

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of Special Meeting of July 6, 2011

Commissioners Present: Phillip Allen, Bette Carter, Cheryl Jones, John Ogletree, Marty Payton, Brooke Tate (Chair), Jo Tyler

Commissioners Absent: Staci Blatt, Chuck Kuester

Staff Present: Tim Murphy, City Planner; Lu Ann Welter, Administrative Assistant

I Call to Order. The Chair called this special meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:30 pm

II Agenda. *On motion of Commissioner Tyler, seconded by Commissioner Payton, the Commission approved the agenda.*

III Minutes. *On motion of Commissioner Carter, seconded by Commissioner Ogletree, the minutes of June 15, 2011 were approved.*

IV 245 N. Main Street, Certificate of Appropriateness, File # H11-34-COA. Prior to opening the public hearings, the Chair announced that any persons desiring to testify at this hearing must first be sworn as witnesses and will be subject to cross-examination by parties or persons whose position may be contrary. A copy of the protocol for a quasi-judicial hearing is provided on the back table next to the agenda. As this is a quasi-judicial hearing, it is very important that we have an accurate record of what goes on. Therefore, 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 this application should disclose it now.

After swearing in potential witnesses for all hearings, the Chair opened this public hearing. At the request of Tim Murphy, City Planner, Commission File No. H11-34-COA was admitted into evidence and the Commission took official notice of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Hendersonville and the Commission's Design Guidelines. Mr. Murphy gave the following analysis:

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness permit from Green Earth Contracting, LLC to undertake the following work at 245 North Main Street:

1. Install a freestanding canopy over an existing ATM.

The subject property is listed as **non-contributing** in the Main Street Local Designation Report and is described as:

245 N. Main Street. First Union Bank. 1970s.
One-story modern concrete building.

The subject property is listed as **non-contributing** on the National Register and described as:

245 N. Main Street. First Union Bank. 1970s.

Only structure of a distinctly modern design on Main Street.

The existing ATM was approved by the Historic Preservation Commission at their November 2010 meeting. The applicant proposes to install a canopy over the ATM. The canopy will have 5 metal supports and a clearance height of 8 feet.

Mr. Murphy reported the applicant did not meet with the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC). He also mentioned that the canopy material was originally proposed to be vinyl but that may have changed.

Brandon Kilpatrick of All About Awnings, LLC, 1548 Airport Road, stated that there is a need for an canopy as water is currently wetting the touchpad and envelopes. The canopy material is proposed to be Sumbrella, an acrylic product, which will match the awning over the back door. (The applicant passed around a sample of the product and color.) The Chair asked if anyone would like to speak for or against the application. When no one came forward, the Chair closed the hearing.

Commissioner Carter moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness permit, as identified in file number H11-34-COA, if installed according to the information reviewed at this hearing and, with any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous or inappropriate with the character of the Main Street Local Historic District for the following reasons: 2.1.8 Awnings should be made of cloth or other woven fabric such as canvas or acrylic. Metal awnings are generally not appropriate, but can be used in some instances if they are compatible with the historic character of the building. Vinyl or plastic awnings are not appropriate. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tyler and passed unanimously.

V **1705 Meadowbrook Terrace, Certificate of Appropriateness.** The Chair opened this public hearing. At the request of Tim Murphy, City Planner, Commission File No. H11-31-COA was admitted into evidence and the Commission took official notice of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Hendersonville and the Commission's Design Guidelines. Mr. Murphy gave the following analysis:

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness permit from Appalachian Homes & Development, LLC to undertake the following work at 1705 Meadowbrook Terrace:

1. Remove board and batten siding (after-the-fact) and replace with wood cement board siding
2. Remove wooden windows and replace with vinyl windows (after-the-fact).
3. Remove front concrete block stairs and replace with wooden stairs
4. Install wooden accessible ramp on the front
5. Replace wooden balustrade on the front
6. Stucco concrete block foundation
7. Reshingle roof with architectural shingles
8. Install decorative corbels on the front and side façade gables
9. Construct an 8' x 14' addition to the rear of the building
10. Construct an 8' x 8' wooden deck and stairs at the rear of the building
11. Install sign

The applicant desires to renovate the building to use it for produce sales. The subject property is listed as **non-contributing** in the Druid Hills Local Designation Report and is described as:

1705 Asheville Highway. Commercial Retail building. By 1926.

Much altered single-story cottage-style structure with gabled roof, board-and-batten siding and a portico with replacement columns. Windows vary, including one-over-one, and six-over-one wood sash.

The subject property is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The applicant was not informed that this property was in the Druid Hills Local Historic District when he applied for a zoning permit. Due to this oversight, the applicant has already replaced the windows and removed the siding as shown in the attached photographs.

Sketch plans have been included with the application. The proposed alterations include the following:

Siding This building previously had vertical board and batten siding. The applicant proposes to install horizontal wood cement board siding.

Windows The designation report states that this building previously had 6 over 1 and 1 over 1 wooden windows. The applicant has installed 6 over 6 vinyl windows.

Front entry The applicant proposes to remove the deteriorated concrete block steps and replace them with wooden steps. In order to meet ADA requirements, a wooden handicapped ramp is proposed to be installed on the front of the building. A wooden balustrade will be installed on the front porch.

Foundation This building has a concrete block foundation with several noticeable cracks. The applicant proposes to stucco the foundation.

Roof The applicant proposes to remove the existing shingles and replace them with architectural shingles. Decorative corbels are proposed to be installed on the front and side façade gables.

Rear There is an existing 12' x 12' addition on the rear of this building that was constructed by a previous owner. The applicant proposes to construct a new 8' x 14' addition in the center of the rear facade. The new addition will be used for refrigerated storage. The siding and shingles on the addition will match those used on the rest of the building. In order to access the addition, an 8' x 8' wooden deck with stairs is proposed to be installed.

Sign A new sign is proposed in the front yard.

Mr. Murphy reported the applicant did not meet with DRAC. Concerning the siding, he said the applicant would like to use a composite material, hardie plank, and run it horizontal instead of the vertical board and batten siding that was previously on the building. He said the applicant has also installed boards under the eaves to cover the rafters. He distributed a rendering of the proposed sign saying it would have a metal pole with the wood composite material for the names of the produce. Commissioner Jones asked the zoning of the property. Mr. Murphy said C-3 Highway Business. The Chair asked if other historic district property owners, who would not typically apply for a zoning permit, are required to know they are in a historic district before beginning work. Mr. Murphy said yes. Commissioner Carter asked whether the property owner should have been informed that this property was in a historic district when he applied for a zoning permit. Mr. Murphy said yes.

Robert Rogers, of Little River Road, said that when he was getting approval from the Zoning Department nothing was said about this property being in the historic district. He received plan approval and then went to the inspections department. Mr. Rogers said they have put quite a bit of

money into the project but stopped work on the exterior when they found out they needed to go through this process. The Chair asked how long they have owned the property. Mr. Rogers said about two years explaining it has been residential and commercial in the past. There was loitering and possible drug activities when they bought the property and have had no luck leasing it. He showed a sample of the hardie plank siding they wish install. He said they would like to install it horizontal instead of vertical in order to avoid having to remove the window trim. He added they will use solid construction practices. The Chair asked whether their realtor told them it was in the historic district. Mr. Rogers said no and it did not show up on any paperwork or survey. The Chair asked about stopping work. Mr. Rogers said they stopped exterior work but continued with the interior renovation. The Chair pointed out that the steps were being demolished earlier in the day. Mr. Rogers agreed and said that they had to remove the steps as the current steps would not meet code. Commissioner Payton asked about the sign materials. Mr. Rogers said the metal post would be 18 feet high with wood at the top and the smaller signs similar to the hardie plank product.

The Chair asked why they closed up the rafters. Mr. Rogers said the rafter tails were not exposed on the entire house and that the tails were not decorative but actually holding up the roof and rotten. Commissioner Jones asked about the addition. Mr. Rogers said they are leaving the 12' x 12' addition and adding an 8' x 14' addition that would mimic the 12' x 12'. The small wooden deck would be for access to the steps outside. The Chair asked why the picture frame window trim was installed. Mr. Rogers said he felt it was more of a cottage look and vinyl windows do not need a slope sill. Commissioner Carter asked the condition of the original windows. Mr. Rogers said they did not operate and were single pane. Commissioner Jones asked about the foundation cracks and if the stucco would be enough to fix them. Mr. Rogers said the foundation is old and takes a lot of water. They will have to regrade the lot away from the foundation. He said an epoxy will fill the cracks and the stucco should fix the problem. Mr. Rogers also said he wants to remove an 18" x 24" window located in the foundation and block it up. He said it would not be allowed today because of the proximity to the stairs. Commissioner Carter asked about the lower level. Mr. Rogers said it is clay and poured concrete. Again because of the lot slope, water does keep the basement wet. He explained Henderson County requires grading eight inches over ten feet around a structure so there may be some trees that have to be removed.

The Chair asked if anyone would like to speak for or against the project. When no one came forward, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Payton commented the building is so altered that it is hard to know what it first looked like. She felt this look is an improvement. Commissioner Ogletree agreed. In discussing the windows, Commissioner Carter said she liked the six over six windows better than the one over one. The Chair said she would like more historic details as this is a prominent corner for the public to see.

Commissioner Tyler stated the property owner was not informed by the City and proceeded to install the vinyl windows. The Chair pointed out the Artificial Policy does not allow vinyl windows. Commissioner Ogletree commented this situation has happened before in Hyman Heights although it occurred before the Commission's vinyl materials policy. The Commission decided by consensus to allow the vinyl windows to remain.

The Chair said she felt the board and batten should remain as that style was already on the building and the store next door has the same vertical siding. She added she is okay with the materials. Commissioner Carter commented there is no way to know the original siding style. The Chair added

projected sills would look better with the vertical siding. The Commissioner voted, four in favor and three against, to require vertical siding.

Commissioner Jones asked if the proposed stairs should be wood. The Chair agreed that they should be wood. Commissioner Jones brought up the window trim. The Chair felt that a protruding sloped sill was more appropriate than the picture window trim. The Commission had no problem with the stuccoing of the foundation, wooden balustrade, blocking in the foundation window or the proposed roof replacement.

The Chair reopened the public hearing to ask about the wooden brackets. Mr. Rogers said they would be protruding, wooden brackets 3½” wide. Mr. Murphy commented that the applicant needs to submit a separate application for tree removal. The Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission had no problem with the additions or the sign. The Chair reopened the public hearing. Commissioner Jones asked about plantings in front of the stairs. Mr. Rogers said he is planning to landscape. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Jones moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness permit, as identified in file number H11-31-COA, if installed according to the information reviewed at this hearing and, with any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous or inappropriate with the character of the Druid Hills Historic District for the following reasons: 3.6.3 Protect and maintain the material surfaces, details, and features of exterior walls through appropriate methods: Inspect regularly for signs of moisture damage, vegetation, fungal or insect infestation, corrosion, and structural damage or settlement, Provide adequate drainage to prevent water from standing on flat, horizontal surfaces and collecting on decorative elements or along foundations, Clean exterior walls as necessary to remove heavy soiling or to prepare for repainting. Use the gentlest methods possible, Retain protective surface coatings, such as paint or stain, to prevent deterioration, reapply protective surface coatings, such as paint or stain, when they are damaged or deteriorated: 3.6.6. If full replacement of an entire exterior wall or feature is necessary because of deterioration, replace it in kind, matching the original in design, dimension, detail, texture and material. Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible: 3.12.3 The use of artificial materials in new construction shall be limited so that the new building is compatible with the surrounding contributing properties: 3.11.5 If needed, introduce new or additional means of access that are reversible and that do not compromise the original design of a historic entrance or porch: 3.11.8 Required safety additions to historic structures may be screened with shrubbery, etc: 3.5.1 Retain and preserve roofs and roof forms that contribute to the overall historic character of a building, including their functional and decorative features, such as roofing materials, cresting, dormers, chimneys, cupolas, and cornices: 3.5.5 If full replacement of a deteriorated historic roofing material or feature is necessary, replace it in kind, matching the original in scale, detail, pattern, design, material, and color. Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible: 3.6.7 If an exterior wall or feature is completely missing, replace it with a new wall or feature based on accurate documentation of the original or a new design compatible with the historic character of the building and district: 4.2.1 Construct new additions so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so that the character-defining features of the historic

building are not destroyed, damaged, or obscured: 4.2.5 Locate a new addition on an inconspicuous elevation of the historic building, usually the rear one: 4.2.2 Design new additions so that the overall character of the site, site topography, character-defining site features, and significant district vistas and views are retained: 4.2.6 Limit the size and the scale of an addition in relationship to the historic building so that it does not diminish or visually overpower the building: 4.1.1 Locate and construct decks so that the historic fabric of the structure and its character-defining features and details are not damaged or obscured. Install decks so that they are structurally self-supporting and may be removed in the future without damage to the historic structure: 2.7.1 Refer to the City Sign Ordinance. All signs must meet the ordinance before being submitted for a COA: 2.7.7 Construct new signs of traditional sign materials, such as wood, stone, and metal. It is not appropriate to introduce an incompatible contemporary sign material, such as plastic, in the historic districts. In addition, the siding shall be vertical hardie plank siding with a board and batten appearance, vinyl windows may remain but the windows sills shall be protruding sloped sills. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cater and passed unanimously

VI Committee Reports.

Designation Committee – Mr. Murphy reported the Design Committee did meet and will have a follow up meeting the next few weeks.

Community Affairs – Commissioner Carter reported on the status of DHI. Ms. Welter said she would like to meet to discuss selling the poster and postcards. She added they should also meet on next year's Preservation Week.

District Improvements – No report

VIII Commissioners Comments. No comments.

IX Staff Comments. Mr. Murphy informed the Commission that the City will pay the \$500 Façade Grant match previously contributed by DHI on applications received prior June 30, 2012.

Mr. Murphy added the Commission is short one member and encouraged everyone to think of people who might be interested in serving.

Ken Fitch, audience member, expressed concern regarding the number of large trees recently removed from Patton Avenue and Killarney. Staff will look into COAs issued and if new trees have been planted. There was also discussion about having the City's Tree Board review and comment on the Commission's Design Guidelines for plantings.

X Financial Report. *Commissioner Jones moved to approve of the Financial Report which was seconded by Commissioner Payton and passed unanimously.*

XI Adjournment. *The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.*