

**CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE**  
**Historic Preservation Commission**

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 21, 2025**

**Commissioners Present:** Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Jim Welter (Vice-Chair), Jane Branigan, Ralph Hammond-Green, Stan Smith, Edward Sine, John Falvo, Lauren Matoian

**Commissioners Absent:** Jim Boyd

**Staff Present:** Sam Hayes, Planner II, Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director

- I **Call to Order.** Chair called the regular meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:06 pm.
- II **Public Comment –** No public comment
- III **Agenda.** Chair made a correction on the dates for the Budget approval. On motion of Commissioner Welter and seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green the amended agenda was approved.
- IV **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Welter the minutes of the meeting of April 16, 2025 were approved.
- V **New Business.**
- V(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness –** 1615 Druid Hills Avenue - Withdrawn
- V(B) **Certificate of Appropriateness -** Elizabeth Duffey, 1521 Kensington Road (File No. 25-25-COA).  
Prior to the opening of the public hearing, Chair announced that there is one application for a COA in the Druid Hills Historic District and one application in the Main Street Historic District that is continued from the April meeting. Any persons desiring to testify at any of the public hearings must first be sworn as witnesses and will be subject to cross-examination by parties or persons whose position may be contrary to yours. A copy of the procedure and rules for a quasi-judicial hearing is provided on the back table next to the agenda. Since this is a quasi-judicial hearing, it is very important that we have an accurate record of the hearing. Therefore, we must ask that you refrain from speaking until recognized by the Chair and, when recognized, come forward to the podium and begin by stating your name and address. Anyone present who has knowledge of anything of value that has been given or promised in exchange for a position to be taken on these applications should disclose it now. Anyone wishing to speak during the public hearing should come forward and be sworn in. Chair swore in all potential witnesses. Those sworn in were Sam Hayes, Elizabeth Duffey, Nicolle Rebolledo and Tamara Peacock.

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated he would like to formally enter the staff report and presentation into the record. This application is for 1521 Kensington Road and is an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the

demolition and reconstruction of the front steps. The applicant is Elizabeth Duffey and the property owners are Robert and Elizabeth Duffey. The PIN is 9569-42-6834. The property is 0.27 acres and the existing zoning is R-10, Medium Density Residential and is in the Druid Hills Historic District. This is considered a major work.

Site photos of the front steps were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The Druid Hills Historic District map was shown and included in the staff report and presentation. The subject property is highlighted in blue.

An aerial view was included in the staff report and presentation with the property highlighted in red.

The history of the subject property was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The applicant is requesting to fully demolish steps including wing walls and stairs. Reconstruction in-kind except for the steps. The steps are requested to be constructed using wood.

The applicant rendering was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Site images were shown showing some of the damage. These are included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes stated the applicant has said that the contractor can utilize as much of the existing material as he can.

The Design Standards that apply were included in the staff report and presentation.

Motion options were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Suggested motions for approval and denial were included in the staff report and presentation along with a condition for approval.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Hayes stated the porch floor is wood.

Commissioner Welter asked how much of the stairs and masonry work was original. Mr. Hayes stated he did not know. He tried to find a photo that dated back but he could not find one.

Commissioner Hammond Green asked if the steps were poured concrete. Mr. Hayes stated the applicant can speak to that.

Commissioner Falvo asked where the wing walls come down above those pillars, will they be replaced as they are now. Mr. Hayes stated the proposal from the applicant is that the wing walls are not actually structurally imbedded into those pillars at the moment so the goal is to adhere them together. That is outside of the scope of this COA. They have not included that in their application, to touch those pillars.

Discussion was made on the interior of the wing walls being painted brick. Mr. Hayes stated there are parts that are brick and other parts that have had a "band aid" applied to it.

Discussion was made on the front porch and the side porch.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Elizabeth Duffey, 1521 Kensington Road stated her name and address for the record. Chair asked what the steps were if they are not poured concrete. Ms. Duffey stated they had a mason come look at them and he could tell that they were originally brick. The steps have always been in pretty bad shape since they moved there in 2013. Someone took cement or stucco and put that over them. This caused the steps to have different heights and slopes and depths. They are pretty dangerous. She discussed the wing walls being unsafe and currently she could roughly knock them down. She wants to make them safe and historically accurate. On the quotes she has, to do everything in brick again is just under \$17,000. She has been trying to find someone to give another quote. She thought if she could just have the steps replaced with wood and have it stained to the original it would be just as good. Chair asked if the porch that is on there now, does that appear to be original. Ms. Duffey stated she is not sure. She thinks the front part is probably original but they may have redone the flooring at some point.

Commissioner Welter asked about seeing under the steps. Ms. Duffey stated the mason looked through the steps and could see brick and he thought the steps were originally brick but he is not convinced that the wings walls are original because they are completely separate from the home.

Commissioner Welter stated their standards state they are required to replace with in-kind materials and cost is not allowed for them to consider.

Chair discussed the standards and guidelines with the applicant. She stated they can consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original materials is not technically feasible. The burden is on the applicant to tell them what is technically not feasible so they can ask questions and go from there.

Chair asked Ms. Duffey if she knew if the homes in the area that were similar had stairs and what the materials are. Ms. Duffey stated she has seen wooden ones on Orleans and she knows they are not technically in the district. Her next door neighbors are wooden and a lot of them from the street seem to be concrete. That is all that she has seen.

Chair stated she does not know the condition of the brick under the stairs and it could be well preserved. One of the options is to use as much of the original materials that are there and what they could talk about is wood could be acceptable and if not add the condition that if there is a way to reuse the brick to do so. If she is open to that the Commission could approach it from that standpoint. The rest of the brick on the columns behind looks to be in pretty good shape.

Discussion was made on the deterioration being due to the steps and wing walls being constructed wrong.

Ms. Duffey was asked if it was possible to go into the crawl space and take photos from behind the steps. She stated she can certainly try to do that. She stated she can walk into her basement but you would have to climb up some dirt. She has not been able to see the rear of the steps under the house.

She is not sure if there is a wall there but she can certainly try to.

Chair stated she would be interested to know if the stucco or whatever is on top of the stairs had actually preserved the brick underneath. Chair asked if there is enough brick would she be willing to put the condition in there, you would have to go back to staff to show what you found. Ms. Duffey agreed to the condition.

More discussion was made on the steps and the brick and the stucco over them.

Ms. Duffey stated the mason did say in order to bring them up to code they would need to add an extra step in there. It would bring it out an extra twelve inches so that the steps would not be so high. There is part of the concrete in the front that ends and gets narrow straight to the street and he was saying that would probably need to be pulled up. But just that portion.

Chair asked if anyone had any other questions for the applicant. There were no further questions.

Chair asked if there was anyone that would like to speak in favor of the application or against the application. No one spoke. Chair asked if there was anyone that would like to speak before the public hearing is closed. No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the application. Chair stated it was hard to determine if it is technically feasible to replace it or not because they do not what is there. She also is not convinced that the wing walls are original. Discussion was made on rebuilding correctly. The Commission liked the idea of finding out what was under the steps and seeing what might be salvageable and report back to staff. Discussion was made on the steps being wood and wood being a permissible material.

***Commissioner Matoian moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # 25-25-COA and located within the Druid Hills Historic District, if added according to the information reviewed at this hearing and, with any representations made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards (Residential) for the following reasons: 1.The masonry features that contribute to the overall historic character of the building are retained. (Sec. 3.2.1) 2.The wing walls will be replaced in-kind, matching the original in design, detail, and dimensions. (Sec. 3.2.7) 3. The proposed wooden steps are a compatible substitute material. (Sec. 3.2.7) Proposed Condition: 1.The applicant shall retain as much original brick as is technically feasible to be used when reconstructing the wing walls. (Sec. 3.2.7) 2. The applicant shall revisit with staff when they see the condition of the brick under the stucco. 3. The applicant will retain as much of the brick as technically feasible for reconstructing the stairs. Commissioner Branigan seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

VI **Old Business.**

VI(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness** - Peacock Architects, 344 N. Main Street (File No. H24-098-COA). Continuation of the open hearing from the April 16, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Hayes stated they have a COA application for 344 N. Main Street for a storefront rehabilitation.

Mr. Hayes gave a project background which is included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes stated there has been some updates to the property. A photo was shown of the building in its previous state. A photo was shown of the façade now after the metal cheese grader was removed. The reason why the meeting was continued is so the Commission could see what was behind it.

The Main Street Historic District map was shown and included in the staff report and presentation. The subject property is highlighted in blue.

An aerial view was included in the staff report and presentation with the property highlighted in red.

The history of the subject property was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A site photo of the original buildings was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes pointed out a few of the architectural elements.

The proposed rendering of the storefront was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes stated there is some of that original prismatic glass that is still present. Staff was able to see that from the interior of the building. The applicant has proposed replacing the prismatic glass with a transom window with fixed glass. When reviewing plans staff advised that the applicant restore the prismatic glass given that it is original to the architectural details however they have planned to replace it with a fixed glass transom window.

A site photo of the side of the building was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Photos of prismatic glass around the district were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. There are five or six instances of prismatic glass around town.

Mr. Hayes stated the other request by the applicant is on the rear of the property. The proposed work included cutting into the stone lintels of the exit and increasing the door height from 6' 4" to 6' 8" due to the egress requirements.

Site images from around Main Street were shown of storefronts and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The Design Standards that apply were included in the staff report and presentation.

Suggested motions for approval and denial were included in the staff report and presentation along with conditions for approval.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair asked if this proposal incorporates what DRAC suggested. Mr. Hayes stated that is correct. Chair asked if they know if there is prismatic glass still in the front. Mr. Hayes stated staff tried to see as best as possible but more than likely it is not in the front. It just appears there is plywood there. The amount of prismatic glass there was discussed. The wood over the glass is painted to look like brick.

Mr. Hayes was asked about the support there. He stated the architect can answer that. Mr. Hayes stated there are the two columns there that go up. Mr. Hayes stated it was the original foundation there.

Discussion was made on historic buildings being brought up to code and allowances for that.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Nicolle Rebolledo, 129 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West stated her name and address for the record. Chair asked if she thought the glass could be preserved. Ms. Rebolledo stated from looking at the glass from within there are some spots that are no longer there so it is not like a full sheet of prismatic glass. Their thought going into this area of the project was to put a fixed glass window like they have proposed and then do something like a film and she has brought a sample they can look at, that mimics the prismatic glass and has that prism feature. Or they could take the prismatic glass that is on site and put a fixed glass window where they are proposing and sort of recess the prismatic glass that is original to the building behind it. Chair stated so you would see the prismatic from the interior, where it was originally and then have the glass. Ms. Rebolledo stated yes.

Commissioner Welter stated so the light effect would be seen on the inside and not on the outside. Ms. Rebolledo stated yes. Chair stated you might be able to see the prismatic behind the glass but you wouldn't have the same effect. Ms. Rebolledo stated the effect with the film is kind of what they are proposing. She showed the sample to the Commission. She stated it is very similar to what prismatic glass is. Chair stated that would be lieu of the prismatic glass. Ms. Rebolledo stated yes. Chair stated the standards say you are not to recreate a false impression.

Commissioner Hammond Green asked what alternative is there to repair what is there and then on the exterior only you would put something to provide the environmental protection for that as well as for the building. Ms. Rebolledo stated their main concern with keeping the prismatic glass as it is would be the energy sustainability of the building. If they were to continue to use this it would not insulate the building as good as it should. There is thermal performance with the fixed glass window and then you have the aesthetic of the prismatic glass behind it.

Discussion was made on trying to preserve what is there and trying to recreate what is there.

Ms. Rebellodo stated just for clarification this is the only window that they are suggesting the prismatic glass. The other transom windows on the on the front façade are to be fixed glass per their proposal.

Chair asked if there were any questions on the rest of the design.

Commissioner Sine asked if the yellow would be cleaned off of the brick. Ms. Rebellodo stated they are going to try and take it off as carefully as possible. She appreciated their recommendations on how to do that the best way possible and best practices. The owner does want to remove the yellow paint and restore the brick as much as possible because it is in such great condition and that is probably due to the fact that it was behind a screen for so long.

Tamara Peacock, 129 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West stated they have a sandblasting technique that isn't exactly sand but rubber pellets and the owner is planning on doing that. She stated due to cost they cannot commit to what the owner may end up doing but no one wants to keep the yellow paint. It is just a matter of trying to figure out how to get it off and not damage the surface.

Chair discussed having a condition to remove the paint and then coming back to staff to see what that may be. Her concern is if the brick is compromised then the Commission will have to have a full discussion about what is going in there to try and fix it. If they could just get the commitment that they are going to proceed with trying to take it off and then revisit with staff for the next steps once they see what is there. Ms. Peacock stated if they wanted the transom to be continuous there is a way to mount the support behind the glass there's a detail where you just do a glaze then go continuous. If they did use the film they could make that front all consistent, like it had looked.

Chair discussed the old photo of the front of the building and asked if it was all prismatic. Mr. Hayes stated yes the transom was all prismatic.

Chair asked if there were any additional questions for the applicant. There were no additional questions.

Chair asked if there was anyone that would like to speak in favor of the application. Chair asked if there was anyone that would like to speak against the application. No one spoke.

Chair asked if there was anyone else who wishes to speak. No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission had discussion on the transom part and film and making it look like prismatic glass. It would be actual glass and the film would be attached to it. The Commission did not favor trying to mimic something.

Discussion was made of the proposed conditions and the front prismatic glass. The Commission discussed trying to make the front look like something. They discussed the smaller window design. They discussed the aesthetics of the building.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated there are very few stores/buildings on Main Street that have that expanse. Most of the images that he showed the Commission were the larger storefronts and they all show similar to what this design is with the smaller windows. Commissioner Hammond Green felt like putting one big piece of glass is not capable of being done. Mr. Hayes stated it would be smaller pieces of glass but the supports would be behind. Chair stated it would give the illusion of continuous glass. Commissioner Hammond Green thought what is proposed would look better than having what would seem like one big piece of glass. Chair did not see anything in the standards that would prohibit that. Her question was because that second condition is on there, where did that come from? Mr. Hayes stated that was staff's analysis based on the standards. That was developed for the Commission to think about. Mr. Hayes discussed how he came to this analysis. It related more to the prior plans.

Commissioner Welter asked if they needed a condition on the design in front of them on the architectural piece of 1917 building, that's going to be maintained. Mr. Hayes stated that is outside the scope of this COA. They have not come to staff with any request for repointing brick or anything like that. That is all staff approval. Mr. Hayes stated the applicant has not stated they plan to do any work above the yellow. Mr. Hayes confirmed that. Ms. Peacock stated they did not know it was there when they did that drawing.

Chair stated they know removing the yellow will be a work in progress and what is behind that is a work in progress but since it is a major work can they add the condition that they come back to staff once they take that off and see what it looks like to determine if another application is needed. Mr. Hayes stated yes and he would add a condition that says they will work with staff through the whole process of removing the paint and until the end to determine what is happening next. Mr. Hayes stated he has reached out to SHPO and forwarded it to architects with some information on cleaning the brick.

Chair asked if there were any further questions for staff. There were no further questions.

Chair closed the public hearing.

More discussion was made on the storefront.

Discussion was made on the door at the rear and it being a safety issue.

Discussion was made on the prismatic glass and giving a false impression of what was there.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Ms. Rebellodo stated they are proposing putting in an actual fixed glass window, like an insulated glazing unit and then taking the prismatic glass that is on the site and having it stay behind the fixed glass window and look into how to support it. Commissioner Welter asked if it would be like a stained glass window. They would have to take the prismatic out.

Discussion was made on leaving the prismatic glass because it is original and trying to preserve it or taking out the prismatic glass and preserve it somewhere in that area behind the plate glass. It was stated that the glass has to come out regardless. Ms. Peacock stated there are holes in it and the nature of the way it was constructed she does not think it can be fixed in place. From a technical standpoint they will have to take it down, send it to a glass shop and have them put another frame around it. Chair



stated once that is done, can that go back in? Ms. Peacock stated yes because it might be a frame that has less pieces because if they can't find any matching pieces they aren't just going to leave holes in it.

Mr. Hayes stated if they did chose to have them restore it and put it in place and not give staff the leeway if it is not technically feasible then for this specific thing they would have to come back to the Commission and say it is no longer technically feasible and they need to adjust their plans and they could come back just for this window.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Further discussion was made on the prismatic glass and restoring it and the condition. Also discussed was replacing it with a window over it. The Commission discussed the standards and protecting the glass. The Commission was in agreement with protecting the prismatic glass.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Ms. Rebellodo stated the glass underneath that would remain. She stated anything that does not have a letter in front of it is an original window that they are preserving. Everything else is a new window. She stated it would be clear glass.

Chair closed the public hearing.

More discussion was made about the approval and conditions.

*Commissioner Welter moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H24-098-COA and located within the Main Street Historic District, if added according to the information reviewed at this hearing and, with any representations made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards (Main Street) for the following reasons: 1. The original storefront no longer exists, and the proposed design retains the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color, and texture of the historic buildings. (Sec. 3.1.7) 2. The applicant incorporated research from the Baker-Barber collection to determine the original characteristics and architectural details of the building. (Sec. 3.1.8) 3. The applicant retained and preserved character-defining architectural elements of the structure. (Sec. 3.4.1.1) 4. The replacement design for missing architectural details is based on historic documentation and is compatible with the historic character of the building and district. (Sec. 3.4.1.3) 5. The increase in size of the existing doors on the rear of the building does not diminish the original design of the building. (Sec. 3.4.2.10)*

*Proposed Conditions: 1. Retain, remove and restore the original prismatic glass transom on the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue side of the building per Section 3.4.1.1 of the Design Standards and replace with a protective glass film to match the original glass on the front and mount the prismatic glass on the interior of the window. 2. Work with staff during removal and restoration of the glass. 3. Work with staff on the removal of the paint on the front of the building. Commissioner Hammond Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.*

VI(B) **2024-2025 Budget Approval.** Chair stated this is an approval for allocating funds for the remaining budget for 2024-2025. Mr. Hayes stated the remaining funds are \$4,633.96 in the account for this year

and it needs to be spent by June 30<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hayes laid out options to allocate those funds.

***Commissioner Welter moved the Commission to grant to allocation of funds for the 2024-2025 budget. Commissioner Hammond Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

VI(C) **Findings of Fact.** 1723 Meadowbrook Terrace. ***On motion of Commissioner Welter and seconded by Commissioner Branigan the Findings of Fact for File No. 25-13-COA were approved.***

VII **Other Business.**

VII(A) **Staff Report.** Mr. Hayes gave an update of the staff approved COA's. He also discussed Preservation Awards and the Annual Report that will be on the City Council agenda next Wednesday. Commissioner Hammond Green stated the coloring books were delivered to the schools.

VIII **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

  
Chair