

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 18, 2026

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

Commissioners Absent: John Falvo

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 5:05 pm.
- II **Public Comment** - None
- III **Agenda.** The agenda was amended to add the approval of the Findings of Fact for H25-69-COA and H25-82-COA under Old Business. On motion of Commissioner Welter and seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green the amended agenda was approved.
- IV **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Boyd the minutes of the special-called meeting of December 3, 2025 were approved. Commissioner Welter abstained from the vote.
- V **New Business.**
- V(A) **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. 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, Kenneth Stevens, Patrick Dunn, and Erica Hodges.

Commissioner Smith asked to be recused from voting on this item as the property was owned by his wife's family. ***Commissioner Hammond-Green moved the Commission to recuse Commissioner Smith from the vote. Commissioner Welter seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

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.

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

A photo of the front façade was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A map of the historic district was 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.

Front and rear elevations were shown. Ms. Slyce stated it does not appear that any of the existing windows on the building are original and have been since replaced. She explained the stairwell addition and the balconies.

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

Photos of balcony examples along Main Street submitted by the applicant were shown.

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

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

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Welter asked if there are three windows on the side of the building right now. Ms. Slyce stated there are no windows currently on the side that is visible. Commissioner Welter asked if those would all be new windows. Ms. Slyce stated yes, those would all be new windows.

Commissioner Matoian asked if that was the original brick on the building where the windows would be placed. Ms. Slyce stated yes.

Chair asked if there were any further 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 they are proposing a façade renovation, trying to bring back some of the character that was lost in some of the old renovations that had been done. There was a metal façade that had been attached at some point that has been removed currently, but with all of the updates we are trying to preserve character but also improve upon some of the proportions. She knows that Ms. Slyce mentioned the one over one double-hung windows, which was the original, but the proportions of those elements were not really proportionate to the design of the structure itself. When you look at the detailing and the intricacies, especially on the front façade with the brickwork, the oversized, large glazing does not really work proportionately to the structure and the aesthetic and the proposed divisions that they are wanting to see incorporated would have been time period appropriate as well. The same thing goes for the proposed balcony. She knows that one of the other questions or issues that they need to address is the use of non-wood product on the front façade. They have some samples with them, but they are proposing using smooth, painted product that when painted, it appears aesthetically to be the same as a wood product but it is something that is going to be much more maintenance friendly. They whole goal of restoring the structure is to bring back the character and have something that is going to have some longevity to it, while still having the character, bringing back the character that was originally incorporated into the design.

Ms. Prudhomme stated on the Main Street level, it's going to be built to suit but they would assume that this would be either a retail space or a restaurant, some sort of commercial space both on the main level and the lower level, that would be assessable from the alley side. The third story, they would have that be residential style spaces. They are trying to incorporate natural light since they have such a long, narrow structure that you only get natural light from the front and rear of the building currently.

Commissioner Hammond-Green stated adding windows where there are no windows has been an issue throughout the downtown Main Street area. Have you considered using skylights to provide the lighting for the apartment that is going to be up there rather than cutting through the existing wall which appears to be in good shape from at least what they have been able to see. Ms. Prudhomme stated the issue with skylights is that because of the construction of, how the roof is constructed as is they did not have skylights originally, which, when they replaced the roof, got covered up because there were so many water issues with the skylights that it was causing damage to the structure. The reason that the structure is in such disrepair at this point was because of water infiltration through the roof, and a lot of it was from the skylight so proposing to go back to it is a bit of an issue.

Chair asked if there were any questions pertaining to the front façade.

Commissioner Welter asked what materials or where are you planning the non-wood materials. Ms. Prudhomme stated the surround around the front storefront, for lack of better words, kind of paneling and trim details, they were wanting to use a non-wood product but painted so it appears as a smooth wood product. Nothing with faux wood grain or anything like that. The balcony would be a metal balcony and then the doors and windows, if they had to have any sort of trim between the doors and windows and the bricks, that little bit of molding would be a non-wood product.

Chair stated they have a no artificial materials provision in the standards and she asked Ms. Prudhomme to come show the Commission what area would be non-wood. Ms. Prudhomme stated currently what is there is just aluminum wrapped and they are wanting to remove all of that. They are trying to replicate it as closely as possible. She discussed using PVC and for longevity this being the best option. She showed examples to the Commission and explained the materials.

Ms. Prudhomme stated they are not suggesting using wood on any of the exterior. There are insect issues, there is water damage issues and so in today's time period they have products that appears as wood and so that panel would be a non-wood product and then they would trim it out with that same product. And then with the painting of those components they would appear as one unit.

Chair discussed the standards not allowing for artificial materials. She asked if there was a consideration for going to wood or is it just going to be a non-wood. Because that is the whole façade and it was historically wood.

Discussion was made on replacing historic material with the same material and what the standards say about artificial materials. Chair stated there have been other applicants that have used wood and treated the wood so they know it is feasible to use wood.

Commissioner Welter stated the windows that are going in, they had mentioned that there were historically similar, and he applauds them for doing research and finding the pictures. With those pictures being presented to the Commission, it is kind of like the standards do say if you are reconstructing, put back what was there and that was the single pane over single pane as opposed to the decorative things that are there. Would you all consider going back to what was in the picture? Ms. Prudhomme stated yes.

Chair stated is the infill the same as what is there? Ms. Prudhomme stated they are not expanding. The only thing they are expanding is the center. They are making it a door versus a window because they are proposing the balcony, but beyond that they are utilizing the openings as they are, as much as they possibly can. She stated again, nothing is original.

More discussion was made on the openings and the infill.

Ms. Prudhomme stated they have an eight foot door with a two foot transom above it. The double hungs are just massive, probably like eight feet or so. They are limited with the height of it and so they really have to have a transom above it to fill in the existing space, which then makes sense to have the same aesthetic across all three with having a transom and then the double hung below it.

Ms. Prudhomme stated all of the windows that are not this front storefront were windows and doors, they are suggesting the wood interior or aluminum clad exterior.

Chair asked because the second floor needs to match the first, if you had or assuming they go with the wood route, if you needed to fill, it would be wood surround to match. Ms. Prudhomme stated yes, whatever they can match, they will. Chair stated she is just looking for consistency because of the standards with the front façade, because that is the historic storefront and the paneling and accents are going to be wood on the bottom, that they match.

Ms. Prudhomme pointed out where the balcony will go and how much brick they would lose. She thought it would be maybe two feet.

Ms. Prudhomme stated the whole thing gets new structural skeleton for lack of better words. She stated they are going to try and remove the paint from the brick safely, if possible but worst case

scenario they would go back with fresh paint on the brick. Chair asked what color would they go with. Ms. Prudhomme stated a light color paint. And the trimming would be a dark accent.

Kenneth Stevens, 57 Lake Drive, Candler stated his name for the record. Chair stated just on record, it says repaint with something that is consistent with the district. Obviously, pink, purple, blue are not there, so as long as it is an antique white or something like that, that's all we are getting at. Mr. Stevens stated the color would be light.

Ms. Prudhomme stated they would go with a traditional metal, all metal railing and structure for the balcony and a wood decking. She stated it is attached to the new structural interior skeleton. It is not bearing on that brick.

Discussion was made on the balcony being five feet. Chair also discussed the deck being removable.

Discussion was made on the detail of the ends of the balcony and this being a decorative piece.

Chair stated concerning the windows on the side, because they have pictures of the original, because they knew these were not there and because they've have not heard another example on Main Street where they were permissively cut and we are dealing with historic brick and the original design, she doesn't know of anything in their standards that would allow them to say yes. They are bound to the standards so the burden is on the applicant if they know of a building that has this. Ms. Prudhomme stated she does not know of any other building that does.

Ms. Prudhomme stated they are proposing that they go to the right-of-way, which is about 30 feet in depth and the overall length of the stairwell addition is approximately 23 feet. And the width on the stairwell is about nine feet. Chair stated so it is a full fill of what is back there. Ms. Prudhomme stated yes. There will be no parking back there.

Ms. Prudhomme stated the way the current building is structured, there are no stairs to the upper level so for egress purposes, they needed to have stairs that could be accessible and not through the main level. The Main Street level also has to have a secondary egress. When you consider all of those things, they really did not have a good option other than to have a stair added. There will be no stairs on the interior of the building. Everything is in the addition.

Commissioner Boyd asked what the proposed material would be for the addition. Ms. Prudhomme stated that is going to be a nichiha siding which is like a concrete siding. And the balcony would be metal and a metal rail.

Discussion was made on the wall and the space and who owns the wall rights.

Commissioner Welter discussed the side and rear being as important as the front façade and asked how they could blend in or not blend in with the buildings on the side of it. Ms. Prudhomme stated what they were instructed is that it should not appear that they are trying to make it look like they are going back to historic, that with the new, this is going to be like a modern concrete looking siding. Same thing with the windows. Aesthetically they want the windows to be the same color but the grill patterns they are proposing will not look like a replication of the existing.

Discussion was made on what was new material and what is existing.

Ms. Prudhomme pointed out and explained what they were proposing. Chair asked if they could get consistency with the front and do wood with aluminum clad back here. Ms. Prudhomme stated that is the plan. The only thing they would not be doing that with is the doors that are in the stair tower because of the fire rating.

It was stated the stair unit is pre-standing by itself. Ms. Prudhomme stated yes, they are trying to not put new load on the existing shell of the building. The stair addition is not visible from Main Street and only a small amount could be seen from the side street. It is visible from King Street.

The siding material was discussed and explained. It is a panel but appears like poured concrete. Chair stated they will admit as Exhibit A, the stair tower material proposal.

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.

Patrick Dunn, 125 South Lexington Avenue, Asheville stated his name for the record. Mr. Dunn stated the front balcony is essentially independent from the building. There is going to be two small holes where beams will be protruding out. There will be columns just inside the walls that will be doing the work, going straight down to the basement, chased down all the way down to the ground and on new foundations just inside the building. In that case, all the load is going to be supported independently from the brick. Very minimal. If it were ever to be taken off, you would have to patch those two holes.

Discussion was made on the steel beams and the size of those. Mr. Dunn stated he thinks they are eight or ten inch deep, something like that. The rest of the balcony is steel framing. The back as well is a completely independent structure.

Mr. Dunn stated the stairwell will be gravitationally and laterally independent.

Discussion was made on the structural changes to the building and the added windows. Chair stated you are sure that whole façade is not going to come down like on one of the other buildings when you cut it. Mr. Dunn stated he has the details for supporting the brick above the new windows. They are putting steel framing. Chair stated so they will interiorly secure before they cut. Mr. Dunn stated yes.

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 adding new windows and being viewable from the street or not. Commissioner Welter stated the State Preservation Office told the Commission that there was some leeway if you can't see it from the street. Discussion was made on whether or not you could see the windows from the street.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Ms. Prudhomme stated they had heard that was something that was a consideration. If you look at the floor plan, they start probably a quarter of the way back on the side because of that, so where you are seeing in the photograph, the windows would not start until after they discussed the view of the parapet. So if you look at the 3D mass modeling and you can see where that first window is, it is significantly set back from the front. She does not see where you would be able to view those upper windows from Main Street. Chair asked about the rear alley because that is a public street too. And King Street. Mr. Dunn stated you can't because that drive-thru are right there, and that's above so you would not be able to see it.

Mr. Dunn stated they mentioned about the water leaks, but also the existing roof is deep. The alternative of skylights is a horrible, not a very good option. He doesn't know if the Commission is considering that but the ceiling to roof height is extensive. Chair stated she thinks that is just a comment that was made.

Chair stated nine is a lot of windows to cut into a side façade that doesn't have any, and it is all historic brick and some elements on there. Why nine? Is there room to do fewer and get the same effect? Is that really what it will take to get light in there? Ms. Prudhomme stated because they are fairly high so you are not getting a lot of glazing in each window. If she could have had double glazing, they wouldn't necessarily need as much. They tried to create as much symmetry within it as possible. If the Commission said they cannot have nine, of course any light is better than no light but this was what made the most sense for the floorplan and the amount of light that they are trying to bring into the interior space.

Ms. Prudhomme explained the way the floors were going to fit.

Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the standards.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Discussion was made with staff on standard 3.4.2.10. Discussion was also made on the wall strength.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Discussion was made on the standards and the SHPO letter. Chair stated they need to be careful referencing the SHPO letter because it is not before them.

Safety concerns and egress was discussed concerning the standards.

The Commission discussed the testimony on the rear façade and the standards that apply.

The Commission discussed the front façade and the fact the applicant agreed that in keeping with the material portion from Main Street, that they would use wood. Wood with aluminum cladding and then wood for the infill surround paneling instead of synthetic material. The balcony was also discussed. The

painting of the brick was discussed.

Chair reopened the public hearing to hear from the engineer. He stated they have actually taken load off of the structure because they are actually supporting that roof just inside the wall with steel columns. It is even more structurally sound because it is doing less work.

Chair explained the guidelines versus the standards now.

Discussion was made on the residential units being short or long term rentals or condos.

Erica Hodges, 1817 Jeffress Road, Mills Riber stated her name for the record. She stated they have not yet determined if the units would be short or long term rentals.

Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney stated the rental of the units is not relevant to the COA application and cannot be considered.

Discussion was made on the building having skylights and the extreme damage the water caused.

Discussion was made on the side façade.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Welter asked if they could think about acting on the front and rear and table the side windows for further discussion. The applicant might be having more information from what they learned today. Chair stated maybe.

Discussion was made on the number of windows and cutting into the brick. Discussion was also made on the code and leaving this open for further discussion concerning the code.

Chair reopened the public hearing.

Chair asked the applicants if they would like time to explore the windows. Ms. Prudhomme stated they will explore their options. Chair stated they are going to hold open that portion of it, just for the windows on the side façade.

The Commission took a short recess.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Welter moved that the application in regards to the windows on the side façade be continued to the next regular meeting, March 18, 2026. Commissioner Welter also moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, with respect to the front and rear facades as identified in file number H26-11-COA, located within the Main Street Historic District, if added 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 is being reconstructed based on historical research and

evidence and maintains the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements. (Sec. 3.1.5) 2. The proposed balcony is new construction on the upper façade and is compatible with existing structures in the district. (Sec 3.2.8) 3. The applicant has located additions on the rear and least character-defining elevation of the building. (Sec 4.2.1) 4. The addition is differentiated from the historical building so that the integrity of the original building is not lost or compromised. (Sec 4.2.4) With the proposed condition that the use of artificial materials in the reconstruction of the front façade is not appropriate. Natural wood shall be used to reconstruct the front façade. (Sec 3.8.1) Commissioner Boyd seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI **Old Business**

VI(A) **Findings of Fact.** 323 N. Main Street (File No. 25-69-COA) *On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Smith the Findings of Fact for File No. 25-69-COA were approved.*

VI(B) **Findings of Fact.** 1015 N. Main Street (File No. 25-82-COA) *On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Boyd the Findings of Fact for File No. 25-82-COA were approved.*

VII **Other Business.**

VII(A) **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair.** *Commissioner Hammond Green made a motion to reelect Cheryl Jones as Chair and Jim Welter as Vice-Chair. Commissioner Matoian seconded the motion which passed unanimously.*

VII(B) **Committee Reports.** Sam Hayes gave an update on the committees. No action was taken.

VII(C) **Approval of Annual Committee Meeting Schedules.** *On motion of Commissioner Welter and seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Green, the annual committee meeting schedules (Designation Committee on the second Wednesday of the month) were approved.*

VII(D) **Staff Report.** Mr. Hayes gave an update on the annual retreat and also on grants. No action was taken.

VIII **Adjournment.** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

Chair