

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of the Meeting of August 21, 2024

Commissioners Present: Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Jane Branigan, Ralph Hammond-Green, John Falvo, Jim Boyd

Commissioners Absent: Jim Welter, (Vice-Chair), David McKinley

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 5:00 pm.
- II **Public Comment:** Ken Fitch stated he wanted to alert everyone the Berkley Ballpark is going under renovations. He wanted the Commission to be made aware of this.
- III **Agenda.** Commissioner Hammond Green moved the Commission to amend the agenda to include the Subcommittee reports. On motion of Commissioner Hammond- Green and seconded by Commissioner Boyd the revised agenda was approved.
- IV **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Branigan the minutes of the meeting of July 17, 2024 were approved.
- V **New Business**
 - V(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness** - Jason Reasoner, 401 N Main Street (File No. H24-050-COA). Prior to the opening of the public hearing, Chair announced that there are three applications for COA's. Two applications in the Hyman Heights Historic District and one application in the Main Street Historic District. 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, Lew Holloway, Dan Chapman, Patsy Stewart, Lisa Duncan and Jason Reasoner.

Chair opened the public hearing.

Sam Hayes, Planner II stated this is an application from Jason Reasoner for the property located at 401 N. Main Street and is located in the Main Street Historic District. The application is for the installation of a mini-split air-conditioning unit on the south side of the building. The AC unit is proposed to be mounted on the side of the building that fronts along 4th Avenue West. The AC unit will be screened using a faux box made from metal.

The current COA application is a Major Work according to the standards of Main Street Design Standards.

The applicant and property owner is Jason Reasoner of P & B Real, LLC. The PIN is 9568-78-8118.006. The project acreage is 2,768 sq. ft and is zoned C-1, Central Business District. The property is located in the Main Street Historic District.

A history of the subject property was given and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Photos of existing conditions of the property were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A Historic District Overlay map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

An aerial view of the property was shown with an arrow of where the mini-split will be located is included in the staff report and presentation.

The box that would be used to screen the unit was shown. Mr. Hayes stated it is unclear in the application if any pipes, wiring or venting would be shown. The applicant can speak to this.

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if the applicant had explored the possibility of putting the unit on the roof rather than on the side of the building. Chair stated they can ask the applicant about this.

Chair asked if there were any existing holes on the brick. Mr. Hayes stated no. Chair stated the windows are all modern but the brick is original. Mr. Hayes stated yes.

Mr. Hayes stated this is the Postero side wall. He explained the location of the proposed unit. He stated the mini-split will be designed to go into the kitchen. He pointed out the door at the back of the building.

The measurements of the unit were discussed.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant or a representative would like to address the Commission.

Jason Reasoner, 401 N. Mian Street stated he could answer any question the Commission had for him. Chair stated they have to adhere to the standards and discussed one of the standards stating If a new mechanical system is needed, install it so that it causes the least amount of alteration to the building's exterior elevations, historic building fabric, and site features. Chair stated the brick is the historical element on this building. They should also be installed in the most inconspicuous area usually along the buildings rear elevation except you do not have a rear elevation. Chair asked if the cooling unit they have now is along the ceiling. Mr. Reasoner stated yes, they have two gigantic air handlers in the building and they are on the roof. They were done by previous tenants. He has consulted Horizon Heating & Air about the possibility of bringing something else into the kitchen. They guys are roasting, it is like 95 degrees in the kitchen in the summer and it is getting worse every year. They said it would be cost prohibitive to ventilate and go through the roof with another ventilation system and that is why he is proposing the mini-split because it has a pretty small impact but it will hit right where he needs it the most which is in the kitchen.

Chair asked if they cannot go into a window opening. Mr. Reasoner stated he has not explored that option. This is his initial proposal. He thinks it could go in the window. Chair stated they understand why he needs the unit but the problem is going into the brick. Brick is sacred, they can't put it back and they can't make more of the original. Once you cut in there is water damage potential and anything else that might happen because they cannot make a perfect seal. If the windows have already been replaced, then that is not an original material. Mr. Reasoner stated he is willing to explore that option.

Chair stated she did not believe the Commission would be agreeable to cutting the brick without more information so if they could hold open the application and if they could get a proposal of what it would look like and if it was feasible to put it in the window, then they could say they have exhausted the statutory requirements at that point and see what that looks like.

Discussion was made on the mini-split and how this unit would directly feed into the kitchen. Mr. Reasoner stated it would not be feasible to run this to the roof.

Chair asked about making the unit a minor work if it was feasible to put it into the one of the windows. Can he work with staff or will he have to wait and come back next month? Chair stated if he amends the application on the record and they get to the point where they can approve it, as long as it is no bigger than the unit presented and it is in that window opening that would save him having to wait 30 days to come back. Lew Holloway, Community Development Director stated the Commission could give that approval and staff could then issue the COA if they could put it in the window and any details could be worked out with staff but. If they cannot put it in the window then it would have to come back to the Commission.

Chair stated if that size unit could go in the window and you could figure out how to put the window back in, basically like a fan. Mr. Reasoner stated they would lose some of the window and have to get that window framed out and walled in and then have a different window beside it and it will change how that window looks but he is fine with that. As long as his guys are not sweating bullets. Chair stated the window is removable basically, and you don't have a rear so this is the least conspicuous and there is already a big exhaust fan sitting out there and she doesn't think it will protrude more than the fan. She stated that the sign sticks out and she doesn't feel like this will be seen from Main Street.

Mr. Reasoner asked if he puts this in the window will he still need the metal screening around it. Mr. Hayes stated the Design Standards do recommend it. Chair stated if they put it in the window she does not know if they will be able to screen it but they can request it and if he can't it is fine. The exhaust fan is already there and it is not screened.

Chair asked if anyone had any additional questions for the applicant. No one had any questions.

Chair asked if anyone would like to speak for or against the application. No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the motion for a conditional approval.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Reasoner stated the Commission was talking about impeding pedestrian traffic, the bottom of the sill which he pointed out on the photo and stated he was worried if they try to attach it above it will not have enough restraint to keep it from crashing down. He thinks it is better to be supported from below.

Chair stated when they were talking about him having to infill some of the window opening and so as long as it looks good and is a compatible material and she knows it is not going to be brick but something that is distinguishable, she thinks it is up far enough that he will not have to go into the brick because it is going to be built in with its own base, basically. Chair asked Mr. Reasoner if he thought he would have to go into the brick. Mr. Reasoner stated he would have to defer that to the HVAC guys. From the mini-splits that he has seen you have the power unit and you have an air flow unit going in. He thinks if they can get into that window and probably add some more support when they go into the window they should be able to do that without going into the brick.

Chair stated they are going to put into the motion that there are not any supporting features or the unit itself be affixed to the brick. If you get to that point they can talk about it and see.

They discussed the cement being part of the brick. Chair stated you cannot go into any of the original building stuff. If he can't take out that glass and do some sort of infill then they will need to revisit what it is going to look like. She isn't saying he can't but they would rather not go into the cement.

The Commission discussed other window units on Main Street. Mr. Reasoner stated this is a starting point and he was agreeable with it.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H24-050-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 new mechanical system is installed so that it causes the least amount of alteration to the building's exterior elevations, historic building fabric, and site features. (Sec. 3.10.3).

2. The location of the new air conditioning unit is placed in an inconspicuous area and is adequately screened from view. (Sec. 3.10.8). It will be installed in the infill of the window that is existing, it is not to impede pedestrian traffic on 4th Avenue and along the sidewalk and no portion of the unit shall be fastened or damage the supporting structures of the edifice and the supporting structures shall not damage the facade of the building or the materials of the building, the brick or the concrete below the window. The window to be infilled is the lower level window. Commissioner Branigan seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(B) **Certificate of Appropriateness.** Patsy Stewart, 1420 Ridgecrest Drive (H24-049-COA).

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated the application is for the installation of a new front door and an after-the-fact request for the installation of double doors on the rear of the house. The applicant is Patsy Stewart and the PIN for the property is 9569-62-1692. The property is .35 acres and is zoned R-6, High Density Residential. The property is located in the Hyman Heights Historic District.

A Historic District Overlay map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

An aerial view of the property was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A history of the subject property was given and is included in the staff report and presentation.

There are two parts to this COA application. The first is for a new door that will match the same design and the wood will be pine wood. The design is an exact replica of the original door. The only change will be a new black threshold. The second part of the application is for after the fact request for rear double doors. The transom was not installed from the rendering and the mutins were not included for the final doors which you can see in the right image.

Photos of existing conditions of the property were shown and are included int the staff report and presentation.

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commission Boyd asked what the current threshold was. Mr. Hayes stated that is a question for the applicant. Mr. Chapman stated wood.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if someone for the applicant could come up and answer questions.

Dan Chapman, 272 Sugar Hollow Road stated the threshold there is so badly done but he thinks it is hard pine and the door is a solid door and it is also pine.

Commissioner Boyd asked what they were changing the threshold to. Mr. Chapman stated it is a metal one to keep the water out. It will be just like this one. It has a cover over it until the house was done. It comes in a unit and not pieced together.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if they would be able to reuse the hardware. Mr. Chapman stated it is not even original.

Chair asked if the transom window would stay on the front. Mr. Chapman stated it will be the same type transom window and it comes in a unit.

Commissioner Boyd asked if the scale and the frame would be exactly the same. Mr. Chapman stated yes, it is just like that, all wood. It can be stained or painted.

Ms. Stewart asked if it could be painted. Chair stated they can't govern the paint colors.

Chair stated it looked like the application is just for the door so if you are talking about replacing a transom window on the front too, she does not think that is in the application. Mr. Hayes stated that is correct. Mr. Chapman stated he could not get a door without the transom because that would not work on a new door. It will be the same type glass.

Patsy Stewart, 1420 Ridgecrest Drive stated she has now moved in. Chair stated just to confirm what you are applying for will be the pine door stated in the application and then the wood surround on the transom window and it will be the exact same dimensions, the glass will look the same and full wood on the frame. Mr. Chapman stated yes but instead of coming in pieces it will be one full piece. They took the brick and reused it.

The Commission discussed the rear door and the deck. Mr. Chapman stated it wasn't even a deck it was a small jut and then steps. It abuts where the brick goes vertical and then horizontal.

Chair stated they have previously approved the deck and this is just the door. She asked what the material is on the doors. Mr. Chapman stated it is a vinyl door. He stated short of putting an awning or something over it you cannot have a wood door there. Chair asked if the door was finished. Ms. Stewart stated the door is done and that window that use to be a door is part of the same room. She explained the layout of the room.

There were no further questions for the applicant.

Chair asked if any would like to speak for or against the application. No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the application. They discussed including along with the door, the door frame and transom to be included in the motion also.

Commissioner Falvo moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H24-049-COA and located within the Hyman Heights 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: Front Door: 1. The replacement door replicates the original door in-kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original architectural trim, detailing, and material. (Sec. 3.7.6) Rear Door: 1. The new rear door is a new design compatible with the original opening and the historic character of the building. (Sec. 3.7.7) 2. The new rear door is located on the rear of the structure, which is a non-character-defining elevation of the building and does not compromise the architectural integrity of the building. The design is compatible with the overall design of the building and does not duplicate the original. (Sec. 3.7.9) 3. The original architectural character of the exterior wall is maintained with the addition of the doors. (Sec. 3.6.8) The front door includes the replacement door, the surround and the transom. Commissioner Boyd seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI **Old Business.**

- VI(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness.** Patsy Stewart, 1420 Ridgecrest Drive (H24-021-COA) Continued from the July 17, 2024 meeting.

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this application is for after the fact new windows on the main structure. The applicant and property owner is Patsy Stewart. The PIN for the property is 9569-62-1692. The property is .35 acres and is zoned R-6, High Density Residential. The property is located in the Hyman Heights Historic District.

Mr. Hayes gave a review of the application. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

Photos were shown of the windows and are included in the staff report and presentation. He discussed some of the windows sizes that have been changed and pointed those out in the photos.

Mr. Hayes stated at the last meeting the Commission requested that the applicant propose a solution that would mask the vinyl windows. The applicant has proposed the following solution. A three-sided frame covering the sides and top of existing windows and designed to cover approximately one-inch of vinyl that is currently visible. The frame is made out of oak wood trim and painted white to match the existing window frame. The wood frames would be adhered to the window but still allow for the removal of the window screens. The applicant has suggested only doing this on the front façade.

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

Commission Boyd stated so basically it is just a piece of molding around the frame. Mr. Hayes stated yes, it is very thin sitting flush against the frame. He was not sure what it would be adhered to with.

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

Dan Chapman, 272 Sugar Hollow Road and Patsy Stewart, 1420 Ridgecrest Drive stated their name and address for the record.

Mr. Chapman stated this is an indentation and he had to fill that in and this is only a sample. What he does, he fills this in and that sets up and he took quarter inch oak and ripped it down and adhered it to it temporarily. He caulked and painted it so you could see what it looked like, prior to making it permanent. Mr. Chapman stated this is what you see in the vinyl. He pointed out where he put the oak in, an eighth inch or less so that you can get the screen out. Then he caulked and painted it. You can see the grain of the wood. Chair stated it looks really good. He stated he is just using an epoxy.

Chair asked when he does the transom on the door, will that match this or will it be different. Mr. Chapman stated it will be pine like the original door. You would have to walk up on it to see the grain of the wood.

Commissioner Boyd asked if the rationale for only doing the front is due to cost. Mr. Chapman stated it is not the cost, there are so many windows that you can't see them because they are so high and he was trying to get out of the labor. It is not cost, it is just the work to do it.

Ms. Stewart stated you are looking high and you can't tell what it is. Commissioner Boyd stated some people can. Chair stated the next person that comes and asks to do the same thing that she did will say "well theirs are vinyl", and she promises they will see them. It happens all the time.

Chair stated technically the standards say they are all supposed to be wood but the rear façade has a little bit different treatment from the others so she understands this is three facades and a lot of windows but if they are doing this correctly because this is retroactive, they all need to be consistent.

Ms. Stewart stated all she can say is she has spent a lot of money. Chair stated she could have come to them first. Ms. Stewart stated the architects could tell them that the cost of brand new wooden windows is four times the amount. Chair stated there is aluminum clad that is an option. Chair stated the point is, it is retroactive and they have to make it fit and they are not asking them to rip them all out and start over. The worst case is they are going to end up doing this all the way around. Ms. Stewart stated this is a pretty good solution in her opinion.

Mr. Chapman stated the top three windows are aluminum and they were done back some time ago.

The Commission discussed the windows in the rear. Chair suggested doing the three facades and not the rear façade. Chair stated there are about 12/13 openings that need to be done. Chair stated if they can get all three facades done then they will meet the standards.

Discussion was made between the Commission and Ms. Stewart about the windows being up high.

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

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed doing the three facades and not the rear façade. Discussion was made on the motion.

Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H24-021-COA and located within the Hyman Heights 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: The existing windows modified with an oak surround on the front and two sides of the home. 1. The replacement windows once the surround is applied match the original design and dimension and utilize a compatible substitute material. [Sec. 3.7.5] 2. The new windows replace the original unit in kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original sash, panel, pane configuration, architectural trim, and detailing with the surround as noted above. Compatible substitute material was utilized. [Sec. 3.7.5] Commissioner Branigan seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

- VI(B) **Lennox Spring.** Chair stated she had met with Mr. Hayes and Mr. Heyman and they were able to get in touch with the lady that owns the house above Lennox Spring and she is very onboard and excited about having the park down there. She has agreed for them to move forward with how to put the easement on the stairs. Chair stated the next step would be to get a surveyor and determine how that easement would run. She discussed there being a second set of stairs but they have not been found yet. The good news is she is going to donate the easement. Mr. Heyman will draw up a mock easement and they will make sure she is agreeable to it. Mr. Hayes has gotten bids from the surveyors. Mr. Hayes explained the bids he had received. Discussion was made on the surveyors. Discussion was made on the cost and allowing a set amount for staff to move forward on. Mr. Hayes discussed the budget and the amounts in the accounts.

Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Commission to approve \$2,000.00 for the survey and fees/costs associated with the acquisition of the stairs easement from the \$10,000 city general funds. Commissioner Boyd seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VII **Other Business.**

- VII(A) **Preservation Awards.** Mr. Hayes discussed a Cultural Heritage Award in honor of Crystal Cauley. The Commission was agreeable to create this award. The Commission will need to determine the details. Staff direction was to continue with the details of the award.

- VII(B) **Subcommittee Report.** Commissioner Hammond-Green gave a report of the subcommittees. The Cookie Caper/Tour of Inns was discussed.

VIII **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:48 p.m.


Chair