

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

**Minutes of the Special-Called Meeting of March 25, 2026**

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

**Commissioners Absent:** Jim Boyd

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

- I **Call to Order.** Chair called the regular meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:13 pm.
- II **Public Comment** - None
- III **Agenda.** On motion of Commissioner Welter and seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green the agenda was approved.
- IV **Minutes.** A correction was made to the minutes to remove Commissioner Branigan’s name from attendance. On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Matoian the amended minutes of the regular meeting of February 18, 2026 were approved.
- V **New Business.**
- V(A) **Approval of Neighborhood History Project Action Committee** – Mr. Hayes discussed having the Neighborhood History Project and establishing a committee to guide this project. He stated staff is requesting a motion to establish this new committee. ***On motion of Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Falvo the Neighborhood History Project Action Committee was established. The vote was unanimous.***
- VI **Old Business**
- VI(B) **Certificate of Appropriateness** – Erica Hodges – 314 N. Main Street (File No. 26-11-COA). Prior to the opening of the public hearing, Chair announced that there is one application for a COA in the Main Street Historic District that was continued from the February 18<sup>th</sup> 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,

Hannah Slyce, Tiffany Prudhomme, Mariana Kilpatrick and Erica Hodges.

Commissioner Smith asked to be recused from voting on this item. Chair stated the recusal is continued from the last meeting.

Chair opened the public hearing.

Hannah Slyce, Planner II stated this is an application for 314 N. Main Street and is a storefront rehabilitation. The application number is H26-11-COA. This is a continuation from the February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

A project background was given and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A map of the historic district was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation with the property highlighted in blue.

An aerial view of the subject property was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation. The property is highlighted in blue.

The history of the subject property was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. A photo of the building from 1953 was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A COA description was given and is included in the staff report and presentation. Ms. Slyce stated the item they will be discussing today is the addition of the side upper floor windows.

A photo was shown depicting where the windows would be installed. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

Other photos were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The floor plan of the upper level was shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Site images were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes showed photos of comparable properties in the area. These photos were discussed. These were examples of new windows that were added on the side of buildings where windows were not previously there.

Staff entered a brief into the record. This is series of briefs put out by the National Park Service that helps interpret the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Hayes read the interpretations.

The Design Standards that apply were included in the staff report and presentation. The Commission discussed the standards. Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney stated the Secretary of Interior Standards are incorporated into their Design Standards and the interpretations that Mr. Hayes read, staff's position is they are not necessarily binding. It is a different way of applying the standards.

Suggested motions for approval and denial were presented and are included in the staff report and

presentation.

The Commission asked if this was different from what was proposed at the previous meeting. Mr. Hayes stated yes the number of windows is one fewer. The windows on the upper area have an added transom. Mr. Hayes stated they have decreased in size.

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 stated she thinks Mr. Hayes has covered all the properties that had been researched that had added windows. The reason for the change on the size of the windows is that they did it based on a code and it is R303 and it has to do with light ventilation and heating. That code gives them a percentage of natural light and they calculate it per the space. The reason the center area needs more glazing is because that area has no natural light. That is where the difference came. They reduced the windows down by one because one of the front windows was not needed due to that percentage. They were proposing to add the transom to keep the horizontal line as consistent in all three units as they can. The window they removed was in the bathroom. It did not really meet the code with what is required. Chair asked if they were operable. Ms. Prudhomme stated they are not. They could make them operable but they have to be fire rated and that would be more of a challenge. Chair asked if the code is required. Ms. Prudhomme stated this is what they found to back what they have proposed. Chair asked where this came from. Ms. Prudhomme stated it is the residential code. It is in the state code.

Chair asked about there being other options and why it has to be located on the side of the building on a solid wall. Ms. Prudhomme stated because then they would be putting them on the existing front and rear, adding more windows to the front and the existing rear facades, except for the center unit. There are no choices there. Chair asked if the calculations included what was already there. Ms. Prudhomme stated yes. Chair asked if this would be in addition to that. Ms. Prudhomme stated yes.

The calculations were shown and discussed in detail.

Ms. Prudhomme stated the only other option is to have skylights but the structural issues with the skylights are not an option.

More discussion was made on the percentage. Ms. Prudhomme gave the percentages for the front and rear excluding the proposed windows. Ms. Prudhomme stated the center section is right at eight percent, it is just the tiniest bit over based on standard sized windows. What is required is 38 and what they are proposing is 39.5.

Mr. Heyman stated they can ask questions but he represents the staff and cannot give them legal advice. He can make an argument on staff's position. He stated he believes what Ms. Prudhomme is referencing R303 from the residential building code and you just have to make sure whatever version of that is put into the record. He is not qualified to tell the Commission which version of the code applies to this.

Ms. Prudhomme stated the front unit with the single window is what is provided with that window and

is six and a half percent.

Commissioner Hammond-Green asked if the door on the front balcony was solid. Ms. Prudhomme stated it is glass but goes to the other bedroom unit.

Discussion was made on the percentage again. Ms. Prudhomme stated this would include four windows on the front and a door. That is the only light available right now. The square footage was also discussed and how the percentage is interpreted. Chair stated she did not know how to interpret whether it was for the total square footage or for each unit. Ms. Prudhomme stated it say a habitable meaning a place is safe, fit and suitable for human beings to live in and/or occupy. So that would be all of the square footage.

Mr. Heyman stated he understands the purpose for this conversation he would caution staff on weighing in and interpreting the building code. For lack of testimony from a qualified expert, he does not know how this section of the building code would apply to this application. Chair stated they are not experts and cannot make that interpretation.

Ms. Prudhomme stated so it sounds like what you need presented is the meaning of aggregate, the meaning of habitable and with that being said what the total square footage is and the current glazing percentage with the four windows and the one door and what that number looks like and then the total number percentage of what they are proposing. Chair stated yes but they still have the issue of the standard 3.6.2 which says that to meet health and safety code and accessibility requirements in ways that do not diminish the historic character, features, materials, and details of the building. That will need to be addressed too. Chair stated the burden of proof is on the applicant. The Commission has to make sure that whatever the code say it still complies with that standard.

Commissioner Welter asked if they had a building permit for this. Ms. Prudhomme stated no, they did not start the building permit process until they had approval from the Commission. They were not getting the building permit since the windows were not approved yet. Chair stated she thought where this might be permissible was if it was needed to meet health and safety codes. They would need that addressed too. Do you have to do it this way? That is something you could explore too. Is there another way to do it? Chair stated the issue is that it is a solid brick wall. Chair stated there may be other options that would satisfy this without cutting into a brick wall. Or there may be an exception for historic buildings where the eight percent is not required. That would need to be explored also.

Ms. Prudhomme asked if there were any other concerns the Commission had. If she is going back to address this concern, she wanted to know if there were any concerns she would need to address as well. Chair stated it is hard to say. They do have the hearing open so they can discuss anything else that comes up.

Chair asked if all they were talking about for health and safety is the ventilation. Ms. Prudhomme stated yes.

Ms. Prudhomme stated the windows would be aluminum clad to match the windows that were previously approved.

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

Chair asked if anyone in the audience had any questions.

Chair asked if there was anyone that would like to speak in favor of the application or against the application. No one spoke. Chair asked if there was anyone that would like to speak before the public hearing is closed.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed if there might be any exceptions for the ventilation for health and safety and they were interested in knowing if there were any exceptions. The standards were discussed.

Discussion was made on whether they want to continue this for more information or if they wanted to take a vote.

Discussion was made on the code and the ventilation requirement. Chair would like to know more concerning this.

The Commission discussed holding the application open and what they need from the applicant.

The majority of the Commission members were agreeable to holding open the application.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Chair asked the applicants if they would be agreeable to holding open the application until next month and getting more information for the Commission. The applicants were agreeable to this.

Mr. Hayes asked if the Commission would like for SHPO to give input on this application.

Chair closed the public hearing.

***Commissioner Welter moved the Commission hold open the COA application as identified in File No. H26-011-COA until the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting and for staff to reach out to the State Historic Preservation Office to provide guidance on new openings in solid masonry walls. Commissioner Hammond-Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

VI **Old Business**

VII(A) **Staff Report.** Mr. Hayes gave an update on the loft tour. No action was taken.

VIII **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

---

Chair