

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

**Minutes of the Special-Called Meeting of December 3, 2025**

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

**Commissioners Absent:** Jim Welter (Vice-Chair)

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

- I **Call to Order.** Chair called the Special Called meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 pm.
- II **Agenda.** On motion of Commissioner Falvo and seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green the agenda was approved.
- III **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Branigan the minutes of the meeting of November 19, 2025 were approved.
- IV **New Business.**

IV(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness – Derrick Pace, 1015 N. Main Street (File No. 25-82-COA)**

Prior to the opening of the public hearing, Chair announced that there are two applications for Certificates of Appropriateness one in the Hyman Heights Historic District and one in the Main Street Historic District continued from the October meeting. Any persons desiring to testify at any of the public hearings must first be sworn as witnesses and will be subject to cross-examination by parties or persons whose position may be contrary to yours. A copy of the procedure and rules for a quasi-judicial hearing is provided on the back table next to the agenda. Since this is a quasi-judicial hearing, it is very important that we have an accurate record of the hearing Therefore, we must ask that you refrain from speaking until recognized by the Chair and, when recognized, come forward to the podium and begin by stating your name and address. Anyone present who has knowledge of anything of value that has been given or promised in exchange for a position to be taken on these applications should disclose it now. Anyone wishing to speak during the public hearing should come forward and be sworn in. Chair swore in all potential witnesses. Those sworn in were Sam Hayes and Matt Holloway and Derrick Pace.

Mr. Hayes stated this is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 1015 N Main Street. This is a major work. The applicant is requesting siding replacement, window replacement and a rear addition. This was applied for by Derrick Pace and the property owner is TCB Property Development, LLC. This property is .59 acres. It is in the R-6, High Density Residential zoning district and in the Hyman Heights Historic Overlay.

An aerial image of the property was shown and is included in the staff report and the property is outlined in blue. Mr. Hayes stated the property sits right at the edge of the district.

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

Site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes stated part of the request is an after-the-fact request. The siding has been removed off of the house already. This is an image taken from the Henderson County Tax Records that shows the house from approximately the last few years, showing the siding on the house.

Mr. Hayes discussed the edges of the house and stated the corners are mitered edge and showed an infographic of what that means and explained this to the Commission.

Site photos were shown of the existing state of the house. Those are included in the staff report and presentation.

A COA description with different options was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A COA description for the new windows was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes discussed which windows were being proposed to be replaced and which ones were proposed to be restored.

A COA description for the extension of the back of the property was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The design standards that apply were discussed and shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The suggested motions were discussed and shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

It was clarified that the front of the property faces North Main.

Staff was asked if the original wood would have been pine. Mr. Hayes stated the applicant may know the answer to that.

Mr. Hayes stated staff stopped the work that was going on so the Commission could hear this and allowed them to seal it up as best as possible.

There were no cedar shakes on this house originally. Commissioner Smith asked if there were cedar shakes in that era. Mr. Hayes stated yes, it just depends on the style of the house that you had.

Commissioner Falvo asked if the original would have had the mitered edges on the siding. The proposal is just to do straight edging. Mr. Hayes stated with the hardie board it may not be technically feasible to do the mitered edges. In one of the emails the applicant spoke to what they were thinking if it was hardie board versus real wood.

Chair asked if they decided it was 90 degree that was the mitered edge. Mr. Hayes stated yes.

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

Chair asked the applicant if he would like to speak.

Derrick Pace, 1015 N. Main Street stated his name for the record. Mr. Pace stated they got started on the project and wasn't aware that they needed to go through this process and so after they had everything removed, Sam came up and they stopped the work. The original intention was to keep the original design of the house. He did throw out some wildish ideas with the porch but he does have every intention of trying to maintain the home because when you are coming in North Main it is one of the first places you see. That was part of wanting to keep everything to look like it had in the past. He thought the cedar shakes might be a neat addition. He has driven through Hyman Heights and some of the other houses had similar features and different accent wall and stuff.

Mr. Pace showed some examples and stated that is the kind of paint he would use and one was hardie board, one was cedar and not white pine but he is happy to go with either option. This is obviously more sustainable and cost-effective in the long run versus natural wood but they do want to maintain the characteristic of the home so he is open to go either way.

Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Smith asked if this was his personal home. Mr. Pace stated yes.

Chair asked the siding they took down, was it original. Mr. Pace stated he believes it was. Chair asked if it was wood. Mr. Pace stated he thinks it was white pine and then on the far side where they extended it, it was vinyl or something else.

Mr. Pace explained how after the storm last year, with all the rain, water was coming into the home and the upstairs through some of the windows. Some of the wood was dry-rotted and was in pretty rough shape. On top of that the house had no insulation so when he moved in there winters were pretty cold. The only area that had insulation was on the side that they had built out. Sam was nice enough to let them put insulation in there and then put the Tyvek wrap over it and that helped tremendously.

Chair stated on this one yes, the wood's not technically there now but it was and it was original or at least we think it is. It has that unique mitered edging and was period-specific because it was wood. The standards say that you should put back the wood unless it's not technically feasible. So standard-wise that is the starting point. You did mention hardie board or white pinewood and they can discuss the specifics. Chair asked if he would be open to the mitered, that would be her preference. Mr. Pace stated he thinks so.

Mr. Pace stated he has been having issues with people coming up to the house at night and trying to come in and go into the basement so he is hoping to, by the end of this today, have a resolution. Chair stated they will come to a decision tonight. He stated he had a restoration company come out yesterday and look at everything and if the Commission would be open to letting him replace the windows that are kind of similar to the ones that were previously replaced because when they were looking at the 20 panel ones, those are the ones that really stuck out. They kind of kept the historical look and he actually got a price to put a new one in. He also discussed fixing it where it is functional and it will lock and be seal proof and he said he could do that and the cost was pretty even so he asked if he could also find another one to put where the mini-split is up on the right side. That would look really good.

Chair asked about the cedar shake and they now have the decorative cedar shake that goes over so it gives the illusion of it being there versus actually in-setting and what he was planning. Mr. Pace stated what got him started on this idea is when they got the siding off and saw the wood. They were like wow, it really looks nice. He was thinking because the boards are going to be horizontal and just matching or taking some sort of natural and just following the same wood pattern and not doing the actual little shakers. He was thinking at the bottom of that window, just across up to the top and give it a little bit of an accent. He stated just horizontal pieces of wood. You would have the white and then like a piece of trim and then it would be natural going across, following the same wood pattern.

Commissioner Matoian asked what they did with the siding. Mr. Pace asked his contractor who stated it was hauled to the dump because it had lead paint in it and to remove the lead paint would have been over one hundred something thousand dollars and it is why the siding got taken off in the first place.

Chair asked about the windows.

Chair swore in Richard Jenkins.

Richard Jenkins, 322 Lyndhurst Drive stated his name for the record. Mr. Jenkins stated the windows will be aluminum-clad. The inside will be wood and the outside will be aluminum clad. They will be new installation windows, new building windows. They go in having a nailing flange then the zip tape gets around the outside of them and then a border of 3.5 or 4.5, whatever the owner decides on will be around the outside with a five or six border at the top for the siding to run in to. Chair asked about the infill and not changing that but what about the muntins. She asked if they come with the snap-ins that are removable. Mr. Jenkins stated they come inside the glass. You order them already like that.

Mr. Pace explained that the windows that were previously replaced are not good windows so eventually he would like to come back and have those replaced. The main ones that are being done now are mainly ones that are either the glass has fallen out and broken or it's leaking. So those are more urgent repairs.

Chair stated just to confirm, with all the window replacement, repair, refurbish, you're not changing the openings, it will all be infill for what is existing. Mr. Pace stated exactly. The trim will match what is there now.

Discussion was made on if any of the windows were functional. Most of those windows are not functional and the glass panels have fallen out of some.

Chair asked the applicant to explain the addition. Mr. Jenkins stated it's going to take that indentation out of the corner and just make the rectangle come right around to match the other side. Mr. Pace stated and the roofline will just extend that out to where it will look uniform with what is there. Chair asked about the siding for the addition and stated it will blend. Mr. Jenkins stated you will not even know it was put in there.

Discussion was made on the addition and it matching the wall that is there.

Chair asked if any landscaping was taken out. Mr. Pace stated no, it was concrete back there. The addition will be a closet.

Chair stated she was not sold of the border on the front and asked Mr. Pace to explain it. The

Commission looked at the tax record photo of the home and discussed the front. Chair asked if he was putting shutters back. Mr. Pace stated he did not believe so. He discussed having a wall on the porch where the two entry doors are. Chair asked why. Mr. Pace stated to give it a little more contrast. He was going to go back white and then he saw the wood under the house with the white trim and thought that looks really nice and it looks like the historic home from up north.

Chair stated what he is saying is follow the same pattern but effectively keep part of it natural wood and then white wood. So they are talking about the aesthetic of painting it which is different than not using the same material because it would be the same material, it would have the same pattern, it would be mitered, it would be exactly what was there but he is just going to paint it. She doesn't know if aesthetically the Commission can say they have to paint it. Mr. Jenkins stated that wood that is on there is on there because back in the day they didn't have plywood to put on the outside. That's not any kind of exterior siding that is out there. Chair stated the issue with the cedar is that cedar was not inside a whole house like this in cedar back in this time when it was done. So the white pine makes sense, so does the aesthetic work if you do all white pine siding and leave some of it natural and some of it painted. And then you lose that kind of rustic because it looks unpainted.

Chair stated if he's got the porch storm or portico area with the natural on there, would that be enough of an accent to kind of break up if he was allowed to do the insets and the triangles? Mr. Pace stated he thinks that would be doable.

Mr. Pace stated he is planning on sealing the cedar and then putting some sort of stain on there to darken it up so that it is not so bright compared to the white. Just to give it a little more contrast. Chair stated it would be cedar board, cedar plank but natural, stained, whatever wood color, not white in the recesses for the triangle. Mr. Pace stated yes.

Chair asked if there were any further questions for the applicant.

Discussion was made on the surround being made to match.

Chair discussed the amended proposal.

Mr. Pace discussed doing the ceiling the same that is under the porch. It would be cedar. The wood under there is all rotted and falling out.

Mr. Pace stated previously on the windows it had white trim but he would like to propose to go back with a black trim and the new windows, have them be black. Chair stated they care about the materials because they are new but what she will say is because you're keeping some of the existing ones, you're going to have some white and some black. Mr. Pace stated they will try and make them all match. Commissioner Hammond-Green stated they could note that existing windows will be updated to match the new windows. Chair stated they could put trim to be consistent. The trim on replacement and repair to be consistent with new.

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

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

Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair summarized the amended proposal. Discussion was made on the siding, windows and the addition. The shutters were also discussed and Chair stated Mr. Pace was not putting those back.

***Commissioner Matoian moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file number 25-82-COA and located within the Hyman Heights 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 (Residential) for the following reasons: 1. Replacement of entire wooden feature is necessary and shall be replaced in kind. (Section 3.1.5) 2. The windows are being proposed to be replaced in-kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original sash, pane configuration, architectural trim, detailing and materials with the provision that trim on the replacement and repair and refurbished windows to be consistent with the new windows trim and framing. 3. The new addition is being constructed so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric, and so that the character, the defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured. (Section 4.2.1) 4. The new addition is located in an inconspicuous elevation of the historic building. (Section 4.2.5) Proposed conditions: Siding should be pine with 90 degree mitered corners, white board and plank width to match original. Porch, triangle dormers and 20-pane window dormer, triangle can be cedar, natural wood, same width as the pine siding and the left front porch (North Main), the ceiling could also be the cedar natural wood. The southern façade, the mini-split replace window cedar to match the front façade dormer insets, if feasible. Commissioner Hammond-Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

V **Old Business.**

V(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness – Matt Holloway, 323 N. Main Street (File No. 25-69-COA)**

Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated this was continued by the Commission so he is not going to go through the full presentation, he will give an overview. The application is for window replacement at 323 North Main Street.

An aerial image of the property was shown and is included in the staff report and the property is outlined in blue.

Photos of the windows were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes stated all of the windows are being proposed to be replaced. The applicant has reached out to a window restorationist who has said they can be restored. Part of the reason why you all continued the hearing was to get more feedback on this.

Site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. An aerial view of the windows being proposed was also shown.

The SHPO report was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The design standards that apply were discussed and shown and are included in the staff report and

presentation.

The suggested motions were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if any of the repairs have been started. Mr. Hayes stated the windows have not been started to be restored or anything like that.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Hayes stated he is not making an interpretation. He is sharing what SHPO has said in their report. He discussed the Main Street Design Standards not distinguishing between windows that can or cannot be seen from the right-of-way.

There were no further questions for staff.

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

Matt Holloway with Aspen Builders stated they are doing the renovation at 323 North Main Street. He stated this is a studio apartment above Moonshine Magnolias retail store. The owners own the whole building. They have been bringing this old building up to code and when he was here the last time, it was important to the Commission to try and figure out if these windows were original. Mrs. Brantley, who looked at these, determined that she thought that they were, so that kind of answered those questions. He wishes the Commission could see these windows because anything can be rebuilt, but they are in pretty bad shape and so the owners asked them to look into what options they would have. They did have somebody come out and look at them and he said it takes some extensive work to do so. They started weighing all of this out and so if they are going to take a window and rebuild the lower half, the upper parts are not quite as damaged as the lower sizes, then they have 50% of the windows that's new wood versus original wood, and then they also have all the seals around the windows that will have to be replaced and the majority of the trim. They felt like what are we gaining. What are they keeping here and it is really some of the top parts of the windows. So they thought let's look into trying to find a window that would enhance the historic part of the building and they found a company called Colvin Kolbe who has a heritage window that is designed for preservation. They looked into this and financially there's no gain here. It really costs probably more money putting the new windows in than trying to restore these. They looked into the Heritage Series windows and they have almost identical dimensions. The sashes are almost identical. The seal that they put in, the exterior trim and the mullions that separate the glass are all identical. These are true authentic pieces of glass in individual pieces that they would match. The other thing that was important to the owners, they didn't want to put an aluminum--clad window in so they found an all wood window which he thinks is important. That's what these windows are and these would be painted exteriors. The only difference is it would have an insulated glass versus a single pane glass. And as Mrs. Brantley said in her report, they are not very visible.

Mr. Holloway stated one of the things the owners wanted conveyed to the Commission was if they go back to repairing the windows then they would probably be forced to put a storm window on top of these. So what you are going to see when you are at 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, looking up at this side of the building, you are going to see metal storm windows versus a wood window. It seems to them that it would look so much more aesthetically pleasing to see a window that looks back when it was built in the 1920's without a storm window. That is what they are hoping the Commission will consider. He brought a brochure for the Commission to look at.

Chair stated Secretary of Interior Standard 6 is also bifurcated because it's got repair, repair, repair, but if you can demonstrate, is this a situation where the severity of the deterioration, in your opinion because you are a professional, would require replacement of a distinctive feature, being the original windows but that if you did replace it because of the deterioration in the damage and the current wood damage, the rot, would the proposed replacement window match the old, original window in design, color, texture, other visual qualities and the materials such that the replacement of the missing feature would be substantially the same? Mr. Holloway stated it is almost identical. They really felt it was important to try and match these windows. He stated there won't be much salvaged in originally by repairing them.

Chair asked if he thought it is technically feasible to restore these to what would be the original. Mr. Holloway stated honestly, and he has been doing this a long time, these windows are in such bad shape it just doesn't make sense to spend the money. Chair stated we preserved the design and the original materials by going back to a heritage window that is wood that looks like what is there. Chair asked what the interior would look like. Would it be a big change from what is there? Mr. Holloway stated the interior is an all wood product as well, same as the exterior. Those mullions have the divided glass, look identical on the inside as they do on the outside. They are all individual panes of glass. They look very authentic, from the inside as well as the exterior. Chair stated it's not going to affect the historic design or elements that were on the interior by changing the design. Mr. Holloway stated it won't at all.

Commissioner Matoian stated in the motion it says work to find a buyer for the salvaged windows, that's one of the conditions, a suggested condition and she asked if he would be able to remove them. She stated her mom buys those. Chair stated the standards do say if you do replace, that you take the salvage material. Chair asked to give the windows a little respect when he pulls them out. People do buy those.

There were no further questions for the applicant.

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

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the motion.

***Commissioner Matoian moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as identified in file number 25-69-COA and located in 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 windows are significantly deteriorated and warrant replacement. (Section 3.4.2.3) 2. The proposed window is an appropriate replacement. (Section 3.4.2.3) 3. The proposed replacement window duplicates the original unit in size, material and design. (Section 3.4.2.4) Conditions: 1. The cladding shall be painted wood. 2. The muntions shall be as close to the original width as possible. 3. The original wood jams shall be retained or replaced in kind to avoid changes to the site line. 4. Window sills shall be repaired or replaced in kind. 5. The six-inch wide mullion on existing windows shall be retained. 6. The existing profile brick mold should be preserved***



*or replaced to match the existing profile. 7. The applicant shall work with staff to find an appropriate buyer and recipient of the salvaged original windows. (Section 4.1.2). Commissioner Boyd seconded the motion which passed unanimously.*

VI      **Other Business.**

VII     **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

---

Chair

DRAFT