

**STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  
HENDERSON COUNTY**

**BEFORE THE HENDERSONVILLE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
FILE NO. H23-67-COA**

**IN RE THE APPLICATION OF  
HENDERSONVILLE HOLDINGS,  
LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF  
APPROPRIATENESS  
PIN 9568-77-8673**

**DECISION**

This matter came before the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission on October 18, 2023 and November 15, 2023 for a quasi-judicial hearing on the application of Hendersonville Holdings, LLC for a certificate of appropriateness for a property located at 225 S Main Street, Hendersonville, NC, Main Street Historic District, Hendersonville, PIN 9568-77-8673 (“Subject Property”) to add windows to second floor side and rear facades, and a rooftop deck, with the application being dated August 10, 2023.

The subject property is identified as a contributing property in the Main Street local designation report.

The file was submitted into the record. Attorneys Bo Carpenter and Jesse Swords of Allen, Stahl & Kilbourne appeared for the applicant. In addition Alexandra Hunt, Planner, and Larry Hogan, adjoining property owner testified, after first being duly sworn.

The applicant previously submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to add eight windows to the second floor side façade, and windows in a semi-circle pattern on the rear facade, but not a rooftop patio, on January 16, 2023 (File No. H22-120-COA). That application came before the Commission for a quasi-judicial hearing on February 15, 2023. The Commission denied that application by Decision dated March 15, 2023. The applicant appealed the Commission’s March 15, 2023 denial to the Henderson County Superior Court. The applicant’s appeal is currently pending.

Though the current application is identical in part to the application in H22-120-COA, the Commission elected to hear the current application because nobody appeared at the hearing to object on the basis of res judicata.

**Issues**

The Historic Preservation Commission’s adopted Main Street Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards are incorporated in these findings and conclusions by reference. The question presented was whether the relevant standards permit the: (1) addition of two windows to the south façade; (2) the removal of an existing window and door on the rear façade and the addition of windows in a semi-circle pattern; and (3) the addition of a rooftop deck as requested in the application.

Section 3.3 of the Design Standards provides in pertinent part that:

**Section 3.3 Side and Rear Facades**

**Sec. 3.3.1 -** Retain and preserve historic façade details and materials on side and rear elevations.

**Sec. 3.3.9** - If new construction of a side or rear façade is necessary, make sure that the design is compatible with the existing side and rear facades in the district including size & spacing of windows or other fenestrations, proportion, scale, and detailing.

Section 3.4.2 of the Design Standards provides in pertinent part that:

**Section 3.4.2 Windows and Doors**

**Sec. 3.4.2.10** - It is not appropriate to introduce new windows or doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Keep new windows and doors compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, size, materials, and details.

**Sec. 3.4.2.11** - If a new window or door is required to meet building and safety codes, it should be done in a way that is the least intrusive to the façade and without destroying historic materials and features.

Section 4.3 of the Design Standards provides in pertinent part that:

**Section 4.3 Rear Decks, Balconies, Terraces, & Rooftop Decks:**

**Sec. 4.3.3** - Construct decks, balconies, terraces, and rooftop decks so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric. Also, ensure that character defining features of the historic building are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

**Testimony**

Testimony is accurately reflected in the minutes.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based on the above testimony, the Board finds as follows:

1. The affected property is 225 N Main Street, Hendersonville.
2. The Subject Property is located at 225 N Main Street, Hendersonville, and is more particularly described in a deed recorded in Deed Book 3877 at page 151 of the Henderson County registry.
3. The Subject Property is situated within the Hendersonville Main Street Historic District.
4. The Subject Property is listed as contributing in the Local Historic Designation Report for Hendersonville Main Street Historic District Hendersonville, North Carolina (the “Designation Report.”) The Designation Report is incorporated in these findings and conclusions by reference.
5. The Subject Property is referred to as the People’s National Bank Building in the Designation Report. The Designation Report contains the following information regarding the Subject Property:

**225-231 N. Main St. People’s National Bank Building. ca. 1910. Contributing.**  
Two-story Neoclassical Revival style building of cream colored brick has a recessed

central entrance beneath an entablature carried by ionic column with egg and dart motif and dentil blocks. The building has a stepped parapet, with a high point in the center. Storefronts are located to either side of the entrance bay, with original configurations but some replacement modern materials. The second story windows are located to either side of the entrance bay, and are group in pairs with a common sill and a limestone lintel above each. Limestone trim is visible on the parapet cap, the lower part of entablature, over the second story windows, on the sill, and on columns.

Designed by notable Asheville architect Richard Sharp Smith, this two-story Neoclassical Style building is built of cream color brick and was the earliest use of the Neoclassical style and a reinforced concrete construction technique for a commercial structure in Hendersonville. There is a recessed central entrance beneath an entablature carried by Ionic columns. "People's National Bank" is incised into the entablature. Façade extends upward into a stepped parapet wall, with the high point in the center. Storefronts are located to either side of the entry bay. Each retains its original configuration, with modern replacement materials. Sanborn maps note that this building was of fireproof construction which included steel framing and reinforced concrete. Balconies have been added on to the front of the building.

Windows on the second story are grouped in pairs with a common sill and a limestone lintel above each. Window sash on the south side are fixed pane; sash on the north side are also fixed with transoms. Balconies have been added over the north portion of the building. Limestone trims the parapet, the lower part of the entablature, above the second story windows, the sills, and the columns.

Concrete made its splashy debut as a building material in 1910, when W. F. Edwards, the most active builder in Hendersonville at the time, decided to try out this material for a new bank. Edwards had previously served as a contractor for the town's water and sewer systems, and the courthouse. For the People's National Bank, he worked closely with a Mr. Blythe. The project clearly caught the fancy of the local citizens. The following reports came from the French Broad Hustler (1/27/1910):

"Messrs. Edwards and Blythe have returned from Atlanta, where they purchased the latest improved machinery for reinforced concrete construction. This machinery will be used for the first time in the construction of the "People's National Bank,"

6. The Designation Report specifically names the architect Richard Sharp Smith's association with the District as a reason for the significance of the District.
7. There are no windows on the southern façade. The first-story shares a common wall with the property immediately to the south, the second-story is exposed.
8. There is one window and a door on the second-story of the rear façade. There is also an exterior metal staircase. The existing window and door have canvas awnings.
9. The applicant has proposed the addition of two aluminum clad, wood windows on the second-story side façade.
10. The applicant has also proposed the removal of the window and door on the rear façade, and the addition of a aluminum clad, wood windows in a semi-circle pattern to the rear façade.
11. There have never been windows present on the second-story side (southern) façade.

12. The rear façade was originally constructed with poured in place concrete in the same manner as the side façade. However, the rear façade crumbled when the property owner immediately to the north attempted to install new windows in the late 1970s.
13. The applicant has proposed to construct a rooftop patio including a brick stairwell access and a metal railing.
14. The rooftop patio is designed in a way as to not interfere with the existing structural supports and skylights on the building.
15. The rooftop patio is also designed in a way so that it will not be easily visible from the public street.
16. The proposed rooftop patio is **not incongruous** with the Hendersonville Main Street Historic District because the Subject Property is a contributing structure, the proposed rooftop patio is compatible with existing rooftop patios in the district, and the application meets the following Design Standards:
  - a. Section 4.3.3 – the proposed rooftop patio will be constructed so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric, and it does not obscure, damage, or destroy the character defining features of the historic building.
17. The proposed rear façade windows (semi-circle pattern), being aluminum-clad wood windows as proposed on Exhibits B and C presented at the hearing, with a flux stone border and brick to match the flux stone or rear façade, are **not incongruous** with the Hendersonville Main Street Historic District because the Subject Property is a contributing structure, and the application meets the following Design Standards:
  - a. Section 3.4.2.10 – The proposed windows do not diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features, and it is compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, size materials, and details.
18. The proposed side façade windows are **incongruous** with the Hendersonville Main Street Historic District because the Subject Property is a contributing structure, and the application fails to meet the following Design Standards.
  - a. Section 3.4.2.10 – The proposed windows would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. The proposed windows are not compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, size, materials, and details.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the above findings of fact, the Commission concludes as follows:

The Certificate of Appropriateness is approved in part, and denied in part, as follows:

The addition of a rooftop patio and rear façade (western) windows (semi-circle pattern) on the second-story on the Subject Property as proposed is **not incongruous** with the character of the Hendersonville Main Street Historic District pursuant to Section 28-147 of the City Code, and the Certificate of Appropriateness is **approved**, with the following conditions:

- a. Rooftop patio – Greenery shall not be visible from the public street. Railings shall match either the front balcony design or the sample provided at the hearing. The railing shall not touch the exterior wall. Rooftop stairwell access color is almond as shown in the sample provided at the hearing.
- b. Rear façade windows – Window design shall be as shown on the amended Exhibit B and page 5 of Exhibit C. The border shall be flux stone. The windows shall be aluminum clad wood.

The addition of side façade (southern) windows on the second-story of the Subject Property as proposed is **incongruous** with the character of the Hendersonville Main Street Historic District pursuant to Section 28-147 of the City Code, and the Certificate of Appropriateness is **denied**.

### DECISION

For the above reasons, the application for a certificate of appropriateness is approved in part and denied in part.

Done this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2024.

---

Chair