

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 20, 2026

Commissioners Present: Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Ralph Hammond-Green, Stan Smith, Edward Sine, Jim Welter, (Vice-Chair), Lauren Matoian, Jim Brewer

Commissioners Absent: Jim Boyd, John Falvo

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

- I **Call to Order.** Chair called the regular meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:05 pm.
- II **Agenda.** On motion of Commissioner Welter and seconded by Commissioner Brewer the agenda was approved.
- III **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Matoian the minutes of the regular meeting of April 15, 2026 were approved.
- IV **Old Business**
- IV(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness – Erica Hodges – 314 N. Main Street (File No. 26-11-COA).**

Commissioner Smith was recused from this discussion.

Chair stated tonight we have two public hearings to consider, two applications for a certificate of appropriateness permits in the Main Street Historic District. Any persons desiring to testify in these hearings must first be sworn as a witnesses and will be subject to cross-examination by parties or persons whose position may be contrary to yours. A copy of the procedures 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 ask that you refrain from speaking until recognized by the Chair and, when recognized, that you 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 who wishes to speak during the public hearings should come forward to be sworn in. Chair swore in Tiffany Prudhomme, Erica Hodges, and Joseph Dinan.

Mr. Hayes stated he is not going to go through the entire presentation in detail, because you all have already received this many times before, and it's also provided in your packet. This is a high-level overview, reminders, so this is a bigger COA. It was a storefront rehabilitation. You all approved the front facade and the rear facade at your February meeting, and, then have continued the side windows.

The COA description was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. The proposal

before the Commission is the original one submitted at the February meeting.

Mr. Hayes stated the furthestmost left three windows are measured three feet by four feet tall. The middle three windows are three feet by three and a half feet tall, and then the far right three windows would be three feet by three feet square windows. So total proposal is nine windows and they get progressively smaller as you get towards the front facade of the building.

Site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. The applicant has attested that you will not be able to see these windows from the street, the front street right-of-way.

The floor plan and site rendering were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes stated just to remind you all, this has been presented before, but, staff presented the Interpreting the Standards Number 14, two meetings ago, which speaks to new openings in secondary elevations, or introducing new windows into blank walls. This was included in the staff report and presentation.

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

Mr. Hayes stated he wanted to summarize the letter with advice from the State Historic Preservation Office. They analyzed the proposal by the applicant and they picked out Standard 1 and Standard 9 of the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation as relevant, and their opinion was that we believe that proposed retrofit of window openings in the side elevation meets the standards, as the alteration supports compatible residential use of the upper floor of the building, and the change does not alter or diminish primary character-defining features of the building. And then the relevant design standards, are 3.4.2 windows and doors.

The suggested motions for approval and denial were included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes stated we were looking before the hearing into how something gets approved, the number of board members that has to vote. And so, per state law, quasi-judicial decisions must be decided by a majority of the board members appointed. So that's not the members that are here, but it's the members that are appointed. So that's nine board members, we have a full board at the moment, so it would be five. You would need five people to approve this. So we just wanted to make sure that you all were aware of that as you're making your decision. I am going to now, let our Assistant City Attorney, Daniel Heyman, come up and give a short presentation.

Daniel Heyman, Assistant City Attorney stated Members of the Historic Preservation Commission, thanks for allowing me to make a brief summation, just because it's been a little bit, that we've been talking about this particular application, and it's, I think we all agree, slightly unusual, so I just wanted to, make a little statement, and of course, Sam and I kind of fumbled the start of this. I should have also introduced you all to your attorney that you requested, Martha Bradley. We didn't do that, I'll do it now. Martha Bradley's in private practice in Waynesville, but she also is a town attorney for the City of Waynesville, and so she's very steeped in municipal law, including quasi-judicial procedures.

Mr. Heyman stated he is recognizing this is slightly unusual, but he just want to say, that it's staff's position that, as a party to this matter, that the application meets the standards. And so he wanted to give a couple of reasons, why we're making that argument. First, I'll point you to the North Carolina General Statutes, on 160D-947A, and I'll just give a little snip of this, that the Commission shall take no action under this section, Historic Preservation, except to prevent the construction, reconstruction, alteration, that would be incongruous with the special character of the landmark or the district, so we're looking at the special character of the district in this case. We're in a local historic district. And again, I'll point you to, the City Code, Chapter 28, Section 151, Design Standards, and Mr. Hayes mentioned the Secretary of the Interior Standards being incorporated into that. And also, just pointing out the last sentence there, these standards are intended to ensure that changes in designated properties shall be in harmony with the reasons for their designation, so it recognizes that change is, possible. Then turning to the Main Street Design Standards, I'll point out a few here. In Section 1.3, it's kind of an introduction to the design standards. The design review process is the title of that. The designation of historic landmarks in local overlay districts is not intended to prevent change, and then it goes on to say the Commission offers assistance to the property owner in shaping the change while meeting the requirements of the ordinance. Moving to Section 3.3, which is side and rear facades, so this being a side facade. In the intro to that section, the design standards provide, many of Hendersonville's downtown commercial buildings have side facades that can be seen from public streets, parking lots, sidewalks, and alleyways. As with the primary front facade, these side elevations are important character-defining elements of the Downtown Historic District. And so, notably, this facade cannot be seen from a public street, a parking lot, a sidewalk, or an alleyway. You've heard testimony to that effect. The Rodham Mall tunnel, the parapet on the front, pretty much means you'd have to be in the sky over the building to actually see this facade. Section 3.4, Materials and Details. And then a subsection, 3.4.1, Architectural Details and Ornamentation. The intro to that section provides architectural details, and downtown Hendersonville include everything from simple masonry treatments, such as corbel brick and string courses, to very detailed ornamentation. Variations in material fenestration and paint color all contribute to the level of ornamentation and individual structure. I think that kind of points to, what is considered, an architectural detail, corbel brick string courses, this being a flat wall would be distinguished from that. Moving to 3.4.2 windows and doors. The intro to that section. Windows and doors by their proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, and size can contribute significantly to a building's historic character, but recognizing that they can but also cannot, so that there might be a case in which they are not contributing significantly to a building's historic character, and staff would make the argument that in the case where they can't be seen from really anywhere, the public can legally be, might be one of those cases. Section 3.4.2.10, which I think the Commission has spoken about before, but just noting, it says, it's not appropriate to introduce new windows or doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Staff would make the argument here that being that these are not on a character-defining facade, that they can't easily be seen, that it wouldn't diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Turning to masonry, 3.4.3.2, retain and preserve all masonry construction features that are character-defining elements of historic buildings, and so, again, making the argument that this is not a character-defining element. You heard about the Secretary of the Interior standards, I'm not going to recite all of that. Of course, it's incorporated into your standards, and mentioned in the City Code. And you received the technical advice memo, from SHPO. It's a good summation of, staff would join that argument. I'll just leave it there, I won't repeat it.

Mr. Heyman stated he will make a quick, argument about the burden of evidence. Decisions, of course, have to be made based on competent material and substantial evidence in the record. A quasi-judicial

decision does, and, as the Commission knows, the applicant has the initial burden of proving that and if the applicant produces sufficient evidence that the standards have been met and no substantial evidence is presented to the contrary, then staff would argue that they're entitled to the approval. And so for those reasons, staff would argue that, this application be sustained. Thank you.

Chair stated she is just curious, because we've had these in the past, and why staff's taking the position now and has not in the past. Mr. Heyman stated It is a, unique situation, just being that it's been a little more contentious than others, it hasn't really seemed to be doesn't really seem to be a need to do that. And so, staff just thought it would be helpful in this case, and I don't want to step in between this is an argument that we're making. I wouldn't do this if you didn't have your own counsel here to question about that. Staff is making this legal argument, not supposing that it's the only decision that you could reach. So, it is unusual, but it's an unusual application and unusually contentious especially between the the board and the applicant, and it's just what we've perceived, and so I thought it would be helpful to offer this. Chair stated that is interesting since they have had one almost identical before.

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

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

Tiffany Prudhomme, 521 Wetmur Street, Hendersonville, North Carolina stated her name for the record. She stated they did revert back to the original design because we were able to find some exceptions in the code. So that's why we made that adjustment back to having the cohesive header heights. She stated they wanted to, again, emphasize that this is not, these windows that we're proposing are on secondary elevations, they are not on character-defining facades, and of course, will not be visible from any location. She tried again to try to find a place that she could get pictures of it, and it is not viewable.

Ms. Prudhomme stated the one thing that we want to point out is that from the standards, that this is considered a rehabilitation under 1.5. It says that the main thing is that the design principles and criteria, of these ten standards are inherent in the design guidelines applied to the Commission in reviewing proposed changes to all district properties. She stated we didn't see a good definition that for rehabilitation, so we tried to look up some defining a better definition of the difference between preservation and rehabilitation. And preservation is generally focusing on the maintenance or repair of historic materials and features, rather than extensive replacement or new construction. So clearly, we don't fall under preservation, we fall into rehabilitation. And the rehabilitation, it's defined as the active process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions, while preserving those proportions and features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. The rehabilitation standards acknowledge the need to alter and add to historic building to meet continuing or new uses while retaining the building's historic character. So then, of course, you've seen the latter, and you've seen that the state's recommendation is that we do fall in under the recommended approach for what we've proposed with the new windows to an existing structure.

Ms. Prudhomme stated one of the things that we kept hearing, was the issue about 3.4.2.10, and going to that where you're not destroying the brick or existing materials. One of the things that we think that is important is understanding what is character defining. There's an article that really gets in depth onto how do you define this character for historic buildings. I'm not going to read the whole article, but give you, kind of, points on what it is. But it says, step one involves looking at the building from a distance, and to understand the character of its site setting, and involves walking around the building where

possible. And then it is, regardless of whether the building is complicated or relatively plain, it is these broad categories that contribute to understanding an overall character, rather than specific architectural features as moldings and their profiles. Identifying the visual character at close range is that you would step two, would be involved in looking at the building at close range. So you can see these details and materials in greater detail. When you're looking at these historic structures, the goal is to understand what are the primary and what are those historic facades that you want to maintain, which, in our proposal, we have done that. We have tried to enhance and revert back to a more historically accurate front and rear facade. And the facade that we are proposing to add new windows to for the new use is considered a secondary facade. There is brick on the side. We are going to maintain as much of the brick as we possibly can, and we are looking at doing it in an appropriate way. Trying to maintain as much of the historic integrity as possible.

Ms. Prudhomme stated in our previous meetings, we did present two buildings that we had found photos of and that should have been in the agenda, I think, that are on Main Street, that brick or masonry was allowed to be "destroyed". In the previous meeting, there was, mention that it was allowed because other windows were existing. One thing that I want to point out is these are not secondary facades. These are primary facades that can be viewed for multiple streets, and multiple angles. We did not see, in the guidelines any verbiage that says that it's okay to destroy brick or masonry materials, or historic materials, if there's other windows on that facade. So, and there's two facades that this is happening on, and again, I did a lot of research to see what's been happening downtown. I know Shine is one of the ones that's been dealt with more recently than others. This, the windows weren't cut in, but the historic features were allowed to be destroyed by being closed in. Now, it's understandable that this needed to happen because the new use for this to be a viable space, needed to close in the windows. But yet again, it was allowed. The precedent has been set multiple times.

Chair stated but can those not be reopened, and that character-defining entrance, the opening, not be re-established? Ms. Prudhomme stated it could be, but could it not be argued that if somebody wanted to take our windows out and close it back up, that you would have a full brick wall again? Chair stated except that those windows existed and these are new.

Discussion was made on the windows at Renzo's. Chair stated she didn't allow those, because she wasn't on the Commission at the time, but we don't have any documentation as to when those were done.

Ms. Prudhomme stated materials have been allowed to be destroyed. Character has been allowed to be destroyed on primary elevations. This is what, again, we are not talking about a character-defining elevation, we are talking about a secondary that cannot be viewed from anywhere. Unless you're in the sky.

Ms. Prudhomme stated we have also proved that, from our engineer, this is not going to structurally impact the existing structure. He's engineered everything for the new openings, and we've got his letter and his statement and testament.

Ms. Prudhomme stated we understand that the guidelines are here. Again, I've walked the city multiple times. I've seen what's happened and the whole goal of the guidelines is to help guide people to restoring and updating these historic buildings in an appropriate way. But the guidelines are not put into place to stop people from doing it if it's done in an appropriate manner. Chair stated they are standards

and not guidelines and she wanted to reflect this in the record.

Commissioner Welter stated that's one of the things that, It's just important to point out the fact that a couple years ago, I think it was 2024, the state changed the guidelines to standards. It's record to follow the standards at that point in time, and we were counseled by staff multiple times, not to take previous considerations in effect, because we were to deal with the standards. Ms. Prudhomme stated the standards are in place to help people through this process, and to do it with an appropriate historic understanding. It's to help us better our city.

Chair stated we have the Secretary of Interior standards and her guidelines, and then we have our state standards and city and everything overlapping. So the original Secretary Interior that was provided that showed examples, I think it was in the first meeting of windows that have been added for upfitting and retrofitting and new uses, had necessity language and requirement language, and the letter from SHIPO also reiterates that if required by a new use. Chair stated they had testimony in the previous meetings that it was not decided upon if the units would be residential. Ms. Prudhomme stated it has always been decided upon that it would be two residential units.

Erica Hodges, 1817 Jeffress Road, Mills River, started her name and address for the record. She stated it's always been two residential units, always, from the beginning. Chair stated it's maybe investment, not primary, is what I'm trying to clarify, but it's still going to be residential. Ms. Hodges stated residential, most likely long-term residential.

Ms. Hodges stated her team has gone above and beyond to present to you all. She just wanted to let the Commission know a little bit about me. I live here. I sell property. I am a broker. I bring people to Hendersonville. I care about Hendersonville. You will see me on Main Street, eating at the restaurants. You will see me in the breweries having a beer. I care, I sit on boards, I care about the economic vitality of Henderson County. I am trying to take this building that is in horrific condition and make it into something beautiful on Main Street. We have researched and researched and researched. These windows cannot be seen. You're talking about use, you're talking about people living in these two residential units with no natural light, except for the front one unit would have front windows, one would have back. Could you imagine living with no natural light? I've paid a structural engineer to inform you. He was here to testify. We are not damaging this building at all. Cutting this brick will not damage this building. You cannot see these windows. I am not doing anything on my front facade or my rear facade. Chair stated well, you are, I think, to be fair, we've already proved that.

Ms. Hodges stated this building will be beautiful, and I'm just trying to give natural light to two residential units, which will bring people to live on Main Street, go to the restaurants, attend all the things that Main Street provides. It's just to help Henderson County. And I'm going to tell you, I have done many other buildings in Henderson County. I have dealt with the city, the county, the inspection department, all the things and boy, this has been a challenge coming before y'all. It's been expensive. My team has gone above and beyond, and I've brought them in here. I've tried to do all that I can do to just make this a beautiful building and to bring people to Henderson County.

Chair stated and if I may, personally, I appreciate what you're saying, and because you told your side, I just want to tell you where we are. We have a harder part of this than we used to, and we don't like playing this role, because we do want, the give and take and the bringing people in, but when they changed the guidelines, they kind of tied us, and so we have a duty to vet it, to build a record, because it

is quasi-judicial, and so that's why we're asking the questions. We're not indicating we're going to vote one way or another, but we have to ultimately be able to point to a record that upholds the standards and the guidelines. So we've got Secretary of Interior, we've got local now, we've got a building code that was introduced that we can't really look at, and so we are just trying, after four months of this, to figure out exactly what's been presented, how to put it together. So please understand, we're not trying to be difficult. But it has been a lot thrown at us, too, to try and navigate this and figure it out, and we are doing the best we can.

Chair stated so there is something on these new plans that mentions a door and that window thing. One of the windows has door language on it, so I'm just clarifying that all we're doing is a window. Ms. Hodges stated they are all windows. Ms. Prudhomme stated it says doors and windows typical, meaning that that is typical for the finish. She stated the windows will not be operable.

Chair stated explain to me the requirement piece of having them installed, please, and where that's coming from. Mr. Prudhomme stated to have the windows installed into residential units is to have natural light in where you're living. Chair stated so the court tells me there's no requirement for them to be operable. It is the light piece that is the requirement under whatever statute or ordinance, whatever it is. Is it building code? Ms. Prudhomme stated no, there is no building code, and that's why I started the conversation with that we found some exceptions. There is a code, but then it says exceptions for historic buildings. We dug into it fairly deeply. So, that's why we started the conversation with, we are no longer pursuing that, and that's why we also changed the windows to be this original design, because they are smaller than the second version, because the second version was based on the percentages that the code would have required. Again, it's two units. The front unit has two bedrooms, and both bedrooms are on Main Street side, and the bedrooms have to be on Main Street side, because we have to provide egress from those bedrooms. Which then puts the living room with no light. We think, again, it's appropriate to say that when changing the use, updating this building to allow for residential, that natural light should be included in that.

Chair stated okay, and so back to the percentages, because we started this discussion before, and I don't know that we got it. So there's nowhere else to locate them to meet the percentages, like, it has to go here, because what's on the front and the back that we'd already approved is not sufficient. Ms. Prudhomme stated correct. So, going back to my opening statement of we're not pursuing it per the code, because there is an exception.

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

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

Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Commissioner Welter made a motion that the Commission go into closed section per 143-3.18.11, exception A3, to consult with an attorney. Commissioner Hammond-Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Commission went into closed session at 5:45 pm.

The Commission made a motion at 6:46 pm to end the closed session. The Commission returned at 6:49 pm.

Chair stated being that there was no further comment, the Commission is returning from closed session, the public hearing is now closed. If there are any further questions for staff or the applicant, the public hearing will need to be reopened.

Commissioner Welter moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file number H26-011-COA, and located within the Main Street Historic District, if added according to the information reviewed of this hearing, and with any representations made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards for the following reasons: Given the location and the windows on the side are not visible from any public right-of-way, windows do not diminish from the original design of the building. (Section 3.4.2.10). The new windows in the side elevation of the second story are compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, position, location, size, and materials, and details. (Section 3.4.2.10). And taking judicial notice of previous decisions of this Commission's factors considered in how much weight to give prior decisions of this Commission for this application. It is a non-contributing building. Removal of brick and damage to the historic materials will be minimal. Original designs impacted, but not necessarily diminished. SHPO and the state's Secretary of the Interior guidance provided that supports the design of the plan. It's not visible from the public right-of-way, non-character defining wall and facade, and no testimony or evidence as to the building's design from prominent or locally significant architects. Commissioner Brewer seconded the motion which passed five in favor and one opposed. Commissioner Hammond-Green opposed the motion.

V **New Business.**

V(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness** – Joseph Dinan – 147 1st Avenue East (File No. 26-28-COA).

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this is at 147 First Avenue East, and this is a garage door replacement, and then a creation of a new storefront. The applicant is Joseph Dinan, and the property owner is HVL Property Holdings LLC. This is located in our Central Business District with the Main Street Historic District Overlay, and this is a major work.

A map was shown of the location of the property highlighted in blue. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

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

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

A description of the COA application was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes stated he will note, and the applicant provided this in their submittal, that there are several

other garage doors along this street that have a similar thing that has been done in each of those garage door openings. And so I think it's their intent to mimic what has been, previously proposed and implemented.

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

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

The suggested motion for approval was shown with one proposed condition. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

The suggested motion for denial was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked what's the fill on the adjacent properties? Is that wood? Mr. Hayes stated so, it differs. The immediate adjacent property is wood, and then as you continue down to Continuum, they have a composite wood. It's like the wood grain composite wood, but they do have that, and then the one immediately adjacent has wood.

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

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

Joseph Dinan, 383 Riverview Hill Drive stated his name and address for the record. He stated we picked the concrete because, as Sam mentioned, it's funny that they're both right next to each other. They're both painted black, and really the only difference is the one that is wood is the paint chips. You really otherwise cannot tell the difference when you're looking at them, other than the finish. The concrete just holds paint better, and it doesn't deteriorate, doesn't break down, so that's why we chose it. But, just at first glance, you really cannot tell the difference. That said, I'm not dying on this hill, if you guys feel super strongly about it. I don't really care, so we can do that too.

The Commission asked about the concrete composite. Mr. Dinan stated it is made out of concrete but has a wood grain. He stated Josh Israel, and Silver Pine Construction are doing all the work. They're part owners of the building, and so they've done a lot. I'm sure he's come before you guys many times.

Chair stated we have standards now instead of guidelines. Standards say, historically accurate materials, one of which is wood, hardie plank is not. So, honestly, I mean, I can't speak for everybody. That was my concern in what has been approved on Main Street before under the standards, the precedent has been wood siding. So, you said you were amenable if you're willing to do that. Mr. Dinan stated sure, it's fine. Cedar, do you guys care? Chair stated cedar is historically accurate in approved materials, and I'm good with that.

Chair asked if the door is operable? Mr. Dinan stated yeah, the roll-up, would be operable. Chair stated so roll-up, so then, entry door is operable, window is? Mr. Dinan stated yes. It'd be closed.

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

Chair asked does anyone on the Commission or the audience have any further questions? Is there

anyone who wishes to speak before we can favor the application? Is there anyone who wishes to speak against the application? No one spoke.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair stated the applicant has agreed to wood. Going to infill the space that's already there. Materials make sense, the design makes sense. Keeping with the standards.

Commissioner Welter moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for Certificate of Appropriateness as identified in file number 26-28- 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 the 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. Contemporary design for a new storefront is compatible with scale, design, material, color, texture of the historic building, (Section 3.1.7). 2. The original opening of the garage door is preserved. (Section 3.4.2.2). 3. The new doors are required to meet building and safety codes and is done in a way that is least intrusive to the facade and without destroying historic materials and features. (Section 3.4.2.11). And the condition that all siding materials shall be constructed of natural wood. (Section 3.8.1). Commissioner Matoian seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI **Other Business.**

VI(A) **Preservation Award Nominations**

Mr. Hayes stated we do have one item of business. We did not do this at the last meeting because, the award recipient was here, so we wanted to keep it a secret. But the Community Affairs Committee wanted to get approval from the broader board to give Ken Fitch the Cultural Heritage Award at our Preservation Awards reception next week.

Commissioner Welter moved that the Commission give Ken Fitch a Cultural Heritage Award. Commissioner Matoian seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Hayes discussed the Historic Preservation Awards at Honeysuckle Holler on May 26th.

The Commission discussed the steps to address the process for hearing COA applications and taking action to ensure that this does not happen again in the process. No action was taken.

VII **Adjournment. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:48 p.m.**

Chair