



# CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Operations Center - Assembly Room | 305 Williams St. | Hendersonville NC 28792  
Wednesday, May 18, 2022 – 5:00 PM

---

## AGENDA

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[A.](#) Minutes of April 20, 2022 meeting

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**

A. Staff Update on Administrative COA's

B. Appointment of the Design Guidelines Committee

C. Staff Update on HPC Workplan

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

[A.](#) 1420 Ridgcrest Dr. – Demolition by Neglect (H21-31-DEM) – *Alexandra Hunt / Planner I*

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

*The City of Hendersonville is committed to providing accessible facilities, programs and services for all people in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Should you need assistance or an accommodation for this meeting please contact the City Clerk no later than 24 hours prior to the meeting at 697-3005.*

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

**Minutes of the Meeting of April 20, 2022**

**Commissioners Present:** Chris Battista, Jim Welter (Vice-Chair), Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Ralph Hammond-Green, Crystal Cauley

**Commissioners Absent:** Chris Barron, Chris Dannals, Sam Hayes

**Staff Present:** Matthew Manley, Planning Manager/Commission Coordinator, Alexandra Hunt, Planner I, Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney

- I **Call to Order.** Chair called this meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 pm.
- II **Agenda.** Chair moved to amend the agenda to include public comment prior to the public hearings and to move Item D up to Item C to keep the COA's together. Commissioner Welter seconded the motion to amend the agenda. Commissioner Hammond-Green moved to amend the agenda to include an update concerning staff approved COA's. Commissioner Welter seconded the motion to amend the agenda. The amended agenda was approved.
- III **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green seconded by Commissioner Welter the minutes of the Regular meeting of February 16, 2022 and the Special meeting of March 30, 2022 were approved.
- VI **Public Comment:** Chair stated anyone wishing to speak would have three minutes and no comments can be made on the public hearings for tonight.

Lynne Williams, Chadwick Avenue. Ms. Williams wanted clarification on speaking about Boyd Park. Chair stated she can make comment on Boyd Park. Ms. Williams thanked the HPC on writing the letter and having conversations concerning Boyd Park. She stated the Friends of Boyd Park and Laura E. Corn Mini-Golf will be holding an event at the library on April 30<sup>th</sup> from 2:00 to 4:00 pm. It is for the community to come out and learn about the history. She previously tried to give public input on Boyd Park at the previous two meetings but was unable to do so. She also wanted to request attention to Chadwick Avenue as a historic district potential and/or single out historic properties in this location to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood which also includes a forest with large trees that are part of the character of the neighborhood. She has a plat of Forest Hills that was platted in 1905 where her house does sit. She was told the HPC has a committee, and this may go before the committee for consideration. If there is anything she can do to facilitate that please let her know. She discussed the sale of the property that may be heard by City Council tomorrow she wasn't sure if this was the property or if it is part of the historic part of Berkley Park but if it is she wanted to bring this to the Commission's attention. Chair stated she was aware of it and the public interest meeting is tomorrow and they will get more details about it and pick up from there.

Larry Phillips, 1102 Pinebrook Circle stated he did send out a bulk email to their petitioners and received three back and would give copies to the Commission if they would like. He spoke with Jennifer Cathy the restoration specialist with the Eastern Division of the North Carolina Historic Preservation

Commission and he also reached out to Sybil Argintar and he did receive a note from her stating this is not only about mini-golf and tennis, this property has been a recreation facility donated to the community and visitors to enjoy and she also stated there was historic significance to this property. She has a resume where she has done a lot of work in historic Hendersonville, but he did not print that off. She has done a lot of the research for downtown Hendersonville. He does have a copy of the email he had sent to Matt and Cheryl. He also sent out information to Matt, Lew and Cheryl on the land swap. He wanted to let them know that City Council has left them out of what is supposed to happen with Berkley Park. On the district map they took the historic ballfield and what was supposed to be the land swap and that completely destroys the National Register of Berkley Park that is on the registry now. It takes it completely out of the National Registry. He wants to bring this to the HPC's attention since they were left out of this. Chair stated they have not been left out of this as she has had conversations with John Connet and they will have a discussion with the Commission but they can't do anything until they have the public interest meeting. Mr. Phillips stated they haven't been included when two years ago they voted to use Berkely Park as a swap and that has completely taken out the historic ballfield from public schools. That is not part of the discussion for tomorrow. He just wanted to make sure they are aware that City Council has taken out the boundaries of the ballfield on the National Registry for Berkely Park.

## V Old Business

V(A) **Approval of the Findings of Fact - H22-01-COA.** On motion of Commissioner Welter seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green the Findings of Fact for H22-01-COA were approved.

V(B) **1420 Ridgecrest Update – Demolition by Neglect (H21-31-DEM).** Alexandra Hunt, Planner I stated the city has not heard from the attorney concerning the Ridgecrest property since last December. Staff is prepared to move forward with the Demolition by Neglect if the Commission would like. Staff just asks that this be continued to May's agenda to give staff some time to review the file and come up with a draft petition to prepare more of an update for the Commission. According to the update in December, they have determined ownership of 1420 Ridgecrest. Chair stated they do have a Code Enforcement Officer now and can move forward but they need to give staff time to put the process in order. The Commission asked staff to add this to the May agenda.

V(C) **Minor works update** – Ms. Hunt gave an update of the staff approved COA's that have been issued.

## VI Other Business

VI(A) **Appointments for the Community Affairs Committee and Designation Committee** – Ms. Hunt explained the purpose for both committees. She stated these meetings can be held virtually. These will be monthly meetings. Appointed to the Community Affairs Committee were Commissioner Hayes, Commissioner Welter and Commissioner Hammond-Green. Appointed to the Designation Committee was Commissioner Battista, Commissioner Cauley, Commissioner Hammond-Green and Chair.

## VII New Business

VII(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness**, Dennis Dunlap, 225 N. Main Street (File No. H22-019-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.

Chair opened the public hearing.

Alexandra Hunt, Planner I stated the city is in receipt of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Dennis Dunlap of Dunlap Construction, applicant and Hendersonville Holdings, LLC, Property owner for the addition of a balcony and the replacement of windows on the second floor for a residential unit located at 225 N. Main Street. It is located above the Christmas Garden Décor and More store. The PIN is 9568-77-8673. The existing zoning is C-1 and is in the Main Street Historic District.

The applicant stated in the application that the balcony will match the existing balcony located at 231 N. Main Street, which is the subject property to the right of the building when facing N. Main Street.

A vicinity map was shown of the Main Street Overlay District with the subject property in yellow. Also shown was an aerial map of the property outlined in red.

The property is a contributing two-story Neo-Classical structure constructed circa 1910 for the People's National Bank and contains four second story windows on either side of the entrance bay. Two storefront entrances on either side of the entrance bay and are accessed from Main Street.

Photos of the existing conditions were shown. The existing balcony on 231 N. Main Street was shown. The proposed balcony will match it. Elevations of the proposed balcony were shown. The sign will be removed, and the balcony will be positioned under the four windows.

The Tree Board reviewed a vegetation removal application on March 15<sup>th</sup> submitted by the applicant to remove the Holly tree located in the front of the subject property and the Board subsequently voted to deny the vegetation removal permit given that it was a healthy Holly tree. There has been discussion that this tree could possibly be pruned and possibly later on down the road, Public Works could replace the trees as they occasionally do to something a little smaller to match the other existing street trees.

The Design Standards that were applicable to this application were shown and are included in the staff report.

Staff will answer any questions the Commission may have, and the applicant is here and can also answer any questions.

Commissioner Welter asked when the sign that they are taking down was put up. Ms. Hunt was unsure of when the sign was placed on the building. She does know it is not considered a conforming sign. The applicant did indicate to staff that the new property owners did also purchase the store and will be moving a different store into that space.



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

Dennis Dunlap, Dunlap Construction stated he is the general contractor doing the work for the unit on the second floor. Jason Kraus and his wife are the new owners. They purchased both the upstairs and the downstairs. The condo was constructed in the early 80's and they will totally gut it out and redo it. They want to match the balcony that is on the right-hand side of the building. They want to match the windows also. One of the windows would be cut to make a door out onto the balcony but it would match everything on the right side. Chair asked how much it is being cut. Mr. Dunlap stated 18 inches or so. The one on the right doesn't show it but one of those lower windows is a door. Chair stated they will be identical, and Mr. Dunlap replied yes.

Commissioner Welter asked when the balcony on the right was added. Mr. Dunlap stated he does remember but Joe Farrar the orthodontist in town, that is his condo, he added it maybe in the early to mid-90's. Commissioner Welter stated it was probably before the historic district. Mr. Dunlap stated definitely so. Ms. Hunt stated staff tried to pull records for 231 and there were none so it must be prior to being in the historic district.

Commissioner Welter asked if the windows that were going in would match all of their guidelines. Mr. Dunlap stated all he knows is they will match what is on the right-hand side. Chair asked if he knows what the materials will be. Mr. Dunlap stated no. Commissioner Welter stated they have guidelines for what the materials can be, and he assumes Mr. Dunlap will follow that. Mr. Dunlap stated yes. Chair asked if he would be ok with the Commission adding a condition to the motion that the materials will match what is in the guidelines. Mr. Dunlap stated yes.

Chair asked if the metal would be wrought iron. Mr. Dunlap stated it is steel. Mr. Dunlap stated he would match what is on the right side and he assume it is powder coated.

Commissioner Battista was concerned about the size of the balcony and the railings and if it would be appropriate even though the neighbors have one. It will considerably change the appearance of the building.

Chair stated one of the guidelines for additions is the addition cannot visually overpower the original building or comprise its historic character or destroy any significant features or materials. Can he speak to the compatibility of this in scale to what is on Main Street? She knows there are other balconies at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Dunlap stated he did those, and they were duplicated from Baker-Barber photos and were based on the photos from that collection. He discussed matching what is on the building even though there are three different owners of the building. They just wanted to duplicate what is on the right side as it is all one building. Chair discussed the scale and dimensions being overpowering and asked if there were any others located on Main Street that are similar in scale and size. Mr. Dunlap stated he does not know. Commissioner Battista stated the second balcony that Mr. Farrar owns is wrought iron and is not as visually impacting.

Chair stated the other issue is the compatibility of the proposed additions of historic buildings will be reviewed in terms of mass, scales, materials, color and spacing of the windows and doors. Additions should echo the style of the original structure and additions that introduce compatible contemporary design are both acceptable. Chair stated that is what they are trying to get to. Mr. Dunlap talked about the brackets and braces and how they would not be seen. Chair asked if these are removable, if in the

future they had to take them off. Mr. Dunlap stated you could take them off. Chair asked without substantial damage. Mr. Dunlap stated there would be through-rods and bolts tied to the building. He stated the building is concrete building, the whole thing. He stated it was easy to attach to concrete. If you removed it, it would leave a three-quarter inch hole where the tie-rods went in.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if the awnings would be removed. Mr. Dunlap stated he did not know; he has not addressed that at all.

The Commission discussed the windows and the windows being replaced and not being the original ones. Mr. Dunlap stated the current windows are just plate glass windows.

Chair discussed having removable additions and the guideline that pertains to this. She stated with the balcony it sounds like if removed the damage would be minimal. What concerns her is if they cut an additional hole for the window. She asked Mr. Dunlap to speak to this as far as code goes. He stated it would not meet ADA to step across a windowsill. As far as code you have to have some kind of accessibility in case of fire and a window suffices but there is a minimum square footage, and it has to be operable. The three balconies he did on the Houston building they had to cut the bottom of the window out because there was an 18" step over the sill. Now it is flush, and you just walk out on the deck. But there was no HPC involved back then.

Commissioner Welter stated there needs to be a balance on the guidelines and the congruity on Main Street with what is already there. He realizes some of the changes were done before the HPC, but this doesn't seem to be too incongruous with what is typical for the Main Street lofts. Chair agreed and stated she was trying to get this to fall within the guidelines.

Discussion was made on the transoms, ones with the design in them and what Mr. Dunlap is proposing. Mr. Dunlap stated the owner told him it would match totally with what is there on the other side. Mr. Manley asked if it would have the design like what is there now and not the one in the photos. Chair asked if it would be mirrored with what the other side is. Mr. Dunlap stated yes. Mr. Manley stated a condition could be made on the awnings. The Commission was more concerned about the design of the windows and balcony railing than they were about the awnings.

Chair stated the current proposal for the record is for the windows and the transom would match what is on the right side the door would be the same as what is on the right side so proposed about 18" change and the materials for the windows and the door would be in keeping with what the historic guidelines require. Mr. Dunlap stated yes.

There were no further questions or comments. Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed symmetry and the number of balconies that are already there. No one had gone to look at the building concerning this application. Commissioner Battista had concerns about the balcony and how much it changes the façade of the building with the scale of it. Chair stated there is no uniform style of balcony for Main Street. She talked about looking at compatibility with what is there now. They discussed the character of the district. They also discussed other balconies being built and having no Commission at that time. The Design Standards were discussed that applied.

***Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H22-019-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 for the following reasons: The proposed addition would not diminish the original design of the building. The proposed addition retains and preserves original architectural metals. The proposed addition will be constructed so that there is the least possible damage to the building and fabric. The proposed addition is designed so that it is compatible with the historic building in mass, materials, color, and proportion and spacing of windows and doors, and either references design motifs from the historic building, or introduce a contemporary design that is compatible with the historic building. Any materials used for the windows or door will be compliant with the historic guidelines and the addition will match the other side of the building. Commissioner Welter seconded the motion which passed 4 in favor and 1 opposed (Battista).***

**VII(B) Certificate of Appropriateness – William Ford – 412 N. Main Street (File No. H22-024-COA).**

Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hunt stated the city id receipt of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from William Ford (applicant and Betty R. Johnson (property owner) for the addition of a vinyl wrapped metal façade on the property located at 412 N. Main Street. The applicant stated in the application they are using metal to create the vision of wood with a storefront sign. The PIN is 9568-88-0236 and the current zoning is C-1, Central Business and is located in the Main Street Historic District. This is a major work proposal.

The vicinity map was shown. The aerial view of the property was shown outlined in red.

Ms. Hunt stated this is a non-contributing building that was constructed in circa 1920. The building originally had a brick façade that was later stuccoed and modernized. The building has a historical marker that was placed on the building in 2009 and states the use as a Men's' Wear Store and Shoe Store. The photo from 1987 was shown and included in the staff report.

The existing condition of the subject property was shown. Ms. Hunt stated the sign is placed on top of the vinyl wrapped metal façade. It is not all one piece. The sign is separate. Ms. Hunt pointed out the cracks on the façade that the metal is covering. Examples of the use of natural wood for facades on Main Street were shown.

The Design Standards that applied were shown and included in the staff report.

Staff can answer any questions and the applicant is present as well.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if the applicant presented a picture of the proposed sign. Ms. Hunt stated currently staff is not in receipt of a sign permit from the applicant. Chair stated it is there already and are now seeking approval for what is already there. It was done after the fact. Ms. Hunt stated correct.

Commissioner Battista stated they do not know what is under the façade. Chair stated stucco but they do not know the condition. Ms. Hunt stated staff is unaware of the condition. She reached out to property manager to see if they had any pictures or photos to see what was there prior to the metal façade being placed on the storefront. They were unable to find or have any photos.

There were no further questions for staff.

William Ford, 412 N. Main Street stated he has photos showing the cracks and they actually go through the whole thing and the metal is actually preserving the structure that is up there. The stucco that was up there was falling and was hazardous to people that were walking underneath it. They thought the metal and steel would hold it and keep it secure. It is actually anchored in to keep it from falling and to preserve it. Chair asked how thick it was. Mr. Ford stated it is a pretty decent piece of steel.

Commissioner Battista asked how it was anchored. Mr. Ford stated it is anchored through the brick. He thought the guy was getting the permit but did not. Chair stated it is anchored through the stucco and through the brick. Mr. Ford stated yes, it goes through the stucco and the brick. Chair asked how many anchor points there are. Mr. Ford stated he could come back at a later date and give her the amount. Chair asked if he knew the condition of the brick underneath. Mr. Ford stated no, the stucco covers it, but the stucco was falling in big giant chips when they were moving in. He put the metal wrap up there to keep it from harming people. The canopy that was there was falling out because of the stucco.

Commissioner Welter stated the stucco was not original and there is brick behind it. He asked if there was any consideration to remove the stucco and go back to the brick. Mr. Ford stated he was not the building owner and did not know what kind of construction cost that would entail. It would also have to be done for the adjoining building as the stucco goes across on it too.

Chair stated in their guidelines the first one states “whenever repairing or renovating, it is recommended that any non-historic storefront or façade treatments including metal cladding or other non-historic alteration be removed”. Starting from that standpoint because they are bound by the guidelines, they are already at the point that new materials that have been put on are not compatible so technically they would be asking him to take those off when the renovation started. As the applicant, he carries the burden to prove that it is compatible with their guidelines. The guidelines say the metal cladding is not permissible, but it also lists materials that would be historically compatible, even if you were putting it up now, new and so this type of metal façade, the materials that are up there are problematic with the guidelines. Mr. Ford stated he thought steel was allowed as one of the signs on Main Street. Chair stated steel is a material that can be used but with the wrapping and the siding it gives a false impression of what the façade is, so it is the wrapping that doesn’t necessarily comply. She was asking him to give the Commission some testimony as to why he thinks it is compatible and does comply. Mr. Ford stated with it being steel that is what he found was permitted and does comply with it and he went with a piece of solid steel and the price of wood right now is massive. He felt like putting wood up there would cause even more vulnerability having to put more holes up there. Chair asked if there was any consideration to steel that didn’t look like another material. Mr. Ford stated no and talked about rust marks and a building in Leicester that had steel on it and in a year red rust running down the façade. Chair asked if he looked at repairing what was there instead of covering it up. Mr. Ford stated no, there was a lot of renovation for the interior, and they put the most cost on the inside to make it safe for people walking through it.

Commissioner Welter asked if he was aware there were guidelines before he started. Mr. Ford stated he wasn't aware there were complete guidelines and when talking with the sign manufacturer, he said these were options that he had done before, and he put his faith in him and thought he knew what he was doing since he has been in business for 20 something years and came recommended from other people. He took into consideration his professional opinion.

Chair stated one of the guidelines states design the replacement feature on historic documentation. She asked if he knew if there were any type of facades on Main Street with this type of façade that would be similar. Mr. Ford stated he believes there are buildings with metal on them and also ones that have the wood but to combine them together, he is not sure.

Commissioner Hammond-Green stated the other examples in their agenda are real wood and not wrap.

Chair stated Mezzaluna has a metal feature up top so there are some examples of metal but not metal wrapped facades so this one is distinguishable. Mr. Ford stated he went with the highest quality so that you cannot tell it is not wood. Chair stated their artificial guidelines state you do not use one material to emulate another one. Chair is looking for testimony that this is historically compatible. They need examples that can tie in and show that it is compatible with the district in order to approve it. Mr. Ford stated he doesn't have that at the moment, but he was trying to emulate the other buildings around them and do it in a way that was meeting a safety factor. The more pieces you put into a building when it already has huge pieces and chips falling apart, the weaker it makes the structure. That was the number one factor with them, to find something to use for a safety factor above anything else and still give a nice, pretty image that doesn't degrade the downtown area.

Commissioner Battista asked if it was addressed with the owner about the building and pieces falling apart. Mr. Ford stated he would have to talk with his boss, she is out of town.

Commissioner Cauley asked when mentioning Mezzaluna, did they get permission from the HPC for their metal features on their building. Chair stated she did not know. Mr. Ford stated Mezzaluna's sign is starting to rust as well. That was why he did not go with a straight metal on the building, because of the rust factor.

Commissioner Battista stated it is all one piece, the sign and the façade. Mr. Ford stated it is two separate pieces.

Chair asked if there were any further questions or if anyone else would like to speak. When no one spoke, Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed things being done after the fact and people not knowing the rules. She talked about having five or six guidelines that are violated right now. She felt like as the tenant, he is in an unfair situation. The Commission discussed holding this open for more information and have staff work with them to come up with a compromise and not actually deny it. They talked about the sign not being approved. Chair stated they could hold it open for additional information from the property owner.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Chair talked about taking a vote or leaving the hearing open and the applicant coming back next month, he has heard the guidelines that apply, and staff can help and try to assess what is there and what complies and the property owner could get involved and tell him if they are willing to do something. This is a larger issue than just a metal facade. She stated they have DRAC that can weigh on materials and what is appropriate. She feels like the tenant is in an awkward position and they are willing to work with him. Mr. Ford stated next month everyone will be out of town on the third Wednesday in May, could they do this in June? Mr. Manley stated they have a façade and a sign that has been put up without permits and staff has not gotten the dimensions of the sign from the applicant in order to process the sign permit and staff has concerns that the sign is too large and would not be a permissible sign. Staff has not received the dimensions and cannot confirm the size and are partially waiting on that and were waiting on the decision on the façade and the HPC's decision on that to move forward on the sign itself. He is hearing there is a lot of concern on the appropriateness of the façade, sounds like there are also concerns about the condition of the building and some property maintenance issues. This could fall under historic guidelines and Demotion by Neglect but also falls under the Property Maintenance Code. They have the historic façade question tonight, the sign component and the property maintenance. There is a responsible party for each of those three aspects. He doesn't think it is ideal to put it off a month and definitely not two months. Chair stated if they deny it, he can turn around and reapply. Mr. Manley stated yes, there is no limitation to applying for a COA. If there is question about this being compatible, that is what the Commission is here to decide tonight. The rest of the aspects can be handled by the appropriate parties after this. Chair stated they would need to vote on this tonight and then he can work with staff on the other issues. Mr. Ford asked if he could leave it up or does he have to take it down. He was worried about taking it down and just having an empty building there. Chair stated they will vote tonight, and the enforcement part is a question for staff, but it doesn't have to come down tomorrow. Mr. Manley stated they can work with the applicant because there is bit of a safety concern. Chair stated safety concerns are considered. Mr. Ford talked about discussing a wood replacement with the owner, but they need to determine the extent of the damage to the façade first. Chair stated they would close the public hearing and take a vote and the applicant can work with staff to move forward.

Chair closed the public hearing.

***Commissioner Welter moved the Commission to find as fact the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H22-024-COA and located within the Main Street Historic District, if added according to the information reviewed at this hearing and, with any representation made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is incongruous with the character of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards for the following reason: The proposed façade would not retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design and is not compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic building. Commissioner Hammond-Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

The Commission took a short recess.

**VII(C) Certificate of Appropriateness – Dennis Dunlap – 434 N. Main Street - (File No. H22-028-COA).**

Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hunt stated the city is in receipt of a Certificate of Appropriateness application from Dennis Dunlap of Dunlap Construction and Rudolph Haug, property owner for the replacement of an existing awning and wood siding for the property located at 434 N. Main Street. The applicant states in the application that they plan to remove wood shingles from the front awning and install new metal roof and new metal over existing wood siding. Staff has met with the applicant at the subject property twice to look at the condition of the original façade of the building after the applicant was able to remove portions of the existing awning to see if the awning could be removed completely and restore the original façade. It was determined that the original façade was beyond the scope of repair the property owner had budgeted for.

The PIN is 9568-88-0412. The property is zoned C-1, Central Business and is in the Main Street Historic District. The proposal is for a major work.

A map of the Main Street Historic Overlay District was shown with the property outlined in yellow. An aerial view of the property was shown with the property outlined in red.

This is a contributing two-story brick building constructed prior to 1908. It was remodeled around 1915 by Erle Stilwell to serve as the Queen Theater. During the remodel the added embellishments that can be seen on the upper façade of the building however since then major changes have been made to the street level façade.

Photos of the existing conditions were shown of the façade. The awning does extend to the right onto the adjoining building. The awning currently has cedar shake shingles. The panels were removed to show the existing condition behind the awning. Photos of the existing façade were shown and explained. A lot of the brick work would need repairing if the awning was removed. It appeared to be some kind of Yarn Store. The Commission and staff discussed the pillars being chopped off.

Ms. Hunt stated the applicant and property owner looked into removing the awning all together and have the original façade showing but once looking at it and given the condition of it, and the cost of repairs and materials it limited to what they can do. Mr. Dunlap gave the property owner three options. The option was shown in the presentation along with the materials they would use which is cedar shake shingles. The applicant has indicated to staff that the property owner in the alternative should the Commission find this not to be compatible would just repair the existing cedar shake shingles of the awning. The applicant is here and can speak more to that.

The Design Standards that were applicable to this project were shown.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if the owner had considered just removing the awning and repairing what is there. Ms. Hunt stated they did, and the applicant can speak more to that. The extent of the damage was determined by removing some of those panels and the quote that was given to try and make those repairs, the owner was willing to make those minimal repairs but when looking at the extensive damage the applicant is here to speak to the cost and the damage underneath and what it would take to repair that.

There were no further questions for staff.

Dennis Dunlap, Dunlap Construction, 720B North Grove Street stated that building was originally built as a hardware store and Erle Stilwell turned it into the theater. He doesn't know if that was a new façade that he put on it or if he did that. If you look on the right of the Queen Theater photo and the two columns there at the bottom of the Queen area, those two columns are gone from there to the ground, the marble base and everything is gone. On the left, both of those columns are completely gone, and they put a huge beam in there and they built a 2' x 6' flat roof sticking out with angle arms welded to the beam that supports that whole awning. They looked at tearing the slope part of it completely off and framing it back up to an awning that just stuck out and doing some kind of roofing on that flat roof where the cut line was. The part where he took the siding off beside the sign that's the little part you would gain with seeing when doing all of that. The rest of it is gone. Rudi owns the other little building beside it that he bought when he moved his jewelry store in there. The awning has been there since the 60's when he took possession of it. He doesn't know if that is the original cedar shake roof on it or not, he assumes it is because that roof is built in a curve. It is not flat. He really wanted to put a metal roof on it and put it to where a metal panel could lie straight on that slope but that is not congruent with the materials that the Commission will approve. The property owner has decided after much consideration that he will settle for just a repair, replace the siding and replace the shingles, stain it and get it done and just go with that. He never did a total amount for the total restoration to take it back to what the theater looked like but that is over 60 grand. It is well over 60 grand. It would cost 6 to 8 thousand dollars to tear the shakes off of it repair it and put it all together like it was in the 60's. He stated there was no rot or water damage. He is looking to replace it with like kind materials.

Ms Hunt stated this was brought to the Commission and placed on the agenda before the property owner decided to amend it and just make the repairs with like materials. Staff decided to let the applicant explain this to the Commission and kept it on the agenda.

Chair stated it is replacing in kind and repairing and there will be no new materials. Mr. Dunlap stated yes.

Chair asked if anyone had any questions or comments. No one had any questions or comments. Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair stated this is an amended application to replace in kind and make repairs and restore it to what it was.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Manley asked if they were withdrawing the application. Chair stated she believes they are just amending it. Mr. Manley stated that amendment would be staff approved as a minor repair and the Commission would not have to take any action on that. He does not think any further action is needed this evening. Staff will work with the applicant. The COA application was withdrawn. No action was taken.

#### **VII(D) Update on Boyd Park**

Chair stated this is not in front of you for a vote. This is for a request for direction. Chair gave brief summary of what has been done so far. A request for a recommendation from the HPC for a public space was discussed. She talked about the different sites for this. She discussed the construction of a



new mini-golf park. There are discussions for public input meetings. She would like direction on continuing the discussion on the park. Eventually they would see the mock-up drawings on Edwards Park and be kept in the loop on this. She talked about doing a study for the Local Landmark and the cost and time of this. There is more to it than just a study it has to go through a whole approval process.

***Commissioner Hammond-Green moved that the Chair and Vice-Chair are authorized to continue with their actions on the Boyd Park issue. Commissioner Battista seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

Mr. Manley stated a meeting on Edwards Park would be held May 17, 2022 from 4:30 pm until 6:30 pm in the City Operations Assembly Room.

VIII ***Adjournment. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.***

---

Chair



## CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY PLANNING DIVISION



**SUBMITTER:** Alexandra Hunt, Planner I      **MEETING DATE:** May 18, 2022

**AGENDA SECTION:** Other Business      **DEPARTMENT:** Community Development

**TITLE OF ITEM:** 1420 Ridgecrest Dr. – Demolition by Neglect (H21-31-DEM) – *Alexandra Hunt / Planner I*

### **SUGGESTED MOTION(S):**

#### **1. For Recommending Approval:**

I move the Commission, based on the findings made in this report identified as file # H21-31-DEM and as outlined in Section 28-191 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Hendersonville, to file a petition with the Zoning Administrator for Demolition by Neglect of the structures located at 1420 Ridgecrest Drive in the Hyman Heights Historic District for the following reasons:

1. The deterioration of the exterior masonry in several areas and cracks in the foundation masonry (**Sec. 28-190(1)**)
2. The deterioration and presence of missing exterior mortar (**Sec. 28-191(4)**)
3. The presence of rotted wood window frames and large gaps between the window and unpainted and exposed wood trim around windows (**Sec. 28-191(5)**)
4. The presence of rot on window frames and eaves (**Sec. 28-191(7-8)**)
5. The presence of erosion under the exterior concrete stairs (**Sec. 28-191(9)**)
6. The deterioration of the foundation and wall of the former boiler room and/or greenhouse (**Sec. 28-191(10)**)

**[DISCUSS & VOTE]**

#### **1. For Recommending Denial:**

*(No action will be taken in the absence of a motion)*

**SUMMARY:**

Staff requests that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) consider “filing a petition with the City” charging that the structure located at 1420 Ridgecrest Drive (herein after “Subject Property”) undergo Demolition by Neglect as set out under Section 28-191 of the City of Hendersonville Code of Ordinances. The history of the property as it relates to Demolition by Neglect is detailed in the timeline attached as Exhibit 1. Staff conducted a cursory investigation into the condition of the subject property on September 21, 2021, and found that the structure contained defects that significantly impaired the integrity of the structure as set out in the standards defined in Section 28-190. Staff last presented the findings from the cursory inspection to the HPC during the October 2021 regular meeting. This item has been continued from the October 2021 regular meeting.

<b>FILE NUMBER:</b>	H21-31-DEM
<b>PETITIONER NAME:</b>	Historic Preservation Commission
<b>EXHIBITS:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff Report</li> <li>2. Timeline of Demolition by Neglect / COA Actions</li> <li>3. Email from Mr. Alexander</li> <li>4. Photos from September 21, 2021 Cursory Inspection</li> <li>5. Photos from ROW dated April 25, 2022</li> </ol>

## MEMORANDUM

---

TO: Historic Preservation Commission  
FROM: Community Development Department  
RE: 1420 Ridgecrest Drive (H21-31-DEM)  
DATE: May 18, 2022



### DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT

Staff requests that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) consider “filing a petition with the City” charging that the structure located at 1420 Ridgecrest Drive (herein after “Subject Property”) undergo Demolition by Neglect as set out under Section 28-191 of the City of Hendersonville Code of Ordinances. The history of the property as it relates to Demolition by Neglect is detailed in the timeline attached as Exhibit 1. Staff conducted a cursory investigation into the condition of the subject property on September 21, 2021 and found that the structure contained defects that significantly impaired the integrity of the structure as set out in the standards defined in Section 28-190. Staff last presented the findings from the cursory inspection to the HPC during the October 2021 regular meeting. This item has been continued from the October 2021 regular meeting.

### Background

The Subject Property has had a long history concerning the maintenance and condition of both the primary structure and associated greenhouse. In 2006, the HPC filed its first petition for Demolition by Neglect with the Zoning Administrator resulting in the removal of the greenhouse but not the primary structure. From 2006 to present, both Staff and the HPC have worked with the property owners to make repairs to the structure as outlined in Exhibit 1.

During the October 2021 regular meeting, Ms. Vaneslow indicated that there was a question of ownership of the Subject Property. The HPC subsequently continued the matter until December 2021 to allow Ms. Vaneslow time to acquire legal assistance. In November 2021, Ms. Vaneslow notified Staff that she retained Mr. Alexander of W.G. Alexander and Associates. In December 2021, Mr. Alexander notified Staff that title to the Subject Property has been determined and requested a continuance until February 2022 (Exhibit 2). The HPC continued the matter until February 2022. During the February regular meeting the HPC granted Mr. Alexander's request for a second continuance for an additional 30-60 days to work through existing estate issues and confer with the property owners to determine a plan for repairs. Staff did not receive an update from Mr. Alexander in advance of the April 2022 regular meeting. Staff conducted a cursory inspection of the Subject Property from the right-of-way on April 25, 2022. Due to The following analysis is based on the cursory inspection conducted on September 21, 2021.

### **Analysis:**

Section 28-191 of the City of Hendersonville Zoning Ordinance allows for the HPC to file a petition with the zoning administrator requesting that the administrator process the correction of deterioration or making of repairs to any historic landmark or structure located within an historic district.

The property is listed as **contributing** in the Hyman Heights Local Designation Report and is described as:

**1420 Ridgecrest Drive. Contributing. Built ca. 1920.** An intact, one-and-a-half-story, gable-end, brick-veneered bungalow with entry portico and front dormer edged with triangular knee braces.

The subject property is listed as **contributing** on the National Register and described as:

**1420 Ridgecrest Place. Columbus Few House. Contributing. by 1926.** One-story plus basement vernacular bungalow with an irregular floor plan, side gable roof, and a front gable dormer supported by knee braces. Entry stoop has a front gable roof and square posts. Walls are brick veneer with shingles in the gable ends and dormer. Windows are one-over-one. Heavily wooded lot drops away to the rear. Columbus Few, the postmaster, and wife Bessie lived here from 1939 to at least 1949. Fair to poor condition.

**Greenhouse. Contributing. by 1954. Removed 2014.**

The following is a list of the standards for use when considering a structure for demolition by neglect. These standards are set out in Section 28-190 of the City of Hendersonville Zoning Ordinance. ***NOTE: The following information is from a cursory inspection conducted on September 21, 2021. City Code requires that a finding of demolition by neglect be made by the Zoning Administrator following a petition by the Historic Preservation Commission.***

## **Chapter 28 Article VI Sec. 28-190. - Standards.**

The exterior features of any building or structure (including walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, pavement, paths, or any other appurtenant feature), or any type of outdoor advertising sign either designated as an historic landmark or located within an historic district shall be preserved by the owner or such other person who may have legal possession, custody and control thereof against decay and deterioration and kept free from structural defects. The owner, or other person having such legal possession, custody and control, shall upon written request by the city repair such exterior features if they are found to be deteriorating, or if their condition is contributing to deterioration, including but not limited to any of the following defects which have the effect of significantly impairing the integrity of such building or structure or the special character of such historic district:

(1) Deterioration of exterior walls, foundations, or other vertical support that causes leaning, sagging, splitting, listing, or buckling.

- **Exterior masonry has deteriorated in several areas. The foundation masonry contains cracks.**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figures 2-6 from September 21, 2022 cursory inspection**

(2) Deterioration of flooring or floor supports, roofs, or other horizontal members that causes leaning, sagging, splitting, listing, or buckling.

- **Roof replaced/repaired 2015**
- **Unable to determine from September 21, 2021 cursory inspection**

(3) Deterioration of external chimneys that causes leaning, sagging, splitting, listing, or buckling.

- **Difficult to determine during cursory inspection.**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figure 18 provided from September 21, 2021 cursory inspection**

(4) Deterioration or crumbling of exterior plasters or mortars.

- **Deteriorating and missing mortar is present in numerous and various places on the exterior of the structure.**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figures 2-6 from September 21, 2021 cursory inspection**

(5) Ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, and foundations, including broken windows or doors.

- **Some window frames are rotting, large gaps between window and frame are present, some wood window trim is completely exposed/unpainted.**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figures 7-10 from September 21, 2021 Cursory Inspection**

(6) Defective protection or lack of weather protection for exterior wall and roof coverings, including lack of paint, or weathering due to lack of paint or other protective covering.

- **Roof on main structure appears to be in good condition**
- **Some windows are unpainted**
- **Unable to determine if there is weather protection on the brick**

(7) Rotting, holes, and other forms of decay.

- **Some rot observed on window frames and eaves**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figures 13-17 from September 21, 2021 Cursory Inspection**

(8) Deterioration of exterior stairs, porches, handrails, window and door frames, cornices, entablatures, wall facings, and architectural details that causes delamination, instability, loss of shape and form, or crumbling.

- **Some rot observed on window frames and eaves**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figures 13-17 from September 21, 2021 Cursory Inspection**

(9) Heaving, subsidence, or cracking of sidewalks, steps, or pathways.

- **Exterior concrete stairs have erosion underneath concrete**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figure 11 from September 21, 2021 Cursory Inspection**

(10) Deterioration of fences, gates, and accessory structures.

- **Foundation / wall for former boiler room / greenhouse is leaning.**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figure 12.**

(11) Deterioration that has a detrimental effect upon the special character of the district as a whole or the unique attributes and character of the historic landmark.

- **The front façade of the structure appears to be in relatively sufficient aesthetic condition.**
- **See Exhibit 3, Figure 1.**

(12) Deterioration of any exterior feature so as to create or permit the creation of any hazardous or unsafe conditions to life, health, or other property.

- **The potential exists for this criteria to be present but it is beyond the scope of the Planning Staff to make this determination.**

### **Procedure:**

#### **Chapter 28 Article VI Sec. 28-191. - Petition and action.**

The historic preservation commission may file a petition listing specific defects with the zoning administrator requesting that administrator act under the following procedures to require the correction of deterioration or making of repairs to any historic landmark or structure located within an historic district so that such structure shall be preserved and protected in accordance with the purposes of Section 28-1 of this Code.

1. Whenever a petition is filed with the zoning administrator charging that a structure is undergoing demolition by neglect, the administrator shall, if her preliminary investigation discloses a basis for such charges, within seven days issue and cause to be served upon the owner and/or such other person who may have legal possession, custody, and control thereof, as the same may be determined by reasonable diligence, a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice that an administrative hearing will be held before the administrator not less than 30 nor more than 45 days after the serving of such complaint; that the owner and/or parties in interest shall be given a right to answer to give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint; that the commission shall also be given notice of the hearing and that the rules of evidence prevailing in courts of law or equity shall not be controlling administrative hearings before the administrator. The purpose of an administrative hearing is to receive evidence concerning the charge of deterioration and to ascertain whether the owner and/or other parties in interest wishes to petition the commission for a claim of undue economic hardship.

2. If after such notice and administrative hearing, the administrator determines that the structure is undergoing demolition by neglect because it is deteriorating, or if its condition is contributing to deterioration, according to the standards of section 28-190, the administrator shall state in writing the findings of fact in support of such determination and shall issue and cause to be served upon the owner and/or other parties in interest therein an order to repair within the time specified those elements of the structure that are deteriorating, contributing to deterioration, or deteriorated. In the event that the owner and/or other parties in interest wish to petition for a claim of undue economic hardship, the administrator's order shall be stayed until after the commission's determination in accordance with the procedures of section 28-193.



**EXHIBITS:**

- 1) Exhibit 1 – Timeline of Demolition by Neglect / COA Actions
- 2) Exhibit 2 – Email from Mr. Alexander
- 3) Exhibit 3 - Photos from Cursory Inspection on September 20, 2021
- 4) Exhibit 4 – Photos from ROW on April 25, 2022

## Exhibit 1 – Timeline of Demolition by Neglect / CoA Actions

### Timeline:

#### 2006

- In 2006, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) filed a petition for Demolition by Neglect with the Zoning Administrator for deteriorating conditions of the structure and associated greenhouse at 1420 Ridgecrest Drive. No substantial basis was found for demolition of the primary structure, but the Zoning Administrator determined that the greenhouse either needed to be repaired or removed from the property. Shortly thereafter, a COA was issued for the repair of the greenhouse with deadline of May 21, 2007.

#### 2007

- **April 2, 2007** - The Zoning Administrator received a letter from an attorney representing both the applicant and property owner requesting an extension of time for the completion of the greenhouse repair. This request was subsequently denied by HPC on May 16, 2007.

#### 2012

- **October 12, 2012** - The Zoning Administrator was contacted by the granddaughter of the property owner, Ms. Vaneslow, stating that the property owner was terminally ill and she had Power of Attorney (POA) and would begin repairs on the property as soon as possible.

#### 2014

- **January 14, 2014** - The Zoning Administrator received notice from Ms. Vaneslow indicating that the property owner passed, and that 1420 Ridgecrest was in probate. Ms. Vaneslow further indicated that repairs will be postponed until at least May 2014.
- **May 19, 2014** – A COA was issued for the installation of a new roof with an expiration date of November 19, 2014.
- **June 18, 2014** – A COA was issued for the removal of glass and framing of the greenhouse with an expiration date of December 18, 2014.

#### 2015

- **July 1, 2015** – A COA was issued to replace the roof, rotten and damaged wood and damaged fascia with an expiration date of July 1, 2016. It is upon information and belief that the roof was replaced in 2015.

#### 2018

- **July 16, 2018** – The HPC sent notice to Ms. Vaneslow that the HPC voted to begin the fact-finding process for a Demolition by Neglect action.
- **August 15, 2018** - Ms. Vaneslow submitted an application for a COA proposing to replace the wooden fence on the property.
- **September 19, 2018** -The HPC voted to petition the Zoning Administrator for Demolition by Neglect concerning the located at 1420 Ridgecrest Drive.
- **October 30, 2018** - The HPC held a hearing regarding Demolition by Neglect in which Ms. Vaneslow was present to answer questions and give testimony.
- **November 2, 2018** - The Zoning Administrator found that the structure is undergoing demolition. An order for repair was issued for the following: water in crawl space, exterior masonry deterioration, vertical cracks in the rear chimney, open cracks near the windows and doors, cracks in the brick and foundation, extensive moisture and insect damage, missing gutters, and damage to roof-sheathing boards.

**2019**

- **March 22, 2019** - a COA was issued for the replacement of two basement windows on the left side of the house with an expiration date of August 22, 2019.
- **November 13, 2019** - Ms. Vaneslow contacted Staff to state that she had scheduled the window installation and masonry repair.

**2021**

- **May 21, 2021** - Ms. Vaneslow provided an update to the Planning Department and indicated various repairs and/or improvements, however, none of the previously ordered repairs were completed.
- **August 4, 2021**- Planning Staff contacted Ms. Vaneslow that Staff was in receipt of complaints about the current condition of the property as well as fallen tree that blocked the road. Ms. Vaneslow responded to Staff and indicated that she was out of town and had been working on the property to prepare for the masonry work to be completed.
- **August 13, 2021**- Staff received an update from Ms. Vaneslow detailing the continued work on the property including the removal of trash and debris and continued yard work. However, none of the previously ordered repairs were completed. Ms. Vaneslow indicated that she was discussing the possible sale of the property with the other property owners.
- **August 16, 2021**- Staff contacted Ms. Vaneslow asking for an update concerning the foundation and the potential sale of the property.
- **August 30, 2021**- Staff indicated that they would like to visit the property and for a copy of the engineer's report. Permission was granted to inspect the property.
- **September 22, 2021**- Planning Staff conducted the cursory inspection.
- **November 17, 2021** – HPC regular meeting is cancelled.
- **December 13, 2021** – Staff received a request for a continuance from Mr. Alexander to after January 2022.

**2022**

- **February 16, 2022** – Staff received a request for a continuance from Mr. Alexander for another 30-60 days.
- **March 16, 2022** – HPC regular meeting cancelled
- **April 20, 2022** – Staff updated HPC on status of 1420 Ridgecrest. Staff indicated they had not received any information from the Property Owner and/or Mr. Alexander. Staff requested to continue this item to the May 2022 agenda.
- **April 25, 2022** – Staff conducted a cursory inspection from right-of-way.

## RE: 1420 Ridgecrest Update

William Alexander <bill@alexlaw.com>

Mon 12/13/2021 11:38 AM

To: Hunt, Alexandra <ahunt@hvlnc.gov>

Cc: Patricia A. Barr, NCCP <pab@alexlaw.com>; 'William Alexander' <bill@alexlaw.com>; jennavanselow@yahoo.com <jennavanselow@yahoo.com>

**Be Advised:** This email originated from outside of the Hendersonville network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Alexandra, Thank you for calling this back to my attention. With the holiday pending, it frankly had slipped my mind. From review of the various estates and public records, I have satisfied myself that this property is now owned by the following individuals according to the percentages stated:

Julia Bryson Ray- 40%

Jennifer Vanselow (n/k/a Jennifer Wentworth)- 30%

Russell V. Jordan- as an heir of Elizabeth Jordan- 15%

Amanda Bryson Jordan- as an heir of Elizabeth Jordan- 15%

We are now in the process of recording the Will of Harry Bittner Bryson in Henderson County, as well as a copy of his death certificate.

I have only taken a preliminary look at the condition of the house, and need additional time to assess information from my clients in relation to the same. I also do not have an existing formal attorney-client relationship with Russell Jordan and Amanda Jordan, though I anticipate that may soon occur. In any event, your proceeding may not be currently supported by adequate legal service of process, so I believe it will be beneficial to all if we continue this matter again until some time in late January or early February. That will give us adequate time to both resolve any issues of ownership/service and evaluate the house condition.

Please treat this as my formal request that this hearing be continued until some date after January 15, 2022. Please let me know immediately if there is any problem with this request.

Sincerely,

Bill Alexander

*Bill Alexander*

LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM M. ALEXANDER, JR., PLLC

559 North Justice Street, Hendersonville, NC 28739

Phone: 828-697-6022

Fax: 828-697-1699

***The information in this message is sent by or on behalf of an attorney and is to be considered confidential, proprietary and/or privileged, or otherwise exempt from disclosure. It is intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) named above. If you are not a named recipient of this message you are not authorized to read, copy, or disseminate any part of this message and you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not an intended recipient, then please (i) do not print, forward, or copy this e-mail, (ii) notify us of the error by telephone at 828-697-6022, or by a reply to this e-mail, and (iii) delete this e-mail from your computer. Thank you.***

---

**From:** pab@alexlaw.com <pab@alexlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 10:30 AM  
**To:** bill@alexlaw.com  
**Subject:** FW: 1420 Ridgecrest Update

---

**From:** Hunt, Alexandra <[ahunt@hvlnc.gov](mailto:ahunt@hvlnc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 10:11 AM  
**To:** [wmalexjr@alexlaw.com](mailto:wmalexjr@alexlaw.com)  
**Cc:** Patricia A. Barr, CLA-NCCP <[pab@alexlaw.com](mailto:pab@alexlaw.com)>; Manley, Matthew <[mmanley@hvlnc.gov](mailto:mmanley@hvlnc.gov)>  
**Subject:** 1420 Ridgecrest Update

Hi Mr. Alexander - I hope all is well. I am reaching out to you for a status update on 1420 Ridgecrest as it relates to the title issues of the property in advance of the HPC meeting this week. We would like to give the commission an update in order to continue this matter to January's agenda so any information you can provide would be appreciated!

Thank you in advance for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,  
Alexandra



**Exhibit 3 – Photos from September 22, 2021 Cursory Inspection**



*Figure 2 - 1420 Ridgecrest Drive*



*Figure 1 - Missing Mortar*





*Figure 3 - Missing/Damaged Mortar*



*Figure 4 - Missing Mortar/Loose Brick*





*Figure 5 - Cracks in Foundation Masonry*



*Figure 6 - Missing mortar and crack above window; rotting window frame*





*Figure 7 - Gaps between window and frame*



*Figure 8 - Rotten/Damaged Window Frame*





Figure 9 - Exposed/Unpainted Wood Window Trim



Figure 10 - Exposed/Unpainted Wood Window Trim





Figure 11 - Erosion Underneath Exterior Concrete Stairs



Figure 12 – Leaning Foundation/Wall for Former Boiler Room /Greenhouse





Figure 13 – Rotting/Exposed/Unpainted Wood Window Frame



Figure 14 - Rotting Wood Window Frame





*Figure 16 - Damaged Shingle*



*Figure 17 - Damaged/Rotten Eaves and Shingles*



*Figure 18 - Missing Mortar on Chimney*



**Exhibit 3 – April 25, 2022 Photos from ROW**











**CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**



**PETITION FOR DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT**

NOW COMES, the City of Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission, acting through its authority granted under Chapter 28, Article VI Sec. 28-191 of the City Code of Ordinances, and files this Petition with the Zoning Administrator, requesting that the administrator act under the procedures set out in Sec. 28-191 with regard to the structure located within the Hyman Heights Historic District and which address is 1420 Ridgecrest Dr., Hendersonville, NC 28793 and finds the following:

The Commission, based on the findings made in the report identified as file # H21-31-DEM and as outlined in Section 28-191 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Hendersonville, finds the following defects to have significantly impaired the integrity of the structure:

1. The deterioration of the exterior masonry in several areas and cracks in the foundation masonry (Sec. 28-190(1))
2. The deterioration and presence of missing exterior mortar (Sec. 28-191(4))
3. The presence of rotted wood window frames and large gaps between the window and unpainted and exposed wood trim around windows (Sec. 28-191(5))
4. The presence of rot on window frames and eaves (Sec. 28-191(7-8))
5. The presence of erosion under the exterior concrete stairs (Sec. 28-191(9))
6. The deterioration of the foundation and wall of the former boiler room and/or greenhouse (Sec. 28-191(10))

Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl M. Jones, Chair  
Historic Preservation Commission