

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 18, 2025

Commissioners Present: Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Jim Boyd, Ralph Hammond-Green, Stan Smith, Edward Sine, John Falvo, Lauren Matoian

Commissioners Absent: Jim Welter, (Vice-Chair), Jane Branigan

Staff Present: Sam Hayes, Planner II, Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney

- 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, 1046 Patton Street discussed designation procedures and history. He discussed stories about special places. He talked about Lenox Spring being an anchoring place of history. He stated it is very important that the local Native American presence be recognized.
- III **Agenda.** Chair made a correction on the agenda to Item “D” being the Gregory House and Item “E” being Lenox Spring. On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Boyd the amended agenda was approved.
- IV **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Falvo the minutes of the meeting of May 21, 2025 were approved.
- V **New Business.**
- V(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness** – Jason Reasoner - 401 N. Main Street (File No. 25-33-COA).
Prior to the opening of the public hearing, Chair announced that there are three applications for a COAs in the Main Street Historic District and two applications for Landmark Nominations. 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, Jason Reasoner, Ann Twiggs, Eva-Michelle Spicer, Barbara Grosso, Ann Twiggs, and Ken Fitch.

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this is a major work and it is a front door installation at 401 N. Main Street. The applicant and the property owner are Jason Reasoner. This property is in the C-1 Central Business

District as well as the Main Street Historic Overlay District.

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

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 door being proposed for this location is on the Main Street side.

The history of the subject property was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. A historic photo of the building was shown and Mr. Hayes stated the original door has been replaced.

A COA description was given and is included in the staff report and presentation. The applicant provided a photo of the door on the side of the building and it will be similar to what is being proposed.

Additional site photos were shown 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 presented and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if there was a rendering of what the new door looks like. Mr. Hayes stated no rendering but you can see from the site sketch what the door would look like. They have created more of a transom window above the actual door and then you would have those sidelights extending all the way up.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if the color would be the same as the photo from the side door. Mr. Hayes stated that is his understanding but he would let the applicant confirm that.

Mr. Reasoner stated that the proposed new door is actually thinner than the existing door.

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

Jason Reasoner, 401 N. Main Street Suite 100 stated his name for the record.

Commissioner Boyd stated the proposed material for the new door was aluminum and asked if it would be the same color as the side door. Mr. Reasoner stated yes. Commissioner Boyd asked what the reason for the door replacement was. Mr. Reasoner stated not only is the door extremely difficult for the guests to open, he has had it worked on a few times to get it balanced and make it easier to open to no avail. It also does not have a good seal on it. There is a lot of energy loss between outside and inside the door. He stated the door is nice but it is ridiculously heavy.

Chair discussed the drawing and Mr. Reasoner explained the drawing and replacement.

Mr. Reasoner stated there are a number of aluminum doors up and down Main Street.

Discussion was made on the size of the door. Mr. Reasoner stated the total size would not go beyond what is currently there.

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

Chair stated just to confirm, he is agreeable if they approve it with the plan that is created with a larger door and lesser side panels but that full section there. Mr. Reasoner stated he can talk to his contractor and make sure the door is wide enough and go ahead and get on his calendar? Chair stated yes, they will approve so that he has options so he doesn't have to come back, he can just talk to staff.

Commissioner Falvo asked if there was any kind of code requirement for the width of a door from a front access with a space such as this one for handicap access. Mr. Reasoner stated it would absolutely have to be handicap accessible. Mr. Hayes stated staff can help with it being ADA accessible.

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.

Ann Twiggs, 305 S. Whitted Street asked how this door will be less heavy than the current door. Is the existing door not aluminum. Mr. Reasoner stated it is not aluminum, it is a very thick glass with steel all the way around it.

Chair asked if anyone wished to speak before the public hearing is closed. No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed 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 # 25-33-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 current door is not the original door based on evidence from the Baker Barber photo collection. 2. The replacement of the door is necessary and is appropriate in size, scale, proportion, material, and detail based on the original door as depicted in the Baker Barber photo collection. (Sec. 3.4.2.3) 3. The new door unit will be appropriately sized to fill the original opening (Sec. 3.4.2.4). The door will not be impeding on the sandstone framing around the door. For the provision of the sidelights may be either as shown in the drawing during the hearing or extend full height and those approvals will be by staff and the door can be enlarged as necessary beyond what is shown in the drawing on the framework. Commissioner Sine seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(B) **Certificate of Appropriateness** - Spicer Greene, 225 N. Main Street (File No. 25-31-COA).

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this is another major work and is a complete storefront rehabilitation at 225 N. Main Street. The applicant and property owner is Elliott Spicer. The project is located in the C-1, Central Business District as well as the Main Street Historic Overlay District.

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

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.

Mr. Hayes stated the description mentioned that the southern storefront (which is the storefront you are hearing today) is unaltered. That is not necessarily true. The Baker Barber photo from the 1900's shows a different storefront. It looks similar but there are definite differences. The image from 1989 does show the current storefront. He is unsure when the full alterations were done to the storefront. There are some significant changes from that earlier storefront to the current storefront.

A description of the COA was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A photo of the inlay of the entryway was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

More site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes discussed the transom windows and stated they are proposed to be replaced with a similar style window.

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.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair discussed the front center and the windows.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if there are different owners for each section. Mr. Hayes stated yes he believes so.

Chair asked if the inlay was just concrete. Mr. Hayes stated it is actually tile. Chair asked if they knew what was under the tile. Mr. Hayes stated that is a question for the applicant.

Mr. Hayes stated he did include two conditions in the approval that the Commission can consider. One is regarding composite material. There was a proposal to use composite material, they specified one

but said it could be something else for the trim and per the Design Standards we don't allow nonnatural wood and things like that and so he added that in there. And the upper transom windows to be preserved rather than replaced with the aluminum clad that they have proposed. These are for the Commission to consider.

Chair asked if Main Street allowed aluminum clad. Mr. Hayes stated we don't specifically say aluminum clad in the standards.

There were no further questions for staff.

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

Eva-Michelle Spicer, 25 Parkview Drive, Asheville NC stated they are delighted to be here in Hendersonville. She stated she is a fourth generation jeweler and her grandparents actually lived in Hendersonville.

Chair asked about the tiles. Ms. Spicer stated they have not pulled up the tiles yet because they have to know what they can put back down. They also bought the condo beneath it so it is actually six different owners in that building. They are all retail and other condos. They purchased this street front and the one beneath it. The basement actually goes out and almost underneath the sidewalk and you can see that the ramp is slab.

Chair stated the transom windows are not original and the crosshatch was added but it does compliment what looks to be original. Commissioner Hammond-Green stated it comes down to compatibility because it definitely is not what was there before. Chair asked how much of that is glass on the top windows. Ms. Spicer stated even though they are aluminum clad, all the triangles are glass. She stated they are selling jewelry and they want as much light in there as possible. All of the triangles in there are glass the crosshatches are just not wood. The glass triangles are panes. They are the same as the condo above them. It is all glass in those crosshatches. It is not tinted, it is just the way the rendering looks. It is as close as they can get to now but the wood is so rotten.

Chair asked if it was wood with aluminum clad. Ms. Spicer stated she did not know the answer to that but she would imagine it was. Chair stated that is what they looked like and what they typically are. There are others around on Main Street.

Ms. Spicer stated aluminum clad is on the storefront. The wood is rotting and it is not great for longevity.

Chair stated their standards do not allow artificial materials. Aluminum is not expressly addressed in the Main Street standards but it is addressed in other districts so the wood with aluminum clad is a permissible historic material. The composite and the artificial stuff even if they look wood grain are not under their standards. When North Carolina changed the rules, standards became rules instead of suggested guidelines.

Chair asked what exactly the material is. Ms. Spicer stated she wished she knew exactly what it was. The composite that she thinks they are using is like a trex like a chicken nugget wood where it is like ground up wood and glued back together again to prevent the rot. Chair asked if she knew of any other

properties on Main Street that have this similar composite. Ms. Spicer stated she does not know of any others.

Chair asked how much of this would be composite. Ms. Spicer stated just the trim. It is to make it look like wood without rotting. It will all be painted.

Discussion was made on the upper part being wood and the door frame being wood currently. Chair asked if everything on the store level front would be composite. Ms. Spicer stated yes. Chair asked and everything from the Spicer Greene up except for the aluminum would be wood. Ms. Spicer stated yes.

Chair asked if it has grain. Ms. Spicer stated it is smooth. Chair stated the reason she is asking is that the standards say you can't create a false impression.

Discussion was made on artificial materials not being allowed under the standards.

Chair stated to confirm for the record, it all going to fill what is there. Ms. Spicer stated yes, they are not going beyond the brick. They are tidying it up with bigger taller doors like in the original photo.

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

Chair asked about the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Hayes pulled those up to search for composite materials.

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. Composite materials were discussed.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if they would consider using a traditional wood unit that is clad. Ms. Spicer stated yes, especially if it is clad because of the rot situation. Her concern is just finding trim that detailed to make it look like what is there now that is clad.

A comment was made asking which is more environmental, chopping down a tree and splitting it then putting alumni foil over it or using wood that has been chopped up and glued together and putting aluminum foil over it.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the motion and conditions.

Commissioner Matoian moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # 25-31-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 new 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 building. (Sec. 3.1.7) 2. The replacement of the door is necessary and is appropriate replacement in size, scale, proportion, material, and detail based on the original door as depicted in the Baker Barber photo collection. (Sec. 3.4.2.3) Conditions: 1. Composite material is not an appropriate substitute material. Natural wood or wood with aluminum cladding should be used for all repairs and replacement. (Sec. 3.8.1) Commissioner Falvo seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(C) **Certificate of Appropriateness – Dan Chapman, 132 3rd Avenue East (File No. 25-30-COA)**

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated the applicant and the property owner did not show up for the hearing tonight. It is staff's recommendation that the Commission continue the hearing. Staff would ask that you continue it to the next meeting.

Commissioner Smith moved the Commission to continue and hold open COA File No. 25-30-COA to the July 16, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Falvo seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(D) **Landmark Nomination – James P. and Hattie Gregory House (File No. 25-02-LL)**

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this is a local landmark nomination for the James P. and Hattie Gregory House. The property is located at 910 Locust Street.

A photo of the craftsman style home was shown and included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes gave a brief history of the property which is included in the staff report and presentation.

Construction of the home was discussed and a brief summary is included in the staff report and presentation.

Rental years and the selling of the home was discussed and a brief summary is included in the staff report and presentation.

The architectural significance of the property was discussed.

Mr. Hayes stated the Commission will either recommend approval or denial and the next step would be to go to City Council for their approval.

Commissioner Smith stated he previously owned the home and wanted to recuse himself from the vote. Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney stated he represents staff and not the Commission. This is a legislative public hearing and not a quasi-judicial evidentiary hearing but if Commissioner Smith does not think he can make an impartial decision based on the facts in front of him he can recuse himself. If he has something to offer that is fine, we are not bound by the rules of evidence in a legislative hearing.

Commissioner Smith stated it is a perfect craftsman model house. Mr. Heyman stated he thinks it is perfectly fine for him to offer his personal knowledge of the home to the Commission.

Commissioner Smith recused himself from the vote.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Discussion was made with Barbara Grosso, property owner about the roofline of the house. She asked that the Commission support this.

Ann Twiggs, 305 S. Whitted Street stated this is a lovely craftsman style home built in 1917. She asked what being a landmark would add to the home since it is already in a historic district. Mr. Hayes stated it is in a national historic district which is honorary but it does not add protection to any of those properties so you can do anything you want in that district where as in the local designated historic district or if it is a local landmark, whatever you want to do on the exterior of the property would come before the Commission and get approval. The property owner also receives a 50% tax deferment to their property taxes.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street discussed the shed and stated it is a very unique feature. He asked how that was described. Chair stated that is spelled out in the application. Mr. Hayes stated they are not doing the interior of this property. Chair stated they could do the shed as exterior to the house. Mr. Hayes stated he can add that to the report for the root cellar. Mr. Hayes stated the landmark would be for the whole property and everything on it.

Chair asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak. No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Historic Preservation Commission recommend to City Council to approve the adoption of an ordinance designating the James P. and Hattie Gregory House (PIN 9569-70-9549) as a local historic landmark and that it include the out buildings as well as the main house. Commissioner Falvo seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(E) **Landmark Nomination – Lenox Spring (File No. 25-01-LL)**

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this is another landmark nomination for Lenox Spring. This is actually a city owned property. This was initiated by the Commission a year or so ago. It is for our Lenox Spring Park which is the city's smallest park. It is a very small piece of property.

A site photo was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A historical overview was given and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A description of the site was given along with a photo of a postcard of the park which is included in the staff report and presentation.

A photo of the site from the Baker Barber Collection was shown and included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes stated they had a plat/survey done of the park. One of the reasons this was done is because the stone steps are not actually on the city's property. The survey was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation. An easement area around those steps has been granted to the city. The easement will be filed and recorded. This will allow the city to maintain the steps.

The elements and architectural description was discussed. Photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. He pointed out what he believes is one of the rails from the street car rail system that ran through the park.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

The Commission discussed the Indian heritage that is associated with this park.

Chair asked if anyone had any questions for staff.

Ann Twiggs, 305 S. Whitted Street stated she lives just up the street from the spring and when they moved here in 2015 they walked down the street to see what was going on down there and did some research and got some stories and lots of people use to come up to take the waters and that's why those seats inside there, the water would come up and they would take the water. It was pretty popular at one time with the turn of the century she thinks. She is very much in favor of it being a landmark. The landmark designation is really important so that it is protected.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street talked about the history of the park and the Native American presence. He stated it was very important to consider and document the Native American presence.

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

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

Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Matoian moved the Historic Preservation Commission recommend to City Council to approve the adoption of an ordinance designating Lenox Spring (PIN 9568-55-1019) as a local historic landmark. Commissioner Boyd seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI **Old Business.**

- VI(A) **2025-2026 Budget Approval.** Mr. Hayes discussed the budget for 2025-2026. The budget was reviewed for approval. The Commission discussed the budget with staff.

Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Commission approve the budget for 2025-2026 year as proposed. Commissioner Falvo seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

- VI(B) **Findings of Fact.** 1521 Kensington Road (File No. 25-25-COA) *On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Boyd the Findings of Fact for File No. 25-25-COA were approved.*

- VI(C) **Findings of Fact.** 344 N. Main Street (File No. H24-098-COA). *On motion of Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green the Findings of Fact for File No. H24-098-COA were approved.*

VII **Other Business.**

- VII(A) **Staff Report.** Mr. Hayes discussed the Neighborhood History Project. He stated he met the SHPO and a consultant today to discuss potential neighborhoods for National Register listing. They walked through three neighborhoods.

- VIII **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.


Chair