



**CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
AMENDED AGENDA ITEM
SUMMARY
PLANNING DIVISION**



SUBMITTER:	Sam Hayes, Planner II	MEETING DATE:	March 19, 2025
AGENDA SECTION:	New Business	DEPARTMENT:	Community Development
TITLE OF ITEM:	344 N Main Street, Storefront Rehabilitation (H24-098-COA) – <i>Sam Hayes / Planner II</i>		

PROJECT STATUS: **THE COMMISSION CONTINUED THE HEARING AT ITS LAST REGULAR MEETING TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO REMOVE THE METAL FAÇADE ON THE BUILDING AND ENABLE THE COMMISSION TO HAVE A BETTER SENSE OF WHAT IS UNDERNEATH THE FAÇADE. THE FAÇADE HAS NOT BEEN REMOVED AT THE TIME OF THE AGENDA AND PACKET GOING OUT.**

SUGGESTED MOTION(S):

1. For Recommending Approval:

I move the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H24-098-COA and located within the Main Street Historic District, if added according to the information reviewed at this hearing and, with any representations made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is **not incongruous** with the character of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards (Main Street) for the following reasons:

1. The original storefront no longer exists, and the proposed design retains the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color, and texture of the historic buildings. **(Sec. 3.1.7)**
2. The applicant incorporated research from the Baker-Barber collection to determine the

1. For Recommending Denial:

I move the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file # H24-098-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 **incongruous** with the character of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards (Main Street) for the following reasons:

1. The original storefront no longer exists, but the proposed design is not compatible with the scale, design, materials, color, and texture of the historic building. **(Sec. 3.1.7)**
2. The proposal does not reflect the original characteristics and architectural details of the building elicited from the Baker-Barber collection photo. **(Sec. 3.1.7)**

<p>original characteristics and architectural details of the building. (Sec. 3.1.8)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The applicant retained and preserved character-defining architectural elements of the structure. (Sec. 3.4.1.1) 4. The replacement design for missing architectural details is based on historic documentation and is compatible with the historic character of the building and district. (Sec. 3.4.1.3) 5. The increase in size of the existing doors on the rear of the building does not diminish the original design of the building. (Sec. 3.4.2.10) <p>Proposed Conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to the uncertain condition of the façade behind the metal screen, the applicant and property owner shall consult with HPC staff to assess the structure and determine whether any modifications to the original COA approval are necessary. 2. The applicant shall photograph the front façade after the metal façade is removed but prior to starting construction and those photographs shall be given to the HPC staff coordinator. 3. The applicant shall set up a site visit with staff prior to beginning construction to allow inspection of the property for original details that were previously unknown. 4. The applicant should not try to recreate the J.C. Penney sign if it is no longer present on the building. 5. Retain and restore the original prismatic glass transom on the 4th Avenue side of the building per Section 3.4.1.1 of the Design Standards. 6. Design the transom window on the front façade to better align with the historic documentation by installing large transom windows that imitate the original window and providing more trim to provide architectural detailing per Section 3.1 and Section 3.4.1.3 of the Design Standards. <p>[DISCUSS & VOTE]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The removal of the prismatic glass transom on the 4th Avenue side of the building would be considered a removal of a character-defining element of the structure. (Sec. 3.4.1.1) 4. The replacement of the transom window with small windows is not appropriate given the historic documentation. (Sec. 3.4.1.3) 5. The increase in size of the rear doors would diminish the original design of the building. (Sec. 3.4.2.10) <p>[DISCUSS & VOTE]</p>
---	--

PROJECT/PETITIONER NUMBER:	H24-098-COA
PETITIONER NAME:	Peacock Architects (Applicant)
EXHIBITS:	A. Staff Report

	B. COA Application C. Warranty Deed
--	--