen area on plan, and Ms. McNamara explained that they had been working with the Parks Department to find a safe and maintainable solution. She added that there would also be a space for a community garden in the kitchen area, as community food sharing was high on the priority list in terms of the results of the survey. Additionally, active recreation equipment was a high priority, so the design team had added outdoor fitness equipment adjacent to the walking track that is currently on site. They had also added a community sharing space for art creation and display, which would act as the gateway from the field to the pool house. Lastly, she noted that they had also included an "all-wheel space" adjacent to the south elevation.

Mr. Roberts asked where the existing pool was, and Ms. McNamara responded that the new features would be in the existing pool area to the west of the poolhouse. She further explained that the lawn/green space is sloping down so it would represent the original feel of the pool. Honoring the history of the pool was an important element in the design. The sloping lawn space will create a type of sloped audience space below the commemorative diving board and stage area. There would also be space for public art within the pool.

In response to Chair Hornaday, Mr. Howell confirmed that they planned to demolish the pump house.

Mr. Holt asked whether historical images would be displayed, and Mr. Howell responded that they have yet to select the artists or decide what would be displayed on site.

Mr. Roberts made the suggestion that the applicant could explore ways to lock the breezeway.

Ms. Humphrey asked why they were unable to bring the pool back. Ms. McNamara noted that she believed it was beyond repair.

Ms. Gorman asked whether they would be willing to have any sort of water feature on site and Mr. Howell replied that the Parks Department has had issues in the past with water features.

Mr. Holt acknowledged that the plan seemed to incorporate the majority of what the community wanted to see in the proposal.

Ms. Cole asked for clarification as to whether or not they plan to fully remove the pool and rebuild something new, or if they plan to retrofit the existing footprint. Mr. Howell confirmed that the original pool outline will be retained, though they will create an angle where there originally was not one, in order to build in seating.

Mr. Howell introduced Ms. Josi Ward, the project team's historic preservation consultant to discuss the historic elements within the project scope. Ms. Ward noted the actual designations were for the pool and pool house, which were simple and elemental structures. She added that the proposed changes were minimal but noteworthy. She expanded on the scope of work for the pool, noting that it would function as a sunken park adjacent to the historic pool house. She added that once 3D renderings were completed, it would be easier to understand what was proposed within the pool space.

She noted that the pool house itself had very few character defining features.In terms of the existing doors on the sides, they were inset slightly from the wall. With the proposed plan, the openings would read in the same way as the doors currently read due to the entries being inset from the exterior wall. The new door on the northern elevation would have a modern treatment, and was not intended to mimic any historic doors. She clarified that the masonry elements will not be changed.

Ms. Bowen asked whether Ms. Ward had done research regarding the historic designation and if the proposed changes might impact the property's historic designation. Ms. Ward clarified that they would not take any actions that would jeopardize the historic designation, and said she looked forward to hearing the advice from SHPO.

Ms. Cole added that in order for SHPO to provide technical assistance, the commission needed to make a motion requesting their assistance and input.

Chair Hornaday opened the floor for public comment at 6:29 p.m., and when no one spoke, he closed the floor for public comment.

Vice Chair-Oliva made amotion to invoke statute NC GS 160D-947(d) to formally request technical assistance from the North Carolina Historic Preservation Office. **This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.**

Other Business

A. Preliminary Local Landmark Designation Applications - E.W. Grove Office Building & Feldman House

Ms. Cole explained that two preliminary local landmark applications had been submitted - for E.W. Grove Park and the Leon & Ruth Feldman House in North Asheville. She said the next step in the process was for staff and commission members to visit the sites, which staff will work on scheduling.

In response to Ms. Humphrey, Ms. Josi Ward, applicant, said that the owners of the Feldman House had applied for landmark designation because the house had been so well preserved. She said the owners were especially proud of the property.

B.

B. HRC Award

Ms. Cole noted that Ms. Bowen had shared an email with her nomination for Buncombe County Special Collections and their work on the Come Hell or High Water project. Ms. Bowen said the project had gotten a lot of recognition from outside of Asheville, and it would be nice to recognize it locally.

Ms. Cole said that Ms. Watkins had also nominated a group of residents for their work documenting and preserving Stumptown history. She'd also nominated Todd Gragg, a local documentary filmmaker. She recommended awarding him for his work on his recent film - Black in Asheville.

a.

Chair Hornaday made a motion to nominate Buncombe County Special Collections Come Hell or High Water, along with Todd Greg for the documentary he worked on with Ms. Robinson for the HRC Award, seconded by Vice Chair Oliva and it was carried unanimously.

C. Comments from Commissioners, Public and Staff
    a. Saturday (April 11, 2026) from 12-4 - volunteer work day at the South Asheville Cemetery
    b. Treasure Tree being celebrated for oldest White Oak tree on April 24th

Adjournment

At 7:03 p.m., Vice Chair Oliva moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gorman and carried unanimously.