

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 15, 2021

Commissioners Present: Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Chris Barron, Sam Hayes, Derek Cote, Chuck Reed (Vice-Chair)

Commissioners Absent: Ralph Hammond-Green

Staff Present: Matthew Manley, Planning Manager/Commission Coordinator, Terri Swann, Administrative Assistant III

- I **Call to Order.** Chair called this meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:04 pm.
- II **Agenda.** On motion of Commissioner Reed and seconded by Commissioner Cote; the Commission approved the agenda.
- III **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Cote seconded by Commissioner Barron the minutes of the Regular meeting of August 18, 2021 were approved.
- IV(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness,** HVL Property Holdings LLC/Katie Montes, applicant, 147 1st Avenue East Unit C, (File No. H21-27-COA). Prior to the opening of the public hearing, Chair announced that 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 protocol 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 what goes on. 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 who wishes to testify during the public hearings should come forward to be sworn in. Chair swore in all potential witnesses.

Mr. Manley stated the applicant is not here, but she was notified of the hearing.

Mr. Manley gave the following analysis:

The Community Development Department is in receipt of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness permit from Katie Montes to undertake the following work at the above referenced property:

1. Replace garage door with roll-up, glass garage door.

The proposal is to replace the current opaque garage door with a roll-up, glass garage door. The date of construction of this building was 1901 and it was considered "contributing". Apparent renovations to the exterior of Unit C have occurred since the inventory was compiled.

Mr. Manley stated the applicant has done a lot of work at this location. It is on the edge of the historic

district. The door was approved on the same building, just a separate unit. They have also repainted and were approved for a lighted sign. A lot of improvements have been done.

They are proposing to replace an existing garage door with a glass aluminum framed 16' x 14' garage door, the glass is proposed to be tinted. The door that was approved last month, all of that has been painted black so that whole stretch of the building will be consistent.

Mr. Manley showed other examples of doors around town that have been approved.

Mr. Manley showed the Storefront Guidelines with an emphasis on .7 – *When original or early storefronts no longer exist or are too deteriorated to save, retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic buildings.* The current door is a replacement door and not from 1910 when the building was constructed.

Mr. Manley also referenced guideline .8 – *The use of reflective or highly tinted glass is discouraged.* They are proposing a tinted glass, he would prefer that the applicant be here but his understanding from the applicant is that the tinted glass in their opinion would not be highly tinted, but it is necessary to help protect from the sun and protect the artwork that is in the building. Their only other alternative would be to put some kind of curtain up behind it which essentially would really diminish the transparency. The goal of the reduction in the tinted glass is to maintain transparency along the pedestrian level and to create a visually interesting experience for folks in the historic district. You have to gage which would be worse, something that is tinted, and you can still see through or something that completely blocks the view.

Mr. Manley stated guideline .10 – *It is not appropriate to introduce new windows or doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Keep new windows and doors compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, location, size materials and details.* They are proposing to fill that entire space. The materials are in line with appropriate materials in the historic district. They are not creating any new openings.

Mr. Manley presented suggested motions to the Commission for approval and denial.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Cote stated his only question to the applicant if they were here would be can they specify the level of tinting they are talking about. He has driven by when they are open, and it looks like they have the door open all the time. Mr. Manley suggested setting a condition in the approval relating to the tinting.

Chair stated Moe's is tinted and as far as she knows it is the only one on Main Street. Mr. Manley thought Oklawaha Brewing was tinted but it is not on Main Street. Chair asked if they could use another property in the district as a comparison. The Commission did approve the tinting on the windows at Moe's due to the southern orientation of the building and if this tinting is not darker than Moe's and staff could make that distinction. Mr. Manley stated that would be a good way to go.

Chair discussed the Tint Barn that was located at the corner of 6th Avenue and Main Street, they were a tinting business and they blacked out their windows where you couldn't see anything and that is what

brought tinting into discussion. That is when the Commission started asking for removable peelings, which is what Moe's ended up doing. Moe's brought in comparison pieces with the part that was in the sun and the part that wasn't and what it had done to it in six months. They lost half their dining room because you could not sit out there, even with the curtains it was so hot. That is how they approached it, if they had other southern facings, this is what they allowed on there and you could still see through it.

Commissioner Cote asked if they wanted to be able to see through it and it not be black. Chair stated the idea is to maintain the original storefronts and they remain visible so that you can see inside. That is what the guidelines state. Mr. Manley stated the guidelines read highly tinted is inappropriate.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair closed the public hearing. The Commission discussed how to include tinting in the motion.

Commissioner Reed moved the Commission find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file #H21-27-COA, if installed 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 Main Street Historic District for the following reasons: 3.1 Storefronts: Storefront guideline .7, at the site of the proposed project the original or early storefronts no longer exist and the proposed project will retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic building. Additionally, the proposed door aligns with 3.4.2 Windows and Doors, Guideline .10 because the proposed project does not introduce new windows or doors that would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features and does keep new windows and doors compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, location, size materials and details. Chair moved to amend the motion to include the condition that the level of tinting on the windows and the door will maintain a level of transparency consistent with the applicable guidelines including 3.4.2.8 but not limited there to and that the windows will be comparable in the tinting to those currently at Moe's Barbeque and also Oklawaha Brewing. Commissioner Barron seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

- V **Approval of Findings of Fact.** Chair stated the Findings of Fact for H21-20-COA, H21-21-COA, H21-22-COA and H21-24-COA needed to be approved.

Commissioner Reed moved the Commission to approve the Findings of Fact for H21-20-COA, H21-21-COA, H21-22-COA and H21-24-COA. Commissioner Cote seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

- VI(A) **Staff update on approved COA's.** Mr. Manley stated there were no staff approved COA's this month.

- VI(B) **Update on African American History efforts.** Commissioner Hayes attended a meeting that was more broad than just 7th Avenue. There were no specific landmark buildings mentioned. Chair stated it would be helpful to have a list of landmark buildings in the 7th Avenue District. Commissioner Hayes mentioned historical signs and plaques. Chair stated they can look at HPC funds for this. Mr. Manley stated several sites are now gone but they could have recognition of those places somehow. Chair suggested a map like the walking tour map. The next meeting will be Thursday at 4:00pm. Chair suggested getting an idea of what they want or would like to do.

stated several sites are now gone but they could have recognition of those places somehow. Chair suggested a map like the walking tour map. The next meeting will be Thursday at 4:00pm. Chair suggested getting an idea of what they want or would like to do.

- VI(C) **Demolition by Neglect – Update on 1420 Ridgecrest Drive.** Mr. Manley showed a timeline of this property. The complaints go back 15 years. It was dormant for about 8 years. Inspections have been done along with updates to staff. Staff did receive a complaint concerning a fallen tree and landscaping issues. There have not been any steps taken since 2018. The City Code under Historic Preservation talks about Demo by Neglect Standards. Mr. Manley is not sure they have the documentation to do enforcement for the remedy of the property and with a new City Attorney he feels like the process would have to start over again. The property owner has mentioned selling the property. Chair discussed deferring any action until the end of the year. Mr. Manley stated he would go out to the property and do an inspection on Friday and include his findings on the next agenda.

- VII **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:53 p.m.


Chair